OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FOURTH SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

7-8 EDWARD VII., 1907-8

VOL. LXXXIII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-EIGHTH DAY OF JANUARY TO THE TWENTY-SEVENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY, INCLUSIVE.



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

ERRATA

VOL. II.

Page 2098, 21st line from top, "A. BRODEUR" should read, "A. BRODER."

House of Commons Debates

FOURTH SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, January 28, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE—ITS USE IN CONNECTION WITH PUBLIC UTILITIES.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny.) (Translation.) Moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 85) to amend the Railway Act.

He said : Mr. Speaker, the object of the Bill I now introduce is to remedy a state of things that prevails especially in the province of Quebec. The principle of this amendment is now embodied in the Railway Act as regards railway crossings, delays of trains, &c. In short, I would like that in the province of Quebec the railway companies, the telegraph and telephone companies, together with every public utility company, should be compelled to use equally the French and English languages in their relations with the public. There are, of course, in the Railway Act two clauses compelling these companies, under a penalty of $5, to publish certain indications in both languages. What I am asking is that this principle be extended so as to meet the requirements of the public. For instance, when to-day a man in the province of Quebec who speaks French only ships goods by a freight train he has to sign a contract. The blank or form handed to him is printed in English only. This remark applies to telegraph, telephone and other companies. Their contract is printed in English only, and that contract which binds the individual is exceedingly harsh. Most of the time, if not in every instance, the man who signs it does not understand the very first word of it.

My amendment is altogether in the spirit of our constitution in the widest meaning of the word. For if there are Canadians who speak nothing but the English language, there are others, especially in the province of Quebec, whose only language is the French. So, hereafter in the province of Quebec every railway, telegraph or telephone company, or any other company being a public utility shall use jointly the English and French languages in all the public operations of their service, either for the publication of the arrival or departure of trains, for time-tables, transfer tickets, way-bills, baggage checks, employees' badges, car class indication, message or contract blanks, subscription books, or public notices or regulations in stations, cars, offices or workshops of such companies or public utilities.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—'LA PRESSE' AND MR. NORTHRUP'S MOTION.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny.) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I wish to rise to a question of privilege. I read in 'La Presse' edition of the 25th inst., that when the question was put on Mr. Northrup's motion relating to the production of certain documents, Messrs. Robitaille and Armand Lavergne were absent, but that Mr. Lavergne was not far away from the House of Commons when the vote was taken. This tends to make it understood that I ran away in order not to vote. Indeed, I was not far from Ottawa, but I was on board of the train going to Quebec.

For the better information of the 150,000 readers of 'La Presse,' I may say that had I been in the House at that time I would have voted for Mr. Northrup's amendment, because I consider it the very essence of our representative government and of Canadian liberalism that members of parliament be allowed to examine all documents before being called upon to grant subsidies to His Majesty.

MAIL COMMUNICATION WITH THE YUKON.

Mr. A. THOMPSON (Yukon Territory). Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to complaints I have had from the Yukon regarding the transmission of mail, and to ask him what mails are allowed at this time to go to the Yukon.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). From the 1st of June until

the beginning of October, perhaps a little later, according to the season of the year, mails are sent direct from any part of this country to the Yukon Territory and to Dawson. After about the 1st of October we send only a limited number of parcels and letters to the Yukon Territory, to Dawson and the surrounding posts. The following classes of mail matter are only sent onwards from White Horse to their destination in the Yukon :—

Letters (in their usual and ordinary form); post cards ; singly wrapped newspapers and periodicals from the office of publication, addressed to public libraries, to newspaper publishers and individual subscribers ; transient newspapers and third-class matter of all kinds except books, trade catalogues, circulars and patterns and samples of merchandise.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do all kinds of mail matter go as far as White Horse ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, all the year round.

Mr. THOMPSON. And have Canadian posmasters been notified of that fact ?

Mr. LEMIENX. They have been notified, but in view of the representations that have been made to the department by my hon. friend, I have issued a new circular that will be posted in all the post offices of the Yukon Territory.

NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN OTTAWA AND WASHINGTON.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether any information is to be afforded to the House respecting negotiations which are said to be pending between Canada and the United States for the purpose of concluding a treaty respecting various important matters. A somewhat circumstantial account has appeared in some of the English journals, and allusion is made in our own press to a projected visit to Ottawa of the British ambassador at Washington. I thought it well to call the Prime Minister's attention to this, in case he might have any communication to make to the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Informal negotiations have been carried on by Mr. Bryce, the British ambassador, upon different subjects affecting the relations between Canada and the United States. One is about inland fisheries. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster remembers very well that when he was in office an attempt was made to have uniform regulations prevail on the great lakes, and to have a close season. That is under consideration at the present time. Then there is the question of the distribution of water power on the great lakes, which has been under consideration for some time. I understand Mr. Bryce is coming to Ottawa in a short time with a view of discussing these and any further questions with the Canadian government.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to draw attention to the return which was brought down in answer to an order of the House, dated 11th December last :

For a copy of all correspondence, petitions, statements, papers, orders in council and proclamations respecting the setting out of limits for prohibition of the sale of liquors along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific under the Public Works Construction Act.

Well, all I get is some correspondence between the Alberta Deputy Attorney General and the Railway Department, and an inquiry by the Railway Department from the Secretary of State, from which it appears that there is not anything to return. I must have been very much misled in reading the papers, as I had gathered that along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific, east and west, there was a variety of moves made and communications took place, and orders given, and orders recalled, so far as the extension of the limits were concerned. I know it was a matter of much remark in the newspapers, and I am afraid that this return is not a full return. This is not what I wanted at all, and it is not such as I ought to get.

Mr. GRAHAM. I suppose the correspondence was brought down. If there is anything in my department which has not been brought down I will be glad to see that it is. There seems to be several departments involved, the Department of Justice, and possibly the Department of Railways and Canals. What department does the hon. gentleman think has been lax ?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the Department of Justice, as usual, is lax in this case.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. No, everything that is on the files of the department has been returned.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When am I likely to receive a return asked for on the 11th of December, and also one on the 10th of December, one with regard to the Postmaster General's Department, and the other with regard to subsidies to steamships ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The return with regard to subsidies has been brought down to-day.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I desire to ask the Minister of Militia when the return asked for on December 11 will be brought down. The return asked for any further information regarding the Ross Rifle Company, and also correspondence respecting the drill shed.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not quite sure about these, I will inquire and let the hon. gentleman know to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. There are some returns that I have inquired about half a dozen times, and have not got them yet. One was from the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the other from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BRODEUR. The return regarding my department is very voluminous, but it is being prepared.

SUPPLY—JAPANESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Before you leave the chair, I desire to address a few remarks to a subject that has already been discussed at considerable length in this House during the present session. My hon. friend the Postmaster General has lately returned from a mission to Japan, and he delivered in this House a week ago to-day a very eloquent speech, giving us an account of the result of his mission. My hon. friend always speaks gracefully and eloquently, and perhaps some of us might have entertained the wish that on that occasion there had been a little less eloquence and a little more information. He found himself constrained, no doubt for good reasons, to circumscribe considerably the information he gave on certain points which are of very material interest and importance to the people of this country at the present juncture. I do not, in the least, desire to be understood as reflecting upon the hon. gentleman in that regard, because, if one principle is to be more insisted upon than another in international dealings, it is that confidences of the character alluded to should be respected. I am alluding to this, however, for the reason that the action and attitude of the present government have brought our affairs in relation to Japan into such a condition that what would otherwise be necessary and desirable information was denied and necessarily denied, I presume, by my hon. friend the Postmaster General to this House on that occasion.

The hon. gentleman took great pains to justify the good faith and courteous attitude of the government and the people of Japan and so far as his remarks in that regard are concerned I entirely concur in what he says. The government of Japan negotiated this treaty with Canada at our instance. As I shall show later on they were not asked to accompany that treaty by any stipulation or proviso which should reserve to the parliament of Canada control of immigration from Japan into this country. This government went to Japan and asked Japan to permit Canada to accede to that treaty absolutely and without reserve and it was upon that application that the government of Japan entered into the convention of 1906 which accorded to the citizens of Japan absolute and full right and liberty to enter and travel and reside in this country. The hon. gentleman has referred to a so-called tacit understanding between the government of this country and the government of Japan. He has also alluded to assurances given on behalf of the government of Japan to the government of this country with respect to the restriction or even the prohibition of immigration from Japan to Canada; and he has declared to the House, speaking for the government in that regard, that this tacit understanding and these assurances have been absolutely and perfectly carried out in good faith by the government of Japan. In that regard he does absolutely justify the government of Japan, but it seems to me, that, having regard to the condition of affairs which has prevailed in this country during the past twelve months, when he justifies the government of Japan he condemns the government of which he, himself, is a member. That, it seems to me, necessarily follows, because, if these assurances were not made on behalf of the government of Japan and therefore indeed not to be respected on behalf of the government of Japan, that is one horn of the dilemma; or, on the other hand, if they have been made, kept and respected in perfect good faith it necessarily follows that these assurances could not, in the first instance, have been what the necessities of this country demanded. I think that absolutely and logically follows. When you justify the government of Japan with respect to the conditions which have prevailed in this country during the past twelve months, then you say in so many words that this government did not take the necessary safeguards and guarantees for the protection of this country and especially of the western provinces from that immigration as to which so many warnings have been uttered to this government during the past six or seven years.

There is one other aspect of my hon. friend's mission to which I desire to call attention before proceeding to deal with the general question. He has spoken of the very great aid and support afforded him, not only by the British Ambassador, but by the British government, and if there is one particular course in which my hon. friend especially showed very great wisdom and shrewdness it is the course which he took as soon as he arrived in Japan in placing himself under the ægis of the British Ambassador and in endeavouring to secure the whole weight of the empire behind him in his application to the Japanese government to exercise that control which the government of this country should itself have been able to exercise if the proper policy

had been pursued and carried out. My hon. friend told us, not in so many words, but I think we could very well read between the lines that if it had not been for the efforts of the British ambassador, if it had not been for the whole hearted support of the British government, his mission to Japan would have probably resulted in an absolute and utter failure—I do not know whether it is much more than that as it is—but it would have resulted in an absolute and utter failure, he would have been dismissed from the Japanese government with a few polite expressions and he would have returned to this country no wiser than when he left. I think that would have been probably the result and it is rather an amusing commentary upon the recent declarations of hon. gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches as to the great revolution which has been wrought in the affairs of this empire, a revolution under which they now take charge of all treaties that specially concern Canada. The boasts made by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the boasts of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) have been heard in this country during the past five or six months, more especially in regard to the French treaty and not very much, I am bound to say, in regard to the treaty with Japan which they themselves negotiated and for which they are solely and absolutely responsible.

Well, the hon. Postmaster General took the right course. This government had got Canada into a very serious difficulty and the Postmaster knew that this government was rather powerless to extricate itself from that difficulty; therefore he had to invoke and did invoke the support of the British ambassador and of the British government as well. Whether or not everything could have been accomplished by $500 worth of telegrams from Ottawa to Tokio and from Ottawa to London I do not know, but I am prepared to assert that any success which my hon. friend achieved in Tokio, as he, himself, no doubt will be prepared to admit, and as he, himself, has, in fact, admitted, is largely due—practically altogether due—to the support of the British ambassador at Tokio.

Now, the question with which we are concerned to-day is a very important question. It is one fraught with momentous issues to this country and it is a question which probably will confront the people of this country when all those who are within the sound of my voice to-day have passed off the scene. It is the great question of world politics which must be worked out on the Pacific ocean in the years to come; it is the great question of the influence that the great nations of the orient, aroused to modern methods and organized as they have not been organized before, will exercise upon the destinies of the world and especially upon the Pacific. This question, while at the present moment it is one within a rather narrow compass, is, after all, a very great question and we are only upon the fringe of it to-day in discussing the question of the control of immigration from the great empire of Japan to the Dominion of Canada.

We all know that in 1894 treaties were negotiated by Japan with various countries. In 1894 a treaty was negotiated between Great Britain and Japan. That treaty did not bind the self-governing colonies of the empire but by article XIX of the treaty it was competent for any of these self-governing dependencies to accede to the treaty, to take advantage of it and to be bound by its terms. In the same year the United States negotiated a treaty with Japan and so far as this question of the control of immigration is concerned there was a marked difference between the terms of the British treaty and those of the United States treaty. The United States reserved to itself the right to control the immigration of labourers from Japan into the United States, as has been shown to this House in a very lucid and exhaustive manner by my hon. friend from Naniamo (Mr. Ralph Smith) in a debate which took place earlier this session. The British treaty with Japan made no such provision, because so far as Great Britain was concerned the possible danger which confronted the United States did not confront the British isles. The British isles, thickly populated and at a great distance from Japan were in no danger of any immigration from that country which could in any way affect the economic interests and the labouring population of the British isles. In the United States the reverse was the case. Japan had awakened; the Pacific had become merely a magnificent highway between the orient and this continent, and so the United States took the precaution, when they entered into a treaty with Japan in 1894, to insert a stipulation which is not to be found in the treaty negotiated between Great Britain and Japan that same year.

It is necessary for the purpose of what I desire to submit to the House, to review to some extent the negotiations between the government of Canada and the Colonial Office of Great Britain with respect to the terms of this treaty and with respect to the conditions upon which Canada was willing to accede to it. I have in my hand a copy of an order in council which was passed by the Conservative administration of the day, on August 3, 1895. The treaty, as the House will remember was negotiated in 1894, and shortly afterwards it was submitted to all the self-governing colonies of the empire. In 1895 it came under the consideration of the Canadian government, and on the 3rd of August, 1895, this order in council to which I refer was passed. I shall read it so that the House and the coun-

try may clearly and thoroughly understand what was the attitude of the Conservative government of the day with respect to the control of immigration from Japan to Canada. I may say by way of preface, that I am a little at a loss to state to the House the official status of Mr. Wilkinson who is referred to in this order in council. The despatch to which it is an answer has not been brought down by the government, for the reason as stated by the Prime Minister, that it is of a confidential character. It is clear, however, that Mr. Wilkinson was an official of either the colonial office or the foreign office, and that he had made representations to the government of Great Britain with regard to this matter which were considered of moment, and which were forwarded to the government of Canada in the year 1895. I may say that this order in council was not brought down with the papers which accompanied the Japanese treaty when that treaty was laid upon the table of the House last session. I looked over the files of that return; I found allusion to this order in council, and the Prime Minister was good enough to send me a copy on Saturday last when for the first time I had an opportunity of perusing it. The order in council is in the following terms :

ORDER IN COUNCIL.

August 3, 1895.

The committee of the Privy council have had under consideration a circular dispatch, hereto attached, dated May 7, 1895, from the Most Honourable the Marquess of Ripon, transmitting copies of two despatches from Her Majesty's minister at Tokio, Japan, on the subject of the emigration of Japanese labourers to the British Colonies ; and also an article from the 'Japan Daily Mail' newspaper, with reference to the trade between Japan and Australia.

The Minister of Interior to whom the despatch and its enclosures were referred, states that the only portion of the reference which is of vital consequence to Canada, is that which relates to the former mentioned subject.

The minister observes from the memorandum of Mr. Wilkinson of January 10, that in the treaty lately concluded between Japan and the United States, there is the following proviso: 'It is, however, understood that the stipulations contained in this and the preceding article do not in any way affect the laws, ordinances and regulations with regard to trade, immigration of labourers, police and public security which are in force, or may hereafter be enacted in either of the two countries.' The corresponding clause in the treaty between Great Britain and Japan merely reads:—'Subject always to the laws, ordinances and regulations of each country.'

The minister agrees with Mr. Wilkinson's observations that this proviso 'could scarcely be appealed to as justifying either exclusion or restriction, without laying ourselves open to the charge of bad faith.'

The minister is further of the opinion that Mr. Wilkinson is justified in the conclusion that 'it might well happen that the government of the colonies would find themselves forced to take measures to restrict, suspend or even prohibit the immigration.'

The minister submits that, in the interests of the Dominion of Canada, there should be a proviso in the treaty of Great Britain with Japan similar to that contained in the treaty between that country and the United States, and he recommends that, when the adhesion of Canada is being given to the treaty, an express stipulation of this kind should be made, and that some further definition should be required of the term 'labourer' so that it will definitely include artisans.

The committee advise that Your Excellency be moved to forward a certified copy of this minute to the Right Honourable Her Majesty's principal Secretary of State for the colonies.

All which is respectfully submitted for Your Excellency's approval.

JOHN J. McGEE,
Clerk of the Privy council.

Now, up to that time, so far as I have been able to understand by an examination of the reports of the debates of this parliament, there had been very little agitation indeed in the province of British Columbia or elsewhere in the Dominion of Canada with regard to the regulation, restriction, or prohibition of the entry of Japanese labourers into Canada, and it seems to me that the order in council which I have just read shows a very considerable degree of foresight on the part of the Conservative statesmen of that day in looking forward to the conditions which actually have prevailed in this country, to a greater or lesser extent, from 1900 up to the present time. On the 6th of August, 1895, that order in council was forwarded to His Majesty's principal Secretary of State for the Colonies by a despatch under the hand of the deputy Governor General, Sir Henry Strong.

The next step to which I desire to call attention is that on the 18th of October in the same year, 1895, the British ambassador at Tokio transmitted to the Japanese government the purport of that order in council, and declared to them in the memo. which he delivered :

The Canadian government in adhering to this treaty would desire a stipulation with respect to Japanese immigration similar to that inserted in the treaty between Japan and the United States, and that they desire a further definition of the word 'labourer' by adding thereto the words 'including artisans.'

And on the 7th of February, 1896, the Japanese government acceded to that request except so far as the word 'artisan' was concerned. I will read that portion which relates to this particular subject, of the despatch of the British ambassador at Tokio to the Marquis of Salisbury, then Foreign Minister for Great Britain. The despatch is under date February 7, 1906, at Tokio and it contains the following :—

His Excellency (that is, the Japanese Foreign Minister), produced a written memorandum, the terms of which were to the purpose that the Japanese government were willing to agree that Canada, in signifying her adhesion to the treaty, might do so with a proviso that the stipulations of the treaty shall not in any way affect the laws of either country in regard to the immigration of labourers, and further, that the treaty should cease to be binding six months after notice to terminate it had been given by either side.

So there was a complete agreement by the Japanese government to the demand of the Canadian government, except that at that time they did not consent that the word 'labourers' should be expanded by adding thereto the word 'artisans.'

The British ambassador, on February 10, 1896, following the suggestion of Canada in that regard, made an inquiry of the government of Japan as to whether or not that which had been demanded by Canada and consented to by the Japanese government would also be consented to by the Japanese government in respect to the adhesion of the other self-governing dependencies of the empire to the treaty of 1894. On the 19th of March, 1896, the Japanese government in reply to this demand of the British ambassador expressed its consent to the adhesion of all the other self-governing colonies on the same terms as Canada, but continued to object to the addition of the word artisans.

On the 15th of July, 1896, Mr. Chamberlain, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, sent a dispatch to the Governor General inquiring whether the government of Canada would adhere to the Japanese treaty. The Conservative government at that date had just gone out of power and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister had assumed the reins of office. On the 29th of July Sir Richard Cartwright then Minister of Trade and Commerce, submitted a report to the Privy Council. I will not read the whole of that report, but I will read a portion of it, because it is rather important as indicating the reasons upon which this government declined to accede to the treaty with Japan. The report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in its preamble, refers to the treaty and to various confidential communications which had taken place with regard thereto, and continues as follows :

The minister in reporting thereon has the honour to submit for the consideration of His Excellency the Governor General in Council, that while he fully approves of the general provisions of the treaty as modified, yet considering the interpretation put by Her Majesty's government as well as by those governments interested upon the intent and meaning of the 'most favoured nation clauses,' as they appear in treaties between Great Britain and foreign countries, which interpretation under existing circumstances would be held to be binding upon the Dominion of Canada, and in view of the provisions contained in article V. of the said treaty, and of questions arising as to the exact meaning of provisions contained in articles VIII., IX. and XV., and considering that apparently under the provisions of these several articles the Dominion would be further hampered in any effort that might be made in connection with the negotiation of arrangements under which any concession made for special equivalents granted by reason thereof to or with other countries, he does not deem it advisable that the Dominion should become a party to or be bound by the provisions of the treaty in question. He therefore respectfully recommends that if approved, His Excellency the Governor General be moved to communicate by cable to the Rt. Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies the substance of the minute of council founded hereon, in order that the Japanese government may be advised thereof with as little delay as possible and within the time limit as per article XIX. of the said treaty.

R. J. CARTWRIGHT.

The language of this recommendation is very confused. There seems to be an omission in one part, because one of the sentences is apparently incomplete; but the purport of it is easily to be understood. The government were oppressed by the fear that the adhesion of Canada to that treaty might hamper them in some way in connection with preferential trade, which was then under discussion. For my part, I do not see what possible effect it could have in the direction indicated by this report, because the Japanese treaty did not embody the provisions contained in the German and Belgian treaties. As every one acquainted with the subject knows, these treaties contained an express stipulation that any concession or advantage granted by Canada to the mother country must be granted also to Belgium and Germany. There was no such stipulation in the Japanese treaty, and for that reason it seems to me no such difficulty could have arisen. Indeed, in the following year the Canadian government itself passed an order in council declaring that Japan was entitled to the benefits of the reciprocal or preferential tariff. The Minister of Trade and Commerce in his report did not take into consideration the labour question at all, but did have regard to a consideration which seems to me altogether fallacious, and which should not have interfered in the slightest degree with the adhesion of Canada to this treaty.

On the 18th of September, 1896, Mr. Chamberlain notified Canada that Queensland has refused to accept the treaty unless given freedom of action in respect to the immigration of Japanese artisans. A further order in council was passed on the 15th of October, 1896, refusing to accede to the treaty for the reasons already stated. On the 21st of October, 1896, Mr. Chamberlain communicated to the Governor Gen-

eral the information that the time for adhering to the treaty had been extended for one year, that is to the 25th of August, 1897.

On the 8th of October, 1896, the British ambassador, in a report to Lord Salisbury, declared that the Japanese government had last come to an understanding with him respecting the exact terms of the protocol which reserved to the self-governing colonies acceding to this treaty a right of control over immigration. I will refer to that report and to the protocol itself, because they are of importance in coming to an understanding of the position which this government afterwards took. The dispatch is dated the 8th of October, 1896, and contains the following language :

I have the honour to inclose copy of a draft protocol which, in pursuance of an understanding arrived at with Count Okuma on the 2nd instant, I placed to-day in His Excellency's hands. It provides for the reservation of the right to legislate with regard to trade, immigration of labourers and artisans, police and public security to all the colonies and foreign possessions of the Crown mentioned in article XIX. of the new treaty, except Newfoundland and Natal which have already signified their unconditional adhesion and is reciprocal in form. It is framed on the model of the last paragraph of article II. of the new treaty between the United States and Japan.

The last sentence of the British ambassador's report in referring to his communication to the Foreign Minister of Japan is as follows :

As, however, no legislation seemed to be in immediate contemplation in either Canada or Australia, it would appear that what the governments of those colonies desired was to have the power of legislation in reserve so as to be able, in case of need, to satisfy public opinion.

And a draft protocol was then agreed upon between the British ambassador and the Japanese government as embodying the terms, provisions and stipulations to which the government of Japan would consent. That protocol is in the following terms, and is inclosure No. 1 in the despatch from which I have already read some extracts.

Draft protocol.

The undersigned duly authorized, &c., have agreed that the stipulations contained in the first and third articles of the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between Great Britain and Japan, signed in London on the 16th July, 1894, shall not in any way affect the laws, ordinances and regulations with regard to trade, the immigration of labourers and artisans, police and public security which are in force or may hereafter be enacted in either of the colonies and foreign possessions of Her Britannic Majesty enumerated in article XIX. of the said treaty, with the exception of Newfoundland and Natal, or in Japan.

In witness thereof

Done at Tokio, 1896.

It will be observed that by this protocol, the terms of which were thus settled and assented to by the British ambassador and the Japanese government, Japan formally consented not only to the restriction already embodied in the treaty between Japan and the United States, but also to the original demand of Canada made in August, 1895, that the word 'labourers,' used in the United States treaty should be broadened by adding thereto the words 'and artisans.'

On the 23rd January, 1897, the matter again came before the consideration of this government, and by an order in council of that date the government affirmed the same reasons as before for refusing to accede to the treaty. And it will be observed in this connection that up to the time the Conservative government went out of power Japan —although it had acceded to the stipulation embodied in the treaty with the United States—had not acceded to the additional words, 'and artisans,' required by the order in council of 1895. It is, however, apparent that the Japanese government, in October 1896, accepted in full the view put forward by the Canadian government in August, 1895, and therefore the treaty could have been acceded by Canada at that time upon the exact terms laid down by the Conservative administration in its order in council of the 3rd August, 1895.

On the 30th July, 1897, the question of Japanese immigration into British Columbia had apparently become a somewhat serious one, because on that date the British Columbia government and legislature sent a memorial to the Governor General in which they respectfully requested that if the Dominion government should decide to become a party to the treaty with Japan, they would secure such stipulations as would prevent the unrestricted immigration of Japanese into Canada. And in the year 1900, there was a petition of more than 2,000 residents of British Columbia to His Excellency the Governor General, in which it was set out that between the 1st January, 1900, and the 30th April, 1900, 4,669 Japanese had landed in Victoria and Vancouver and the province was being flooded with them.

So the matter stood until the 7th June, 1905, nearly ten years afterwards, when, by an order in council passed by the present administration, it was declared that the previous obstacles to the accession of Canada to the treaty had been removed and His Excellency the Governor General was moved to ascertain whether or not the Japanese government was prepared to admit Canada to participation in the treaty. The Colonial Secretary had before him the attitude of the Canadian government in 1895. He had before him the express declaration made by Canada in 1895 that Canada would not accede to this treaty except with stipulations which would enable

Canada to restrict Japanese immigration if necessary. And he had before him, no doubt, the consent of the Japanese government to the protocol which I have already read—the protocol containing an express proviso and stipulation with regard to the control of immigration. So he addressed to the Governor General of Canada the despatch which I have under my hand, and which is as follows :

London, July 14, 1905.

Referring to your confidential despatch of 7th June, should Japanese government be informed that your government wishes to adhere to treaty of 1894 and supplementary convention of 1895 under same terms and conditions as Queensland in 1897 which Japanese government then agreed to extend to any other colonies adhering within prescribed period, namely (1) that stipulations contained in first and third articles of treaty shall not in any way affect laws, ordinances and regulations with regard to trade, immigration of labourers, artisans, police and public security, which are in force or hereafter may be enacted in Japan or in colony; (2) that treaty shall cease to be binding as between Japan and colony at expiration of twelve months after notice has been given on either side of desire to terminate same.

Or are your government prepared to adhere absolutely and without reserve as would appear to be the case from speech of Minister of Agriculture in Canadian parliament, June 22? Please telegraph reply.

LYTTLETON.

The speech of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) delivered in this House on the 22nd June, 1905, is to be found at page 7912 of 'Hansard.' It declares in effect that the government have absolutely abandoned an intention of discriminating in any way against Japanese labourers coming to Canada and that consequently Canada was prepared to accede absolutely to the treaty without reserving control of immigration from Japan. I am not giving the hon. gentleman's exact words but their effect, and the hon. gentleman will correct me if I am wrong.

Therefore, the government of this country had their attention directed by this despatch from the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Lyttleton, to the attitude which their predecessors, the Conservative government, had taken in 1895—an attitude which eventually had commanded the assent and approval of Japan. Thus, this government had before them the exact situation. They had before them, on the one hand, the question of absolute and unreserved adhesion, and on the other hand the question of acceding to that treaty upon the terms already consented to by Japan, which would enable the government of this country at all times to control the immigration of artisans and labourers from Japan into Canada. But hon. gentlemen opposite paid so little attention to the subject, they had this most important feature of the question so little in mind, that apparently they forgot all about the despatch of the Colonial Secretry. So that on the 5th September, 1905, nearly eight weeks afterwards, they sent a despatch through the Governor General to the Colonial Secretary to this effect :

My Prime Minister earnestly hopes that you will press the immediate entry of Canada into the Anglo-Japanese treaty.

Without deigning one word of reply to the warning addressed to them by the Colonial Secretary in respect of the attitude they should assume as to the control of immigration, they apparently forgot the subject absolutely, and some seven or eight weeks afterwards sent this further despatch through the Governor General requesting that the British government would press the immediate entry of Canada into the Anglo-Japanese treaty. Well, if they were forgetful, if they were mindful of Canada's interests, the Colonial Secretary had these matters in mind; for, the following day, September 6, he sent in reply the following telegram to the Governor General :

London, September 6, 1905.

In reply to your telegram received to-day please inform your Prime Minister that before taking steps as regards adhesion of your government to commercial treaty with Japan His Majesty's government awaiting reply to telegram of July 14.

LYTTLETON.

A great deal is said sometimes—I think, on occasion, even by the Prime Minister himself—as to the disregard by the imperial government of Canadian interests in the negotiation of treaties with foreign powers. Here was a case in which the British government were trying to preserve the interests of the Canadian people in the control of immigration, and these gentlemen upon the treasury benches had so little regard to this subject, of such transcendent importance, as it is that they even forgot within six or seven weeks the warning which had been addressed to them on the subject by the imperial government. They again called their cabinet together and took the subject into earnest consideration. And this is the result of their deliberations, as embodied in the order in council of September 25, 1905 :

Ottawa, September 25, 1905.

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has had under consideration the minute of council approved on June 7 last, advising, on the recommendation of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that His Excellency be moved to ascertain whether the Japanese government would be prepared to admit Canada to a participation in the existing treaty between Great Britain and Japan, adopted in the year 1894 and supplementary convention 1895 and has had also under consideration the cable des-

patch from Mr. Lyttleton to Earl Grey of July 14 last inquiring whether the government of Canada was prepared to adhere absolutely and without reserve to the treaty of 1894 and 1895, or whether Canada desired to limit the terms of the treaty to the conditions made on behalf of Queensland when accepting the Japanese treaty, which provided that the stipulations contained in the 1st and 3rd articles of the treaty should not in any way affect the laws, ordinances and regulations with regard to trade, immigration of labourers, artisans, police and public security which are in force or might hereafter be enacted in Japan or Queensland; (2) limiting the treaty to a period of 12 months after notice given on either side.

When the minute of council dated June 7, 1905, was approved the judgment of the Privy council as expressed in that minute was that Canada was willing to become a party to the Treaty of 1894 and supplementary convention of 1895 without any reserve. Since those dates Japan has enacted a law limiting immigration to foreign countries thus removing one of the objections that influenced the government of Canada in declining to become a party to the treaty with Japan in 1897. It is doubtful whether Japan would now agree to a treaty on any other basis than the proposals contained in the original treaty.

The undersigned therefore recommends that a cable despatch be sent to Mr. Lyttleton advising him that the government of Canada is prepared to adhere absolutely and without reserve to the treaty of commerce and navigation made between Great Britain and Japan in 1894 and supplementary convention signed at Tokio in July, 1895.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

R. W. SCOTT,
Secretary of State.

So, on the following day, September 26, 1905, the deputy of the Governor General, Hon. Mr. Taschereau, addressed the following dispatch to the Colonial Secretary:

Government House,
Ottawa, September 26, 1905.

The Right Honourable
Alfred Lyttleton, P.C., &c.

Sir,—The Governor General had the honour to send you to-day a telegraphic message in code of which the following is a translation:—

Referring to your telegram July 14, responsible ministers prepared to adhere to Japanese treaty 1894, and supplementary convention of 1895, absolutely and without reserve. Minute of council and despatch follow by mail.

I now have the honour to enclose herewith copy of the minute of council referred to, upon which that message was founded.

H. E. TASCHEREAU,
Deputy of the Governor General.

We observe an entire absence from this order in council of any mention of the assurances that have been referred to so copiously by my hon. friend the Postmaster General and Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux). There is no assurance referred to in this order in council which forms the basis upon which Canada acceded to this treaty of 1906. The reasons set forth in this order in council are two: First, that Japan has enacted a law limiting immigration to foreign countries. Now, Japan could enact a law one day and repeal it the next, just as the parliament of Canada is at liberty to repeal or alter or modify any enactment of this parliament, and the mere enactment of a provision by the parliament of Japan, subject to alteration or repeal the next day, surely was but insufficient ground for putting to one side all considerations of that protocol which had been assented to by Japan and which would have reserved to Canada control which Canada ought to have over immigration into our country. The second reason assigned is as follows:

It is doubtful whether Japan would now agree to a treaty on any other basis than the proposals contained in the original treaty.

What was the ground for that doubt? Japan had consented to a protocol in October, 1896, and this government had it open to them at all times between October, 1896, and September 25, 1907, to accede to that treaty with a stipulation ensuring to Canada the control over immigration. For what reason is it to be said that there was any doubt? At all events, assuming that there was doubt, would it not have been worth while before plunging into a treaty of that kind which deprives us of the control of immigration, to at least make an attempt and, after making an attempt and ascertaining what the conditions were, to come to parliament and have a discussion and find out whether or not the true voice and spirit of this country was in favour of giving up control of immigration from Japan in order to secure any commercial advantages which would accrue to us by adhesion to that treaty?

Now, we have heard a good deal about assurances, and we have been told a good deal by my hon. friend the Postmaster General as to the spirit in which these assurances have been carried out by Japan. I do not desire to controvert his statements in the slightest degree in that regard. But I am prompted to observe that these assurances, as I understand the matter, were conveyed to this government by the consul general of Japan, Mr. Nossé, who formerly resided in Montreal and afterwards resided here in Ottawa. I have yet to learn that a consul general has any diplomatic functions or status which could have justified our government in accepting his assurances on that point. Why the very first duty of a new ambassador—and an ambassador has a high diplomatic status—upon his arrival in the country to which he is accredited, is to present his credentials, sometimes with a further statement of his powers. These powers are narrowly and closely examined, and on engagement made by him outside of his powers is entertained by the country to which he is accredited.

So far as Mr. Nossé is concerned, any

elementary book on international law, all the standard authorities on international law lay it down as beyond question that a consul has no diplomatic status, he has no apparent authority to enter into an engagement of this kind. I could not get an answer from the Postmaster General as to whether the Japanese government held itself bound by all the engagements made by Mr. Nossé on its behalf. My hon. friend contended that Japan was bound. He asserted that the official status of the consul general was sufficient to give credit to these assurances. He put forward, in one part of his speech at least, the reason that these assurances were given upon paper bearing the impress of the imperial government of Japan. Well, that would be a far reaching argument if it were carried to its legitimate conclusion, and I presume my hon. friend the Postmaster General would not be disposed to lay too much stress upon it. But if this government were entitled to accept the assurances of Mr. Nossé, as the Postmaster General declares, then in respect of the doubt which has been raised as to the adherence by the Japanese government to the consent which it gave in 1896, I would like to point out that Mr. Nossé, in 1903, made a very important statement to the government of this country, a statement which would have justified the government in concluding that the government of Japan would maintain that consent and would adhere to that treaty with the stipulation I have already quoted. On the 30th of March, 1903, Mr. Nossé addressed a communication to the Prime Minister. This communication was not brought down in the papers laid upon the table of the House in 1906; it is included however in the further return which has been laid upon the table of the House during the present session. The communication in question reads as follows :

March 30, 1903.

Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
Premier and President of the Council,
Ottawa.

In answer to my cablegram to the imperial Japanese government advising them to continue the policy of restricting their people immigrating in any large number into British Columbia, I have received a cable instruction to the effect that I have to give your government the renewed assurances that the Japanese government are not desirous of forcing their people into British Columbia against the wish of the province, and that they are willing to enter into an agreement with your government by which they may bind themselves, if their present policy of rigid restriction is not deemed satisfactory to your government.

T. NOSSE,
Consul General of Japan.

If that means any thing it means that the government of Japan, in March, 1903, would have been perfectly willing to have Canada accede to this treaty upon that proviso and stipulation to which Japan did give its assent in October, 1896. With a communication expressed in such forcible terms, and of so recent a date, it does seem remarkable that the government, in 1905, saw fit to plunge this country into the difficulty with which it is now confronted, and so to alter the condition of affairs that we cannot maintain over immigration to this country that control which is eminently necessary in the public interest.

Now I come more particularly to the results of the mission to Japan of my hon. friend the Postmaster General. The real object of his mission was to induce Japan to exercise that control over immigration into Canada which we should be able to exercise ourselves. It is one of the attributes of the sovereign power of any State to restrict, or even altogether prohibit, the entrance of aliens within its territory. If we had preserved that right by the stipulation insisted upon by the Conservative government in August, 1895, there would have been no difficulty. We did not reserve that right; therefore, having passed over to the Japanese government that control which should have been exercised by ourselves, it became necessary for my hon. friend the Postmaster General to go to the Japanese government and to ask them to exercise some control and some regulation. That in short is the actual position of affairs which confronted this government when the Postmaster General embarked on his mission to Japan. I am bound to say that the Japanese government seems to have exercised a perfect courtesy and a most wonderful forbearance in agreeing not to insist, for the time being, upon its full treaty rights, which undoubtedly had been granted to Japan by the treaty of 1896, bringing into force the treaty of 1894. What has my hon. friend the Postmaster General brought back ? He has brought back, outside the information which he is not at liberty to disclose to this House and to which I will not again refer, a letter from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Viscount Hayashi. That letter has been read to this House, and appears on the pages of 'Hansard.' It is a very polite letter, it is couched in the most courteous terms. Let us see what there really is in it so far as the interests of this country need safeguarding. In the first place let me read the letter, because it is well that the attention of the House should again be directed to its exact terms :

Tokio, December 23, 1907.

Monsieur le Ministre,—

In reply to your note of even date, I have the honour to state that although the existing treaty between Japan and Canada absolutely guarantees to Japanese subjects full liberty to enter, travel and reside in any part of the Dominion of Canada, yet it is not the intention of the imperial government to insist upon

the complete enjoyment of the rights and privileges guaranteed by those stipulations when that would involve disregard of special conditions which may prevail in Canada from time to time.

Acting in this spirit and having particular regard to circumstances of recent occurrence in British Columbia, the imperial government have decided to take efficient means to restrict emigration to Canada. In carrying out this purpose, the imperial government, in pursuance of the policy above stated, will give careful consideration to local conditions prevailing in Canada, with a view to meeting the desires of the government of the Dominion as far as is compatible with the spirit of the treaty and the dignity of the state.

Although, as stated in the note under reply, it was not possible for me to acquiesce in all of the proposals made by you on behalf of the Canadian government, I trust that you will find in the statement herein made proof of the earnest desire of the imperial government to promote by every means within their power, the growth and stability of the cordial and mutually beneficial relations which exist between our countries. I venture to believe, also that this desirable result will be found to have been materially advanced by the full exchange of views which has taken place between us, and it gives me special pleasure to acknowledge the obligation under which I have been placed by your frank and considerate explanations regarding the attitude and wishes of your government.

I avail myself, &c., &c.,

(Sgd.) TADASU HAYASHI.

The Honourable Rodolphe Lemieux,
Postmaster General and Minister of Labour for Canada, Tokio.

Well, let us analyse this letter and see what there is in it.

First, there is the assertion of the full right and liberty of Japanese subjects to enter, travel and reside in Canada.

Second, there is the statement that it is not the intention of the Japanese government to insist upon the complete acknowledgment of its rights when that would involve a disregard of the special conditions prevailing in Canada from time to time. Who is to be the judge of these special conditions ? Is it the government of Canada or the government of Japan ? We are absolutely in the dark as to that. Why should special conditions in Canada, which ought to be the subject of regulation by the parliament and government of Canada, be a subject of appeal from this government to the government of Japan ? Yet, that is the condition to which the affairs of this country have been brought by the adoption of this treaty without proviso.

Thirdly, he declares that the Japanese government has decided to take efficient means to restrict emigration to Canada so far is compatible with the spirit of the treaty and the dignity of the state. Who is to be the judge of these matters ? Is it the government of Canada or the government of Japan, and what are the efficient means which are to be taken to restrict immigration ? Are they to be efficient in the judgment of the government of Canada, or, are they to be efficient in the judgment of the government of Japan ?

Fourthly, he declares that for this purpose the Japanese government will give careful consideration to local conditions in Canada. So that local conditions which should be the subject of observation, consideration and enactment by our own government and parliament have been transferred, by means of this treaty, to the Japanese government which graciously promises that it will, in future, for the purposes alluded to, give careful consideration to local conditions in Canada.

Now, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that, by the action of the government in this regard, Canada has handed over to Japan that control of immigration which Canada herself ought to exercise, that the regulations governing immigration in future are to be Japanese regulations, that the control and policy are to be Japanese and that in case of difficulty our remedy and our only remedy, outside of the abrogation of this treaty, is by appeal to the Japanese government from time to time. The government of Japan can change its policy to-morrow. A new government might come into power within three months in Japan and that government might repeal every law on the statute-book in Japan with respect to the restriction of immigration, it might abolish every limitation which has been enacted by the present administration and we could, in three or four months, be in exactly back the same position as we were before the hon. Postmaster General went to Japan.

Of what avail after all are these assurances ? Did we not have an abundance of assurances according to the view of this government, between 1900 and 1907 ? I have some of these in my hand. Let us look at them for a moment. In May, 1900, we were told that by an order of the Japanese government immigration to Canada had been limited to five per month for each emigration agent in cases of persons passing through the hands of emigration agents. and that the number of other immigrants had been limited to five per month for each prefecture. By a letter of the Japanese consul of the 7th August, 1900, it was declared that the Japanese government had entirely forbidden for the present emigration from Japan to Canada and also to the United States. It is perfectly obvious that that order must have been rescinded or otherwise we could not have had the immigration into this country which has prevailed during the past year. On the 3rd February, 1903, the Consul General for Japan, whose statements are regarded as official by this government declares in a letter to the Prime Minister that there is a total and absolute restriction of immigration from Japan to Canada by the

Japanese government, that the only Japanese allowed to leave Japan for Canada are: (1) Those holding old passports and certificates of Japanese consuls certifying that they are residents of and returning to Canada; (2) families of Japanese residing in Canada and coming out to them, and (3) merchants and students duly qualified. And so on all through the piece. The assurances which my hon. friend the Postmaster General has brought back from Japan do not seem to be fuller or more conclusive or to offer any better security than those which have been given to us from time to time from 1900 to 1907. I do not say in this regard that we are to find any fault with the Japanese government. The Japanese government has a perfect right to deal with these matters as matter of internal regulation just as Canada ought to have an absolute right to deal with the restriction of immigration to her own shores from Japan. Both countries should be entitled to exercise these rights to the full. The situation at the present time is that Japan, in so far as immigration from that country to Canada is concerned may exercise control and that Canada may not exercise any control.

My hon. friend has asked for a fair trial of the new regulations. I would not object to giving the new regulations a fair trial and I trust that assurance which the Postmaster General has been able to secure from the government of Japan will answer all the expectations which he has announced to the House in his speech of a week ago. That, however, does not alter the situation, that does not affect the principle and the principle for which we must stand in this House is that Canada ought not to enter into any treaty engagement which would prevent the necessary and effective control of immigration into this country. It is a subject which may be of transcendent importance as far as oriental immigration is concerned, it is a question of vital importance not only to British Columbia but to the whole of the Dominion and it is fraught with the gravest consequences not only to us at the present day, not only to the great wage earning population of the country but to all the people of Canada and to those who will succeed us in the future in developing this country. So, I think it is only right, Mr. Speaker, in view of what has taken place from 1895 down to the present time, that the subject should be placed before the country upon a basis which we deem right and which is in the interest of Canada. Therefore I move:

That all the words after the word 'that' be left out and the following substitued therefor:

By order in council of 3rd August, 1895, the ministry then in office in Canada called attention to the dangers of unrestricted immigration and declared that Canada's adhesion to the treaty of 1894 with Japan should be accompanied by such a proviso or stipulation as would enable parliament to control the immigration of labourers and artisans;

That Japan in 1896 consented that such a proviso and stipulation should accompany the adhesion of Canada to the treaty;

That notwithstanding such consent the present government in 1905 deliberately abandoned any such proviso or stipulation, although its great importance was twice called to their attention by the British government during the course of the negotiations; and, having entered into the treaty of 1906 (which brought into force in Canada the treaty of 1894 absolutely and without reserve) the government secured its ratification by parliament in 1907.

That the ratification of the said treaty of 1906 was almost immediately followed by a great influx of Japanese labourers into Canada;

That in the opinion of this House Canada should not enter into or accede to any treaty which deprives parliament of the control of immigration into this country;

That this House, while expressing its profound appreciation of the friendly intentions and courteous assurances of the Japanese government, and while declaring its sincere desire for the most cordial relations with the Japanese people, desires nevertheless to record its strong protest against a policy under which our wage-earning population cannot be protected from destructive invading competition except by entreating the forbearance and aid of a foreign government.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER (Kootenay). Mr. Speaker, this question which we are now discussing has occupied the House for a considerable time, and there will no doubt be further discussion upon it. I am satisfied that the importance of the subject justifies all the time that this parliament may devote to its serious consideration. It is a question which is fraught with great importance to the province of British Columbia, and to my mind it is of equal importance to the rest of the Dominion. It is a question that is national in its character, and I am sure that the members of this House who have listened to the speeches delivered by the British Columbia representatives upon the motion of the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) have a good deal of light thrown upon the Oriental question in so far as it affects our province of British Columbia and all Canada. I am satisfied that these hon. gentlemen have a different view on that question now from that which they held before the facts were so ably presented. My hon. friend from Nanaimo and other hon. gentlemen have given various grounds upon which it was not in the interests of British Columbia or in the interests of Canada that there should be any large influx of Oriental immigration into British Columbia. It is not my purpose to cover all the reasons set forth by these hon. gentlemen, who have marshalled all the facts that it is possible to marshal in support of their contention. But, sir, I may add another ground upon which objection may be based

to any great influx of Oriental immigration into British Columbia, and it is a ground which even a proud and sensitive nation like Japan can take no exception to. In the province of British Columbia we have a country which those of us who have the good fortune to live there take a great pride in. We have a country of unlimited resources in minerals, in timber, in fisheries, and in the near future I think we may say in agriculture also. We have a country of magnificent scenery, a country of unexcelled climate. We have a country that we believe should be preserved essentially as a white man's country. When I say this I do not mean to say that none other than a white man shall place his foot upon the soil of our province, because that would be carrying the principle to an extreme; but what I do mean by 'an essentially white man's country, is a country wherein not only those who are employers and who can live without doing actual manual labour are white, but a country where the white man who has to earn his livelihood by the sweat of his brow may call his home. I want not only the preponderance of commercial and industrial interests in British Columbia to be white, but I want the great preponderance of the labour interests to be white also. We British Columbians have our ideal of what British Columbia should be, and I do not know that I can better express that ideal than by reading the concluding sentences of a very instructive article written by R. E. Gosnell, published in a recent issue of the Vancouver magazine called 'Westward Ho.' The concluding sentences of this article read:

> This vast and in some respects still unknown country has possibilities in store for it not yet, perhaps, dreamed of. It has without peradventure great possibilities as a home for the British immigrant and as a field for the investor; possibilities as the point of convergence of trade and commerce along the all-red line to the utmost development of which the statesmen of the empire are pledged; possibilities as an educational centre as famous as any in Europe; possibilities of great industrial wealth; possibilities, in short, as a greater Britain on the Pacific, where British arts and institutions will expand under fresh impetus, where the British flag will for ever fly, where British laws and justice will be respected and enforced, and where British men and women will be bred equal to the best traditions of the race.

That is our ideal, and there is no reason why that ideal should not be attained in the province of British Columbia. But if it is to be attained it can only be by bringing to our province two classes of people—either those who are British born and have a love of British institutions inbred in them, or people of some other nation who are assimilable; people such as the Germans or the French, or other nations of that character, who leave their fatherland for one cause or another to seek a permanent home here and to grow up with this new country. Such people come to us for the purpose of adopting Canada as their nation; they become residents, they become citizens, their children and their children's children are born here, and although they always have a warm spot in their hearts for the land of their birth, they become in every sense of the word true British subjects, true citizens of Canada, imbued, as are the British born subjects themselves, with a preference for British institutions, a loyalty to the British flag, and a love for the reigning sovereign of Britain. These, sir, are the two classes of people by whom we can populate the province of British Columbia so as to reach the ideal enunciated in this magazine article which I have read. It may well be asked: Cannot the Japanese race help your province to attain the same ideal? But with all due respect to the Japanese race, I say no. We all know that the Jap is an excessively patriotic man; we know that love for the Mikado and that obedience to his will exists in the Jap from the cradle to the grave. And we know that no matter what country he may emigrate to, his emigration is not looked upon even by himself as a permanent departure from Nippon or as a permanent residence in the land he goes to. He comes there for a time. He may take the oath of allegiance of that country, but that oath, whatever it is, is not as binding upon him as the traditions which have been instilled into his mind from his early infancy. These will outweigh any advantages which he may obtain from taking the oath of allegiance and becoming a citizen of that country; and, instead of looking forward to his children and his children's children inhabiting it as subjects of its rulers, the Jap is always looking forward to the day when he can return to the land of the Rising Sun and end his life under the rule of his beloved Mikado. I say that citizens of that character, no matter how estimable they may be in other respects, are not the material with which we can preserve the Pacific province for a white race that will be true and loyal to the British flag. Japan herself, being a nation which instils into her people from infancy exalted ideas of patriotism should certainly be the last nation to cavil at the people of British Columbia or the people of Canada for desiring to have as citizens and builders of their nation people who will be as loyal to the flag we are born under, the British flag, as their people are to theirs.

Having said so much with regard to the unassimilable nature of the Japanese people as populators of our country, let me proceed to the consideration of the present treaty between Japan and Canada. That treaty was signed between Great Britain and Japan in the year 1894. It was fol-

lowed by a protocol in 1895, by which self-governing colonies could obtain the benefits of that treaty and still retain control of their immigration. Contrast the position of Japan in 1894, when that treaty was signed, with her position in 1905 or 1906 or 1907. In 1894, Japan was a third-rate or a fourth-rate power, at the present time she is classed among the first-rate world powers. This position, it is true, has been won by a great struggle, in which she not only showed her great resources, but also the bravery and patriotism of her men. Therefore what Japan might have been willing to concede in 1894 or in 1897, at the time when my hon. friend the leader of the opposition says she was willing to treat with us on the basis of giving us control of our immigration regulations, she could not concede at the time this treaty between Canada and Japan was signed, that is, discrimination against her people.

Now, what was the object of Canada in entering this treaty with Japan? The object was that she might enlarge her commercial relations with that country. Canada, as a young and growing country, must constantly seek an outlet for her increasing productions and her expanding trade; and looking at Japan on our western border, we saw a promising market for Canadian goods. Our Minister of Agriculture went there some years ago, and returned with a favourable report to the government. So that our reasons for entering into a treaty with Japan were purely commercial reasons, having in view the benefit of both countries. When we come to consider the benefit to be derived from this commercial treaty with Japan, I for one will not minimize the importance of that consideration. Up to the time that treaty was entered into, there was very little to give an impetus to our trade with Japan. The possibilities all lay in the future. and those possibilities promised to be great. Now, I admit that we can pay too great a price for even the possible advantages of this treaty. That price would be to my mind the flooding of British Columbia or of Canada with Japanese immigrants. We from British Columbia have stood out against that, and we are still standing out against it. We want to have restricted the immigration of orientals of every description, and the closer and greater the restriction is the better pleased will be the people of British Columbia, and the better pleased shall we be as the representatives of those people.

That brings us to the question, whether the government of this country is liable to criticism for the manner in which it entered into this treaty with Japan. The hon. leader of the opposition has directed the greater part of his speech to a criticism of the acts of the government in that regard. Let us see if that criticism is merited. I believe the best way for us to judge of that would be to consider matters as they were before the treaty was entered into and to suppose that we had before us to-day the question whether or not we should enter into a treaty with Japan unrestricted in its terms as to immigration.

Let us for a moment divest ourselves of our political differences. Let us imagine ourselves a harmonious body, not divided into division of government and opposition, or Liberal and Conservative, but simply and purely discussing this question as a business proposition in order to decide whether or not it was in the interests of Canada to enter into a treaty with Japan. If we put ourselves in that position, we can best judge whether or not the government is open to the criticism which has been bestowed upon it by the leader of the opposition. Of course the hon. gentleman is quite within his right, in criticising the government on this or any other matter that comes before the House, and I am not at all questioning that right. But assuming the position of a body discussing this matter free from any political bias, what do we find? In about the year 1900, there was a good deal of agitation over the influx of Chinese into British Columbia and commissioners were appointed to investigate. I note that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) said that some fifteen or twenty years ago, Chinese immigrants were welcomed into British Columbia. I wish to correct him on that point. I have been in that province some twelve or thirteen years, and certainly during that period the Chinese were never welcome in our country. And if the hon. minister will turn to the 'Hansard' of 1884-5, he will find there a resolution moved by the then hon. member for Nanaimo, Mr. Gordon, regarding the undesirability of Chinese or oriental immigration into British Columbia. That was during the administration of the late Sir John Macdonald. This commission, which was appointed in the year 1900, went to British Columbia and took evidence, and recommended the imposition of a $500 poll tax upon Chinese. That recommendation afterwards became law. But in that same recommendation, the commissioners advised that a similar restriction should not be placed upon Japanese. Why did they so recommend? There must have been some reason. The reason was that the consul general of Japan in Vancouver talked this matter over with the commissioners and assured them that the Japanese government would restrict Japanese emigration, and did not desire that a similar restriction should be imposed upon their people as was to be imposed on the Chinese. The commissioners relied upon this assurance and so did the government. The result was that from 1901 until 1907, the number of Japanese coming into British Columbia did not exceed the number to which the consul general of

Japan in Canada had promised they would be restricted. All the assurances of Japan, all the assurances given by the consul general of Japan and accepted by the government here, were carried out. Then we had a series of letters read by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux), making a connecting chain showing that these assurances were persisted in and would be carried out in the future as they had been in the past. These facts were all present in the minds of the government and the minister.

My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) has referred to the message from the Colonial Secretary and has accused this government of having practically forgotten so important an issue in a treaty between Canada and Japan. I do not take that view at all. I do not believe that the government forgot or overlooked in any way that issue. But the question which this government had to face was this: If we are to enter into this treaty with Japan, we have to rely on the good faith of Japan that she will restrict emigration into British Columbia. If we ask for more, we shall not get it, and may as well abandon the idea of entering into a treaty with Japan at all. Of course we are all wiser after the event than before, but I would point out that, up to the time when they were in active negotiation over this treaty we find that Japan had kept her promise and restricted within the number she undertook to do through her consul general. Then it was a question, as it would be with us if we were considering it to-day, whether we were prepared to accept that treaty with Japan, relying on her good faith to carry out in the future, as she had in the past, the promises given us. Or should we refuse the treaty altogether. It was either the one or the other because the correspondence brought down and read by the Minister of Labour shows clearly that the Japanese government would not consent to a clause in the treaty which would practically discriminate against her people as compared with the people of other nations. Therefore the criticism of the hon. the leader of the opposition can only hold provided there was any reasonable doubt in the minds of the government of Canada as to whether or not Japan would continue to maintain her restriction of emigration to Canada. Let us then see how these assurances were carried out by her.

Until some time in the summer of 1907 there was no complaint that these regulations were not being carried out. At that time, suddenly there was a large influx of Orientals, both Japanese and Hindus. The people of British Columbia became alarmed, and very rightly so. They saw at once that there was something wrong; that either the Japanese government was deliberately disregarding the assurances it had given by its consul to the government of Canada, or there was an evasion in some way. And, naturally, the people of British Columbia became very much excited, and telegrams and resolutions were sent to the Prime Minister of this country, some asking him at once to cancel the treaty, others asking him to convene a special session of parliament to pass the Natal Act, and others of an equally direct nature. Now, in view of the feeling of the people of British Columbia, I do not blame any of the bodies or citizens that sent any of these telegrams or resolutions. At the same time I think it is well for Canada that we had a Prime Minister who, notwithstanding the pressure, notwithstanding the excitement that existed, could go about the remedying of the evil in a calm, though active, manner. Canada has assumed a position among the nations of the world, and we cannot act like a petulant child—she cannot enter into a treaty one day and cancel that treaty with a stroke of the pen the next day. We must have broader views of national matters than that. Our Prime Minister had those views. He took the only course he could take as Prime Minister of a great country—that of immediately going to the root of the trouble and applying the remedy there. In pursuance of that policy the Minister of Labour was sent on a mission to Japan. Before dealing with that part of the case, I may say that I do not consider the signing of that treaty between Canada and Japan is at all the reason for the great influx of orientals into Canada at that time. That influx was brought about by the commercial conditions of the country. We had very large railway enterprises in the western portion of Canada in course of carrying out, and I contend that had the conditions been the same at any previous time there would have been the same influx of Japanese into British Columbia then that there was in 1907. Had the conditions been the same before the signing of the treaty, there would have been the same influx that there was after the signing of the treaty.

Now, let us see how the Japanese carried out their restrictions, even after the treaty of 1907, as set out in the report of Mr. Mackenzie King, a report which, I am sure, not only every member of this House, but every person in the country, will recognize as one dealing fairly and impartially with the question, and, at the same time, one that is ably complied and very clear. At page 19 of that report, Mr. Mackenzie King, speaking of Japanese labour coming from Japan, says:

> On the other hand it is to be remembered that they were not without powerful Canadian interests behind them when they went to Japan, that they had in their possession documents which indicated the need and the desire for Japanese labour in this country, that they were able to afford assurances that for this labour employment would be immediately

forthcoming, and that they were in a position to conjure with names which, to the statesmen of Japan, would not be without significance or weight. In justice to Japan and to the prejudice which has been aroused against her people in some quarters, in consequence of the sudden influx of her countrymen in large numbers to Canada, it is not to be forgotten that in the regulations, which were issued about April of the present year, the exception permitting emigration companies to send labourers to Canada was made conditional upon the production at the Foreign Office of Japan of the duplicates of bona fide agreements with responsible employers of labour in this country; the bona fides of which agreements the Japanese government required should be certified to by her consuls resident in Canada. If there was a change in the policy of Japan, it was not one which could adversely affect the interests of this country without a Canadian citizen, or a Canadian corporation, first placing upon it the seal of his or its approval.

Now, while Mr. Mackenzie King sets that forth as a--I will not say as an excuse—but rather as an amelioration of the offence, if any, committed by Japan in allowing more than the restricted number to come to Canada direct, still I take a little different view. I do not excuse the Japanese government for this at all. All the dealings that Japan had with us respecting immigration had been with the Dominion government, and notwithstanding the fact that corporations, which may be influential in the west, or any other interest or citizens of the west, had signed the contracts for imigrants for the purpose of supplying labour, I say that Japan is not wholly blameless in that she did not come to the fountain head, the Dominion government, before she granted passports to these people, for she must have known that the number that came—nine hundred—was in excess of the number to which immigration had been restricted.

Now, the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) sought to make a point out of the fact that as late as March, 1903, in answer to a telegram sent by Japanese Consul General Nossé to the government of Japan, the government of Japan expressed its willingness to enter into an agreement with the Canadian government with regard to immigration. The hon. gentleman's point was that, as late as March, 1903, the Japanese government was willing to make to Canada the same concession with regard to immigration as it made to the United States. He gives the broadest possible interpretation to that letter. In fact, I do not think it is susceptible of that interpretation. All it means is, in effect, this: You have verbal assurances from us that we would restrict immigration into British Columbia and into Canada to a certain number each year; if you are not satisfied with these verbal assurances we will enter into an agreement with you; we will put these verbal assurances into writing. That is all that letter can be construed to mean, no matter how broadly you interpret it.

Now, then, coming to the subject of the mission of the Minister of Labour to Japan, the Prime Minister of Canada, acting as a statesman should after, realizing the responsibility of his position, and in order that Canada might not be placed in the wrong by committing any hasty act, sent one of his ministers to negotiate with the government of Japan. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition partly attributed his success, because he did not say the mission was not a success—to the cloak of protection that was thrown around him by the British Ambassador at Tokio. Well, no doubt the British Ambassador was a great assistance to the Minister of Labour. Canada was entitled to all the assistance he could give our Minister of Labour, because, for Imperial reasons, on more than one occasion, Canada has taken an attitude which she might not have taken had those reasons not existed. This was one of those reasons, and therefore I say that the Canadian minister was entitled to all the aid, and prestige and co-operation that the British Ambassador in Tokio could give him. We all recognize that the mission of the Minister of Labour to Japan was one of great delicacy. We must all appreciate that a matter involving a semblance, at least, of possible discrimination between races, is one of great delicacy indeed. The Minister of Labour came back to this country, and in a very able speech stated to the House the results of his mission, and he also added that there were matters which, for diplomatic reasons, he was not in a position to disclose. Now I may say that, as a member from British Columbia, I would like very well to tell my constituents and the people of that province what was the exact nature of those restrictions that would warrant the minister in using the words I propose to quote later. In that respect I am almost as curious as my hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Owen) was, when he asked a question of the Minister of Labour while he was delivering his speech. But I fully appreciate that in matters of this kind there may be conditions of settlement which it is not in the best interests of either Canada or Japan should be published. As a supporter of the present government I have to take one of two positions. I have either to say that I am not satisfied with this arrangement or I have to say that I am willing to trust the minister who negotiated it, and to place implicit faith in him when he says, as he did say in his speech last Tuesday, in effect, that with the avenue from Japan carefully regulated, and with the avenue from Hawaii absolutely closed we have eliminated from this issue ing that may give rise to fu ble with regard to Japanese on. Now the minister hi must e the

importance of these words, he must know that he has made such an agreement, has entered into such conditions with the government of Japan, and which have been accepted by this government, as will ensure that there is no possibility of future trouble from an influx of Japanese immigrants. I have got to take his statement in good faith, and as a member from British Columbia, I am prepared to take it in good faith. I ask that time be given to prove the words of the minister true. I am satisfied he would not have made such a statement in this House had he not felt convinced that the Japanese government would maintatin with absolute good faith the engagements they had entered into, some particulars of which the Canadian minister was not at liberty to disclose to this House. I say, Mr. Speaker, that for my part I am willing to take the responsibility of placing implicit confidence in the Minister of Labour in that regard, and in the good faith of the British Ambassador who, as the Minister of Labour states, is cognizant of these conditions.

Now I am not going to detain the House any longer on this matter, there are others who will follow me. But I would like to make a word of reference to the amendment that has been proposed by the leader of the opposition. First, we have the recital of the attitude of the Conservative party in 1894 and 1895, and the attitude of the Japanese government at that time. I have already dealt with that subject, and I have said that what the Japanese government might have been willing to accept previous to 1897, they would not be willing to accept at the present time.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the Consul General say, in dealing with that condition, that they were willing to accept it ?

Mr. GALLIHER. No, I explained to the House, Mr. Speaker, that by the fullest interpretation that can be put on the letter of March, 1903, it could not be held to include the reservation of the right to pass immigration laws in Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. What does my hon. friend make of this wording in the telegram of the Consul General of Japan :

The renewed assurances that the Japanese government are not desirous of forcing their people into British Columbia against the wish of the province, and that they are willing to enter into an agreement with your government by which they may bind themselves.

Mr. GALLIHER. If the assurances which have already been given to them are not sufficient—is that not there ?

Mr. SPROULE. If they are not sufficient ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes, that should be there ; we had assurances from the consul of Japan and while the consul of Japan was having interviews with the ministers here, when this matter was brought before him, he cabled to Japan and the answer came back——

Mr. SPROULE. To that effect.

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes, and what was that effect ?—if you are not satisfied with the verbal assurances I have given to you, we will enter into an agreement to carry out those assurances. That is the meaning of it if it means anything. Take the government of the United States to-day, who have this exception in their Act, and what do we find them doing ? They are going over and negotiating just the same as the Minister of Labour went over and negotiated and we have not yet heard whether they will meet with equal success, but even they, with that right reserved in their treaty, have the right to pass these immigration laws, they recognize the official standing of Japan to-day and they do not want to commit an act which will be considered as unfriendly to Japan.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the hon. gentleman aware that they have made a special regulation in regard to Corean and Japanese labourers ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I am not aware of the exact nature of it. I see some newspaper reports which may or may not be true and I am not going to pin my faith upon the strength of these, whether they are or are not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am speaking of regulations which are to be found in an official publication of the United States government.

Mr. GALLIHER. Now we will proceed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Pass that.

Mr. GALLIHER. There is nothing to it, as far as that is concerned. We found them negotiating to-day just the same as we had to go and negotiate. Now, the second last clause of the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition is :

That in the opinion of this House Canada should not enter into or accede to any treaty which deprives parliament of the control of immigration into this country.

Very good; that is a good sentiment, a very proper sentiment, but in this particular case what does it effect ? We have already entered into a treaty and to put that on paper does not alter the fact in regard to the Japanese treaty. It is there. As to the treaty it is too late. Then the hon. gentleman declares :

That this House, while expressing its profound appreciation of the friendly intentions and courteous assurances of the Japanese government, and while declaring its sincere desire for the most cordial relations with the Japanese people, desires nevertheless to record

its strong protest against a policy under which our wage-earning population cannot be protected from destructive invading competition except by entreating the forbearance and aid of foreign government.

Now, we are all of one mind as regards this idea, both Liberals and Conservatives; we do not want to see any competition in labour in British Columbia that is not fair and is not warranted. We desire, where the labouring pople of British Columbia have to enter into competition with others, that that competition shall be fair and that it shall not be with people who can work for less wages, who can maintain themselves for less, or who will lower the standard of living of the labouring people of British Columbia or of Canada at large. But, what does this resolution mean? Supposing we all cast our votes for this resolution there is nothing in it which relieves the situation of our own people. If the hon. gentleman had gone farther and stated the proposition whether in view of these circumstances it is advisable to at once give notice to repeal the Japanese treaty he would have proposed something definite and substantial, but the hon. gentleman carefully avoided that. He puts forth an amendment here which sounds very well, reads very well and is very patriotic, but which accomplishes absolutely nothing and which means nothing.

Mr. SPROULE. It means a vote of censure on the government for their neglect to safeguard British Columbia's interest when they had an opportunity to do it.

Mr. GALLIHER. So long as it means—and I will accept the hon. gentleman's explanation of it—merely a vote of censure, I am prepared to drop the subject. I will not detain the House any longer. The subject is one on which I feel keenly and have felt keenly all along. I would like to mention, however, that some of the papers—I am satisfied that they have no authority for saying it—are making the statement that coolie immigration from Japan to Canada is limited to 1,000. I am satisfied that they have no authority for saying that because I am prepared to state to the Minister of Labour in this House that if I believed it was limited to 1,000, or to considerably less than 1,000, I would stand up in this House and object to such an arrangement.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. GALLIHER. I am satisfied from the words of the hon. minister—and on this subject he must know the feelings of the people of British Columbia—that the number must be less than that stated because otherwise the members from British Columbia would not be satisfied. Now, I think I will conclude.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the limit?

Mr. GALLIHER. That is one of the features that, the Minister of Labour stated in this House for diplomatic reasons, he was unable to disclose.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The statement made by some of the papers that the limit is fixed at 1,000 is published without authority.

Mr. GALLIHER. I will hope so.

Mr. TAYLOR. If it should be correct, what then?

Mr. GALLIHER. If it is correct this House will find me on my feet protesting against it and asking for the cancellation of that treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. The limit is not large enough?

Mr. GALLIHER. The limit? I trust that both parties in politics and that the press who supports either party in politics will consider that the arrangement which has been made is entitled to a fair trial and that nothing will be done to inflame the public mind one way or the other. Let us give the matter time and prove whether the words of the Minister of Labour are true and whether the Japanese government are in earnest in dealing with the government of this country and whether they will maintain the arrangement they have made.

Mr. EDMUND BRISTOL (Centre Toronto). Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting spectacle to see our distinguished friends from British Columbia trying to square themselves with the people of that province and trying to justify the mistake which this government has made in sacrificing not merely the interests of the people of British Columbia but the interests of the people of Canada by limiting the right which the people as a whole have through this parliament to control immigration into this country. Now, my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Galliher), it seems to me, has evaded a good deal of what we might fairly consider in this resolution. The first matter brought to the attention of this House was an order in council as far back as 1895, wherein the administration of that day pointed out the danger that there would be to Canada from Japanese immigration unless it was restricted in some reasonable way and declining that Canada should enter into this treaty unless some restriction were put upon the immigration of Japanese labourers.

The present government came into power in 1896 and they had the opportunity of deciding this matter one way or the other in the interests of the people of Canada, and they had before them for good or for bad the opinion of the previous administration on the question. But what did this government do? Did they make any inquiry as to the volume of the trade of Canada with Japan before they acceded to

this treaty ; was there any business investigation made by this business administration as a result of which they could announce to parliament that it would be a wise policy for Canada to come under this treaty? They did nothing of the kind. They sat down apparently until August, 1897, and then for reasons set forth in the memorandum which has been read, they refused to bring Canada under the treaty, mind you, they had an opportunity at that time of bringing Canada under a treaty by which Canada to-day would be restricting or not restricting Japanese or any other immigration if she chose to do so, and this government declined to avail itself of that opportunity. I ask hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House : What reason was there that existed in 1897 why they should not have approved of that treaty reserving to Canada the right to deal with the immigration of Japanese labourers and artisans ; what reason existed then that did not exist in 1907 when the treaty was signed ? If it was a good thing for Canada to increase its trade with Japan, what change has taken place ? What reason was there why it would not have been good business in the interests of the people of this country to have put this treaty in force ten years ago and obtained for Canada the benefit of that trade ? I have not heard from the other side of the House one solitary remark which would tend to disprove the charge that the government has been derelict in its duty in not having brought that treaty into force at a time when they could have put it into force without injury to the people of this country and which if they had put it into force then, would have given us for these intervening ten years the benefit of this trade with Japan, if there is benefit in it. We find the present government not merely careless of the rights of the people of this country in not restricting immigration, but we have them careless of the financial and business interests of the country in not putting into force ten years ago a treaty which if it is good for Canadian trade to-day was at least as good at that time. I venture the statement that the most serious mistake this government made was that when in 1897 they had an opportunity of clearing up this matter once and for all, they had not the good sense to follow the policy which had been laid down by the previous Conservative administration, and which if followed would have left us our self respect, our full power to deal with immigration, and would have benefited the trade of Canada.

Leaving the year 1897, when the matter could have been properly adjusted so as to satisfy every interest concerned, the treaty stood over. But while it stood over there was a warning addressed to this government by the government of British Columbia on the 30th of April, 1897. On that date the government of British Columbia memorialized this government and :

> Respectfully requested that should the Dominion government decide to become a party to the treaty with Japan they will make such stipulation as will prevent unrestricted immigration of Japanese into Canada.

Therefore, as far back as 1897 this government had before it the policy of the previous Conservative government ; it had before it the attitude of the people of British Columbia which has not changed ; it had before it the memorial from the government of British Columbia ; it had in fact the fullest possible warning that any government could have had, that if it entered into this treaty without reserving the right to restrict this immigration it was going to lead to trouble in Canada. Again in 1900 there was a petition of 2,167 residents of British Columbia to the Governor General which pointed out that between the 1st of January, 1900, and the 30th of April of that year, 4,669 Japanese landed in Victoria and Vancouver, and that the province seriously felt such an enormous immigration within such a short time.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman from Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) said there was no need for restriction up to the present time.

Mr. BRISTOL. I cannot agree with the hon. member (Mr. Galliher) in view of the facts before us. Of course, if you forget the facts you can argue any thing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear hear.

Mr. BRISTOL. I dont wonder that the hon. members from British Columbia say 'hear, hear,' for if there ever was a case which they will have to forget the facts concerning this is it. But the people of British Columbia will not let them forget the facts and it is in the interest of the people of Canada that the facts should be placed before them.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Dont shed any tears about the British Columbia members.

Mr. BRISTOL. It must be objectionable to some of my friends opposite to have the facts brought out, and among these facts is a letter written on the 30th of March, 1903 by Mr. Nossé. Now, if I understood at all the argument of the Minister of Labour, it was, that the Canadian government had assurances both written and verbal that Japanese immigration would be restricted and kept within bounds. If I at all understood the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Galliher) it was that this letter which was read by the Minister of Labour and I think quite properly read by him, meant nothing of the kind. The House will have to judge between the interpretation put on this letter by the Minister of Labour and the in-

terpretation put on it by the member for Kootenay, but in the meantime the letter might speak for itself. It says :

I have to give your government the renewed assurance that the Japanese government are not desirous of forcing their people into British Columbia against the wish of the province, and that they are willing to enter into an agreement with your government by which they may bind themselves if their present policy of rigid restriction is not deemed satisfactory to your government.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ?

Mr. BRISTOL. Delighted.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Is not that very letter protesting against legislation on the part of the legislature of British Columbia?

Mr. BRISTOL. I am not able to give my hon. friend the information because I am not conversant with the particular reasons why that letter was written.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. You should not discuss it then.

Mr. BRISTOL. Pardon me ; I am discussing that letter as a letter telling this government that the Japanese government were prepared to enter into a binding agreement and I am commenting on it in that light.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. That is the very thing they have done under the Lemieux negotiations.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is the binding there?

Mr. BRISTOL. Is my hon. friend (Mr. D. Ross) asking a question or making a speech ? The hon. gentleman says that is done under the Lemieux agreement, but I do not understand it so.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I refer to the agreement with the Postmaster General.

Mr. BRISTOL. I do not quite so understand it. I will read this letter again for fear my hon. friend (Mr. Ross) has forgotten it.

I have to give your government the renewed assurance that the Japanese government are not desirous of forcing their people into British Columbia against the wish of the province, and that they are willing to enter into an agreement with your government by which they may bind themselves if their present policy of rigid restriction is not deemed satisfactory to your government.

That letter was dated March 30, 1903, and is as I understand part of a series of written assurances which the government rely on to say, that having these assurances it was unnecessary for them to protect themselves in the Japanese treaty, My hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) also referred to the report of the Royal Commission on Chinese and Japanese immigration in 1890, and I trust I may be permitted to call the attention of the House to a part of that report which he omitted to read, and which I think is the most important part of the report and that which bears most materially on the matter under discussion. It is as follows :

Nothing further is needed to settle this most difficult question than some assurance that the action already taken by the government of Japan will not be revoked.

That, of course, is the essential thing. To say that such is the policy of a country is one thing ; it is another thing to say that that policy will not be changed. Hon. gentlemen opposite, from their experience of the past fifteen years, can give some evidence as to whether policies of governments are liable to be changed from time to time, even without any reason. We will not discuss that point at any length ; but it is an obvious absurdity to take from a government such a statement of policy when everybody knows that a government has a right to change its policy at any time on such an important matter as immigration or on any other matter. Therefore, the commission put the case properly by saying that if the Japanese government would agree not to revoke that policy, the interests of Canada would be protected.

Then, coming down to 1905, we find the government negotiating another treaty with Japan, for reasons which have not yet been stated to this parliament. I assume that they must have been actuated by substantial trade reasons, or by some reason, in entering into such a treaty ; so that the country could compare the advantages of this treaty on the one side with the disadvantages of Japanese immigration on the other side. Assuming that the government had some reasons of a counterbalancing character in their minds, we find that on July 14, 1905, at the time the matter was under consideration, Secretary Lyttleton sent the following communication to the Governor General :

Referring to your confidential despatch of June 7, should Japanese government be informed that your government wishes to adhere to treaty of 1904 and supplementary convention 1895 under same terms and conditions as Queensland in 1897, which Japanese government then agreed to extend to any other colonies adhering within prescribed period, namely: (1) that stipulations contained in 1st and 3rd articles of treaty shall not in any way affect laws, ordinances and regulations with regard to trade, immigration of labourers, artisans, police and public security, which are in force or hereafter may be enacted in Japan or in colony; (2) that treaty shall cease to be binding as between Japan and colony at expiration of twelve months after notice has been given on either side of desire to terminate same. Or are your government prepared to adhere absolutely and without reserve, as would appear to be the case from speech of Minister of Agriculture in Canadian parliament, June 22?

Now, it seems to me that the position of the matter was practically this. The government tell us that at that time and continuously since they have received assurances that Japanese emigration would be restricted. They certainly produce a letter from Mr. Nosse, written in March, 1903, which would indicate the truth of this statement, and which of course we cannot deny and do not wish to deny. But, Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to a memorandum of Mr. Scott, the Secretary of State, of September 25, 1905, in which he states that the government proposes without reserve to adhere to the treaty of 1894, and goes on to say :

Since those dates Japan has enacted a law limiting emigration to foreign countries, thus removing one of the objections that influenced the government of Canada in declining to become a party to the treaty with Japan in 1897.

I merely wish to say that whoever wrote this memorandum lost sight of the fact that in 1897 it did not matter what Japan did in regard to emigration, because this country had the absolute right, in becoming a party to that treaty, to reserve our rights with reference to the regulation of immigration ; so that the reason given is both fallacious and untrue. The memorandum of Mr. Scott goes on to say :

It is doubtful whether Japan would now agree to a treaty on any other basis than the proposals contained in the original treaty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what the people of this country have a right to complain of is this. The government say that they have assurances ample and clear from the Japanese government that emigration of Japanese labourers will be restricted. If they have those assurances, they have been warned that any laws restricting emigration from Japan could be revoked. If the Japanese law restricted emigration, I would like to ask why this government did not ask to have the restrictive clause put into the treaty, that being in exact line with the policy of the Japanese government, as embodied in its statutes, and the verbal declarations of its ministers and officials. Can it be alleged that Japan would not agree in 1905 to what was its declared policy? Had the Japanese one policy for the closet and another for the public ? No ; the conduct of Japan throughout this whole matter has been thoroughly honourable. If anybody is to blame, it is not the Japanese government, but this government, in failing to have inserted in the treaty the clause which the Japanese had agreed to in 1897, and which their assurances from that day to this have been fully in accord with. It was the duty of this government, in the interest of the labouring people and all the people of this country, to maintain the right of Canada to control its own immigration. They failed to ask for that very thing which the assurances they are now boasting of would undoubtedly have given them the right to ask for if those assurances were true in fact. This government, however, were willing to rush wildly into this treaty, not only without having reasons of a commercial character for doing so, but also without asking for those assurances which the government of Japan ever since 1897 had been willing to give. So if we have an unsatisfactory state of affairs in British Columbia to-day, it is due to that failure on the part of this administration. I do not believe my hon. friends from British Columbia were as fully apprised of the facts in relation to this matter in August, 1905, as they are to-day, or I venture to say that all of them would have been after the government to see that they did not overlook the interests of British Columbia in this matter. If the members from that province will examine the records of parliament they will be convinced that both in 1897 and in 1905 this government has been derelict in its duty not only to the people of British Columbia, but to people of the whole of Canada.

At six o'clock. House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Owen Sound and Meaford Railway Company.—Mr. Telford.

Bill (No. 84) to incorporate the Dominion Transportation and Storage Company.—Mr. German.

SUPPLY—JAPANESE IMMIGRATION.

House resumed debate on the motion for Supply and the amendment of Mr. R. L. Borden thereto.

Mr. BRISTOL. In commenting on the action of the government in 1905, when it rushed into this treaty with Japan, I do not lose sight of the fact that in September, 1905, the government, or some member of it, received a letter from Mr. Nossé telling them that while he gave every possible assurance that there would be no trouble over the immigration question, at the same time he thought the Japanese government would refuse to enter into the treaty in the way in which they had agreed to enter into it in 1897. I venture, however, to submit that in a matter of so much importance this government ought not to have taken what might be, in the language of the street, termed the bluff of Mr. Nossé, and have allowed themselves to be drawn into making an absolute treaty with Japan. On the contrary, the duty and obligation rested on this government, if they proposed to enter into this treaty, of negotiat-

ing directly with the Japanese government or the accredited representatives of that government empowered to sign a treaty. I venture to submit that if the Postmaster General and Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) had gone to Japan in August, 1905, instead of waiting until 1908, and made directly the same representations to the Japanese government in 1905 which he did in 1908, and which he was then equally entitled to make in view of the assurances that had been given to the present government from time to time by the Japanese Consul General at Montreal, the present administration would have given some evidence that they were keenly alive to Canadian interests, would have made a proper treaty, or possibly would have had to report that, despite all their efforts, they found it impossible to make any treaty with Japan which would include a restriction of Japanese immigration to Canada. No such effort however was made, and after the steed was stolen the stable door was securely locked, and my hon. friend went on his mission to Japan. The people of this country, and particularly the people of British Columbia, have a just grievance against this government for having, without the slightest effort or the slightest personal communication with the Japanese government, and solely on the personal assurances of the Japanese Consul General, entered into this treaty and brought this trouble on the Dominion in the shape of an immigration to which the people of British Columbia in particular are bitterly hostile.

But, Mr. Speaker, if there was one thing that seemed to give the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) and his immediate supporters from British Columbia great comfort, it was the statement made by that hon. gentleman that, notwithstanding any treaty, the Japanese would have come in all the same. I am not quite able to follow my hon. friend's line of reasoning, and I do not like to characterize it as a statement devised on the spur of the moment for his own personal comfort and to console his constituents ; but in another part of his speech he complained of the action of the Japanese government in having granted too many passports, and said that that was the real reason why so many Japanese came into this country. It was the right of the Japanese government to grant passports under the treaty which has caused all the trouble. Well, the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) that the Japanese would have come in despite any treaty, and his argument that their coming in was due to the exercise by the Japanese government of the right to grant passports given them by the treaty are directly contradictory.

But quite apart from that this government has again shown its aftersighted wisdom. On the 8th January of this year they passed an order in council as follows :

Therefore the Governor General in Council is pleased to order and it is hereby ordered that, whenever in the opinion of the Minister of the Interior, the condition of the labour market in Canada is such as to make the application of section 20 of the Immigration Act desirable or whenever in the opinion of the Minister of the Interior, other conditions exist which is a special degree render necessary the application of sections 26 to 30 inclusive of the said Act, immigrants may be prohibited from landing or coming into Canada unless they come from the country of their birth, or citizenship, by a continuous journey and on through tickets purchased before leaving the country of their birth or citizenship.

And I find in the 'Globe' of January 11th, in a special despatch from Ottawa, the following statement :

The new regulation applies equally to all countries, and is designed principally to prevent the influx of Japanese from Honolulu and Hindoos from Hong Kong. It will thus have a large effect in preventing the continuation of oriental immigration in the west which now comes via these two ports.

So that not merely had the government the power in 1897 to make this treaty in a form which would have prevented this immigration, not only had they the opportunity in 1905 to negotiate a similar treaty, which they did not even attempt to do, but they had the power under the Immigration Act to pass this same order in council to prevent immigration from Honolulu or the Sandwich Islands, or any other objectionable point. But they waited until after the damage was done before they passed this order in council. I submit, therefore, that our people have the right to complain of the action of the government in all these respects. If you go to British Columbia you will find it commonly said out there that the people of eastern Canada have no knowledge of the conditions existing in that province regarding this matter and take very little interest in it. Certainly, in view of the course taken by this government in the past few years in view of the neglect shown by this government of the interests of the people of British Columbia, the people of that province have the right to complain that during the past seven years the present administration has not given that attention to their interests which those interests demand.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. What about British Columbia before 1896?

Mr. BRISTOL. The first treaty was made in 1894, and in 1895 the Conservative administration advocated the policy of restricting Japanese immigration, but they had not the power to embody that policy

in any treaty, and they were compelled to leave to the Liberal administration which succeeded them the obligation of carrying that into effect. But the Liberal administration did not do it. I am not here to-night to make any attack on the people of Japan.

No British subject can fail to admire the greatness, the intelligence, the industry and ability of that great people. But we have a right, on the floor of this House and before the people of this country, to arraign this government for any mal-administration, mistake or neglect of the interest of the Canadian people, and I submit that it is our duty, as members of parliament, to bring to the attention of the people those points on which the government has failed to maintain Canadian interests in this matter. This is a most important question as affecting the future interests of Canada. If we wish to have a national policy, if we claim the right to protect the manufacturing and commercial interests of our country, we should have the same right to protect our labouring men from the competition of any immigration that will be detrimental to their welfare. In that regard I attack this present administration in respect of the matters under discussion. The making of treaties is a thing of great and serious importance. There seems to be what might be called quite an epidemic of treaty making among hon. gentlemen opposite. As Canadians we desire to make our own treaties, but if the government wish to make treaties with credit and advantage to the people of this country they should carry on their work with due attention to the interests of the Canadian people that a business man would give to his own affairs. The hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) asks us: Why do you not move to denounce the treaty? I submit that it is open to us to denounce these inefficient and amateur treaty-makers, but there is no responsibility upon those on this side to denounce the treaty. That is a question that comes within the scope of the government's duty. Why? Because, as a government, they alone are in possession of all the facts; they alone have control of the machinery by which the matter is to be investigated. Therefore, they must take the responsibility of deciding whether the treaty should be denounced or not. That responsibility does not rest upon the opposition; we have not the information upon which to act. Our responsibility begins and ends when, in a fair and reasonable spirit, we present to the House and the people the facts of this very important matter. And so, in conclusion, I would say that when the government helped themselves so liberally as they did in 1896 to the various policies of the Conservative party, I think it would have been very much in the interest of the people of Canada if they had also helped themselves to the Conservative policy for the prevention of this undesirable immigration.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS (Yale-Cariboo). The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) has extended his sympathy to the members of British Columbia for what he is pleased to call their anxiety to square themselves. We appreciate the kindness of heart that prompted that sympathy; we appreciate also the sympathy itself. But I hasten to assure the hon. gentleman that we do not deserve it and we do not need it. We have no 'squaring' to do. The position which the members from British Columbia take at this time is exactly the position they took when this treaty was unanimously ratified by parliament about a year ago. If there is any 'squaring' to be done, it must be done by such gentlemen as the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol), the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and others who take the directly opposite position to that taken by the minister in January last when the treaty was ratified. So far as the leader of the opposition is concerned, he fully agreed to the ratification of this treaty with the correspondence in his possession—correspondence asked for by himself, laid on the table at his request, and available to him for six months before the treaty was ratified. That correspondence contained no assurance; it said nothing about the explanations which are now made by this government in reference to these assurances. The hon. gentleman agreed to the ratification of the treaty without any assurance regarding the restriction of Japanese immigration, and without the knowledge of the explanations since made by the government. If he could accept the treaty with out these assurances, how can he quarrel with the ratification of the treaty and with his own action in that connection, now that he has possession of these assurances? So, as I say, if there is any 'squaring' to be done it must be done by hon. gentlemen opposite who unanimously voted for the ratification of this treaty.

The hon. member for Centre Toronto speaks of a Japanese immigration into this country because of the ratification of this treaty. Surely he will not argue that if the treaty had not been ratified this immigration would not have taken place? Surely the Japanese were at least as free to come into this country before the treaty was ratified as they were afterwards. How, then, can the hon. gentleman say that because of the ratification of this treaty the immigration took place? I dealt with the merits of this question at some length in this House, and I do not wish to repeat the arguments I then made. But I wish to draw the attention of the House to some matters connected with the correspondence brought down and the explanations made by the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux).

This correspondence shows that this treaty was first passed in 1894—passed not by this parliament, or this government, but by the imperial government. The language of the treaty is not our language but the language of the imperial government. A good deal has been said in reference to the clause giving the subjects of Japan full right of residence in this country. But a similar clause is included in every commercial treaty made by Great Britain, and every commercial treaty made by the United States. Hon. gentlemen seem to argue that this Dominion of Canada could get a friendly treaty with Japan that would not include the ordinary clause included in every commercial treaty entered into between civilized nations. I shall not weary the House with citations, but I may say that you will find the same clause in the treaties in force between the United States and Austria-Hungary, between the United States and Hayti, between the United States and Honduras—between the United States and every country with which the United States has a commercial treaty. Is it arguable that any country will enter into a friendly commercial arrangement only to be met at the door with a hostile clause declaring in effect: Your nation can trade with us, but your people are not to have the ordinary rights that a citizen should have in a country with which you are going to carry on friendly trade. The proposition is not arguable. The treaty came to us as it was drafted and approved by the imperial government. The leader of the opposition refers to an order in council passed by the late Conservative government, pointing out the objections to the ratification by this country of the treaty. The objection was the natural one that we did not want to bind ourselves in connection with the immigration of the Japanese.

An order in council to that effect was passed, and I draw attention to the fact that it is apparent that no correspondence leading up to this order in council was left by the late government for its predecessors, because it was not filed and brought down. I am not quarreling with that at all because naturally it would be of a confidential character, and therefore was not left in the office. Then what happened? Queensland said, we will not agree to the ratification of this treaty unless there is a stipulation that this clause should not interfere with our right to regulate emigration. Japan said, We will agree to that. But they also said, If you are going to get a clause of that kind inserted, instead of this treaty continuing for twenty years, it should continue for only six months. It was distinctly stated that the reason Japan reduced the duration of the treaty from twelve years to six months was that if Queensland ever attempted to pass any emigration laws hostile to the Japanese, a notice would be immediately given for the abrogation of the treaty. But the authorities in Great Britain at that time were evidently extremely anxious to induce the various self-governing colonies to ratify the treaty, and arrangements were made under which Japan agreed to give the same exception to all self-governing colonies that signified their willingness to ratify this treaty, in other words, a protocol was added to the treaty.

Now the leader of the opposition says that that was the time to secure the ratification of this treaty. Well, let us see whether it was or not. As pointed out by the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce in a minute to council there were certain objections to the treaty because of the application of the favoured nation clause. At that time, as I understand it, this government had adopted a policy of a preferential tariff with Great Britain. Under the favoured nation clause, Germany, Belgium, Japan, and any other country having treaty arrangements with Great Britain, were entitled to the same preference that we were giving to Great Britain. As it was the policy of this government not to extend that preference to other than British countries, our government did not ratify this treaty, and asked for the denunciation of the Belgium and German treaties. That is the reason set forth in this minute to council. The other objection to the treaty was covered by the protocol which Japan voluntarily agreed to, so there was no necessity at that time of considering that objection to the treaty. Then what happened? On account of this barrier to the ratification of the treaty, the treaty was not ratified until the time expired in which it could be ratified. Then we come to the year 1903, I think, when there was considerable correspondence between this government and Mr. Nossé, the Japanese consul, in reference to legislation which this government contemplated enacting to restrict oriental immigration, in consequence of the report which this government had received from the commission appointed to investigate oriental immigration into the province of British Columbia. This commission reported in favour of a $500 poll tax on Chinese, and that policy was adopted. The commission also reported that in view of the fact that Japan had voluntarily agreed to restrict emigration to Canada, no legislation should be enacted against the Japanese, and the commission's report was adopted in that regard also. Now it is important to keep this in mind, because it shows that the position of the government then was identical with the position of the government when this treaty was ratified by the House, and the position of the government then was not criticised or objected to by hon. gentlemen opposite on the ground that it did not legislate against the Japanese.

In this connection I want to draw attention to a remark of the leader of the opposition and of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), in reference to a letter written by Mr. Nossé, in which he undertakes to bind the Japanese government. As this letter was written in connection with a protest from the Japanese government with regard to proposed legislation against its subjects, how can it be construed as an undertaking on the part of Mr. Nossé to agree to any legislation by this government to restrict such immigration when the very letter itself was in reference to the objectionable legislation ?

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me it makes no difference whatever in discussing that question. Did he not agree to enter into an agreement ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. If the hon. member will carefully read Mr. Nossé's letter he will find that, though couched in very polite and diplomatic language, he is not writing with the same ease and accuracy that he would use in writing his mother tongue. I think it was scarcely fair on the part of the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for East Grey to put a meaning into the word 'blind' which all the surrounding circumstances show was never intended. Mr. Nossé has at all times assured this government that the government of Japan was willing voluntarily to restrict emigration to this country, and therefore he objected to any hostile legislation on the part of the British Columbia government or of this government. If that is the tenor of all his letters, how can you read the meaning into Mr. Nossé's letter that he is willing to bind his government ?

Mr. SPROULE. I have read it carefully, but I do not see how you can come to any other conclusion. It says :

I have received a cable instruction to the effect that I have to give your government the renewed assurance that the Japanese government are not desirous of forcing their people into British Columbia against the wish of the province, and that they are willing to enter into an agreement with your government by which they may bind themselves.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I am sorry I cannot convince the hon. member for East Grey, I did not expect I would be able to do so. But at the risk of being tedious, I will repeat my argument. Mr. Nossé is writing to this government—I have not the correspondence before me, but I remember it well—in connection with the proposed legislation against the Japanese. He is also writing to this government protesting against the legislation proposed in the province of British Columbia. That is his reason for writing to the government, and he points out that Japan has voluntarily restricted immigration into this country, that it will continue this policy of voluntary restriction, and that therefore there is no necessity for any legislation of that kind being passed. If that is the reason for Mr. Nossé's letter how could any reasonable man read into that letter such a meaning as the hon. member for East Grey wants to convey unless he is anxious to take advantage of the peculiar wording of that letter written by a gentleman not using his own mother tongue ? Let us go a little further. Mr. Speaker, when this government took steps to secure the ratification of the Japanese treaty they did not do so without being urged by hon. gentlemen opposite to secure the ratification of this treaty. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. S. Barker) spoke in this House about the disadvantages under which people doing business in this country were placed by reason of the fact that this treaty had not been entered into. In May 29, 1905, he refers to difficulties that certain constituents of his had in getting goods into Japan. There was considerable discussion in the House at the time and the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) confirmed a statement which I recently made in reference to the causes which induced the government not to ratify the treaty. A question was asked by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) which is as follows :

Does my hon. friend recollect what was the chief factor in causing this action of the government, what possibilities they would have let themselves in for had they accepted the treaty and at about what time this occurred?

The hon. Minister of Finance replied :

Some years ago. It relates to the operation of the favoured nation clause, and also my recollection is that it affected our freedom of action on the labour question.

When the govenment decided to ratify this treaty as they were bound to do, they intimated to the imperial government that they were anxious to secure its ratification. The first thing the imperial government did, through its Secretary of State for the Colonies, was to ask this government if they wanted the treaty absolutely and without reserve or with the clause which had been granted to Queensland. Hon. gentlemen make a point of this ; as far as the correspondence originally brought down is concerned, it does show that such a suggestion had been made by Mr. Lyttelton, but the correspondence now shows that in the interval between the receipt of this telegram from Mr. Lyttelton and his reply, Mr. Nossé, the Japanese Consul, sent a letter to the government in which he said that he understands that the government is going to ask for this reservation, that he hopes they will not ask for it because Japan will not now grant it and that he is still willing to undertake on the part of his government to carry out the restrictions which have been satisfactorily working up to that time, and that notwithstanding the

treaty these restrictions will be continued. In view of this letter to Mr. Nosse, in view of the statement that Japan could not agree to the reservation which had been offered to Queensland and in view of the fact that during all the intercourse with Japan, and when other legislation was introduced a similar undertaking had been given and carried out, I believe that the government were justified in accepting this assurance if they wanted the treaty ratified and if they wanted the benefits to be derived from the ratification of the treaty. I think I remember the dates; Mr. Nossé's letter was written on July 19 and the day following, or two days following, a telegram was sent to Mr. Lyttelton saying that they wanted the treaty absolutely without reserve having received assurances from Mr. Nossé. The treaty was ratified. The correspondence was brought down and laid on the table of this House in connection with the ratification of the treaty. As I said at the outset, it was brought down at the request of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Bordon). When the ratification of that treaty came up for discussion in this House that correspondence was passed over to the hon. leader of the opposition. Had he looked at the correspondence as the leader of the opposition should he would have found none of those assurances in that corespondence, but still he accepted it without any assurances at that time. He accepted that treaty without any assurances and without any explanation from the government excepting the explanation of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who, in response to a question from my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy), said that the restrictions which had hitherto been in force would be carried out notwithstanding the treaty. The hon. leader of the opposition was the first to urge upon this government—he is upon 'Hansard' and I have already quoted his speech at that time—the necessity of having this treaty ratified. When the treaty came up for ratification his only contribution to the debate, although he had the correspondence without the assurance in his possession, was to ask: What is the value of a yen? He has these assurances now and he has the explanation of the government now. If he could support the ratification of the treaty in 1907 without assurances and without explanations how can he oppose it in 1908 when he has these assurances and these explanations? Surely, if there is any squaring to be done it must be done by hon. gentlemen opposite. I am bound to say that my own position in the matter is the position of every member of this House. We knew the gravity of the immigration question as far as these oriental nations were concerned. We appreciated it. We knew something about the negotiations between Japan and this government in connection with the $500 Chinese tax. We knew that there was an understanding between this government and Japan, we accepted the word of the leader of the government that these assurances would be continued, and we made no protest against the ratification of the treaty. The leader of the opposition did exactly the same thing. I do not want to be condemned by the leader of the opposition for having done exactly what he did, although it places me in rather distinguished company, but I am bound to say that when he did accept the treaty in 1907, when he accepts the assurance of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) that the arrangements entered into with Japan will work out satisfactorily, and which we are bound to believe will work out satisfactorily in so far as the province of British Columbia is concerned, it would be more in keeping with his position, having once accepted the ratification of the treaty without assurances, to wait and see the results of the negotiations entered into by the hon. Postmaster General before introducing a motion of censure into this House, censuring not only the government but censuring also himself who was primarily responsible, because it was he who asked for the correspondence, in not giving to this House the nature of that correspondence and in having accepted that treaty without any assurance in reference to immigration. It seems to me, as I pointed out before, that in so far as the leader of the opposition is concerned, his criticism of the government would be far more effective if it did not come a year or two soon or a year or two late. He would be perfectly justified a year ago when the treaty was up for ratification to point out to this government—were there not these assurances—that no arrangement had been made to protect this country against the influx of Japanese labour, because the correspondence as brought down did not contain the Nossé letter. He would have been perfectly justified then in pointing this out to the House, and I am sure that if he had done so, that treaty would not have been ratified without the assurances which the government gave at a later date. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden), is also unfortunate that in his motion of censure he does not seem to have the support of these great newspapers which are pleased to support him in his ordinary political programme. The Montreal 'Star' of January 26, speaking of the settlement arranged for by the Postmaster General. has this to say:

> The statement of Hon. Mr. Lemieux, following the report of Mr. Mackenzie King, seems to put the Japanese question into about as satisfactory a position as the country could hope. The Japanese government did not break faith.
>
> We could hope for nothing more exclusive short of the right to put up the bars entirely

against the Japanese, and this could never be attempted so long as Canada proposes to keep on friendly and trading terms with the most progressive people in the orient.

We must surely continue then to rely upon the word of our ally until that word be proven unreliable.

That is the position the Montreal 'Star' takes. The Toronto 'News,' which I believe is supposed to be independent but which is rather favourable to the leader of the opposition, has this to say:

Mr. Lemieux shows that from 1900 to October 1, 1907, the Japanese government's restriction of emigration had proved satisfactory even to British Columbia. Last year's influx was largely from Hawaii, a portion of the United States. Now that the Dominion government had shut this avenue of entrance, the situation would revert to that which existed prior to last autumn. For seven years the Tokio government had carried out its undertaking in good faith, and even the small influx direct from Japan was due to special representations made to the Japanese government by Canadian interests. Tokio agrees to suppress the emigration companies, and thus end the transfer of contract labourers to Canada.

The Toronto 'World,' a newspaper loyal to the leader of the opposition commends in very strong terms the satisfactory arrangement made by the Postmaster General. The Montreal 'Gazette,' a newspaper which is always orthodox Tory in its political views commends in the strongest possible terms the settlement made by the Postmaster General and asks that it be given a fair trial and that turmoil in connection with the question be discontinued. So that the leader of the opposition not only condemns himself for having agreed to the ratification of this treaty, but by the resolution he has introduced to-day he brings upon his head the condemnation of all the influential Conservative newspapers which have expressed their gratification and their pleasure at the satisfactory arrangement made by the Minister of Labour.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two views to every question. We, in the province of British Columbia take one extreme view of this oriental question. The people of British Columbia are opposed to oriental immigration. The members from British Columbia have endeavoured in the House to impress these views upon the House; in their interviews with the government they have endeavoured to impress these views upon the government. On the other hand, the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Canadian Pacific Railway and other organizations which are known to be not unfriendly to hon. gentlemen opposite, take the other extreme view. They believe that it is in the best interests of this country that it should be flooded with cheap labour. Between these two extreme views, the government have taken, I believe, a course that will meet with the approval of the majority of the people of Canada, and will also meet the wishes of the people of British Columbia. In this connection I might be permitted to say that the right hon. leader of the government has, in his wise administration of public affairs always followed a course similar to that which he has adopted in connection with this question. His policy on other cognate questions has always resulted in the best interests of Canada. When we had to face questions that disturbed and aroused the passions and prejudices of the people; when we had to face questions of race and creed in this country, the right hon. gentleman always refused to accede to the extreme views of either one class or the other, and has wisely sought a middle course to bring about a settlement which would restore peace and harmony in the Dominion. In connection with this Japanese question, by diplomacy, by negotiations, by moderation, I believe he has succeeded in satisfactorily solving the difficulty, as he has succeeded in satisfactorily solving all other problems of a similar nature which have presented themselves since he has been head of the government. I believe, Sir, that a trial of the arrangement entered into will convince not only the people of British Columbia but the people of Canada, that it is the best and the happiest solution of this difficulty.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). Mr. Speaker, the historical record of the negotiations between this country and Japan has been very fully placed before us this afternoon by the leader of the opposition. I believe, as others believe, that this question we are now discussing is not simply a provincial question; is not simply a matter for British Columbia, but is an economic question and a national question. It is a question which is certainly exercising the minds of the citizens of Canada generally. The records at our disposal (which I have only seen recently) contain some astounding information with regard to the negotiations up to the present time. The question is not a new one; it has been before this country since 1894. The negotiations that were entered into by the late Conservative government and the position, they took in the matter have been very fully dealt with to-day, so that it will be necessary to make but a brief allusion to them. In the order in council of the 3rd of August, 1895, we have a very full statement of the attitude of the Conservative government on the question of immigration from Japan and from the orient generally. That order in council is of great interest in the light of what has taken place since. When the present government came to power it had the advantage of all the information that had been gathered up to that time; it had the advantage of all the information that had been

gathered after that date, and the government may be presumed to have known all the facts when they ratified the treaty. The treaty had been held up for several years after 1895. The Conservative ministry of 1895 deemed it of sufficient importance to not ratify the treaty because it contained what they considered to be a very dangerous clause with regard to these very immigrants from Japan. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Duncan Ross) has ignored the stand which the Conservative ministry took at that date, but if he will read the order in council of August 3, 1895, he will find that the Minister of the Interior took a very serious view of this immigration from Japan.

The order in council says.

> The Minister of the Interior to whom the despatch and its inclosures were referred, states that the only portion of the reference which is of vital consequence to Canada, is that which relates to the former mentioned subject.
>
> The minister observes from the memorandum of Mr. Wilkinson of January 10, that in the treaty lately concluded between Japan and the United States, there is the following proviso :—It is, however, understood that the stipulation contained in this and the preceding article do not in any way affect the laws, ordinances and regulations with regard to trade, immigration of labourers, police and public security which are in force, or may hereafter be enacted in either of the two countries. The corresponding clause in the treaty between Great Britain and Japan merely reads:—Subject always to the laws, ordinances and regulations of each country.
>
> The minister agrees with Mr. Wilkinson's observations that this proviso 'could scarcely be appealed to as justifying either exclusion or restriction, without laying ourselves open to the charge of bad faith.'
>
> The minister is further of the opinion that Mr. Wilkinson is justified in the conclusion that it might well happen that the governments of the colonies would find themselves forced to take measures to restrict, suspend or even prohibit the immigration.
>
> The minister submits that, in the interests of the Dominion of Canada, there should be a proviso in the treaty of Great Britain with Japan similar to that contained in the treaty between that country and the United States, and he recommends that, when the adhesion of Canada is being given to the treaty, an express stipulation of this kind should be made, and that some further definition should be required of the term 'labourer' so that it will definitely include artisans.
>
> The committee advise that Your Excellency be moved to forward a certified copy of this minute to the Right Honourable Her Majesty's principal Secretary of State for the colonies.
>
> All which is respectfully submitted for Your Excellency's approval.
>
> JOHN J. McGEE,
> Clerk of the Privy council.

The government must have foreseen at that time that this very matter of immigration was one that was going to give trouble between Canada and Japan if it were not carefully guarded in the stipulation made at that time. In the light of that, and in the light of subsequent despatches, this government, in adopting the treaty last year, practically ignored all the representations which had been made and which they certainly had in their possession long before the hon. leader of the opposition saw the papers. If these papers were available, as the hon. member says, it was only for a very brief space of time, and the hon. leader of the opposition probably had not time to study them as they should have been studied before the treaty was ratified. It is now perhaps too late to cry over spilt milk, and we must make up our minds that for the present at least we are against a bad proposition that has been put through this House in an unguarded moment. I am not going to shirk any responsibility that may rest upon me in regard to the passage of that treaty. It is true I was in the House at the time and heard the remarks made by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy); and I must say that if we all had done our duty on that occasion as well as that hon. member, I believe that treaty, so far as the immigration clause was concerned, would not have been ratified. The hon. member for New Westminister stood practically alone in the House in pointing out the danger that we were incurring in passing such a treaty with a wide open door to immigration. It was explained to the House by ministers at that time—and we took their word, believing that they knew whereof they spoke—that the immigration from Japan was going to be of a very limited character, that it would be confined, I think, to five from each province, which in itself would not have been a danger. But by ratifying that treaty we practically tied our hands, and our hands are tied so long as that treaty is in force. Now, I am willing to admit that the Minister of Labour, in his late mission to Japan, has probably made the best of a poor case. I could not see what he was likely to accomplish by going, seeing that our hands were tied by a treaty which had only been ratified by this House in 1907. But if we had not the full light at that time, we have now the full light, not only in the documents laid on the table, but in the facts as they exist to-day. We had not the facts at that time; but to-day we find that instead of a few hundreds or scores of Japanese coming in yearly, we have been treated in the last few months to a flood of Japanese and many thousands of other Orientals. Many of these people were perhaps wanted in British Columbia by certain interests; but in the general interest of Canada I do not think they were wanted, and are not to-day. I am not here to depreciate the

Japanese nation. As a nation they have commended themselves to the world in a wonderful way. They have adopted civilization more rapidly perhaps than most nations of the world. Their power is felt throughout the world to-day. They have fought great battles and won great victories, and they are capable of achieving great things in industrial pursuits as well as in war. I do not deny their shrewdness, intelligence and high moral worth as a people. But we say that it is not desirable to admit a very large number of them into the Dominion of Canada in any one year, that we cannot absorb them satisfactorily, that they are not a people who will assimilate with the people already in the country who have built up the civilization we enjoy. The tendency of an influx of Orientals is to lower the standard of living. This is not saying anything in disrespect of those people. They are perhaps, according to their lights, as good people as our own, and have perhaps to a greater degree lived up to their opportunities. But they are a dangerous element in this respect, that they carry a keen competition into all the walks of life. They do not perhaps make money any faster than the ordinary white man, but they hold on better to what they make and send it to the country from which they have come. That is not what we want in this country. We want citizens who will spend their earnings in the country and become a part of it. We do not find the Orientals to be of this class or such as can be easily absorbed. I believe the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) delivered a notable speech in Victoria, British Columbia, last summer, which I read with a great deal of pleasure, and I would like to hear him repeat that speech in this House. If he was correctly reported, he took the same view of this question that I am taking, that the Japanese were not a desirable class of immigrants, that they could not be easily absorbed, and that therefore it was not in the interests of Canada to encourage an influx from Japan. We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that there are other considerations which make this treaty valuable to Canada. They say that we will derive great profit from the increase of our trade with Japan. Well, I have been looking up the Department of Trade and Commerce report in order to see what has been the trade between Canada and Japan in the past few years. I find that our exports to and our imports from Japan were as follows :—

	Exports.	Imports.
1903..	$325,181	$1,487,451
1904..	342,116	1,998,801
1905..	510,925	1,914,787
1906..	494,102	1,662,929

And in the nine months of 1907, we exported $538,548 and imported $1,658,795.

In other words, our total exports, and that is really all that counts with me—although I know hon. gentlemen opposite count a dollar bought just as much as a dollar sold —our imports from Japan were about $3. to $1 we exported. In all we exported about a half a million dollars worth of goods in a year. That is not an immense business, and the years I have given will show that that trade has not developed in leaps and bounds. It is a very small trade, certainly not a trade, in order to obtain which, we should open doors to a flood of Japanese immigration. Is there any likelihood of our becoming, within the near future, large exporters to Japan ? I think not. They do not use much of our goods. We are told that our flour is of too high a quality and the price too high to suit Japan. In fact the trade between Canada and Japan is a very small item ; and to point to the possibilities of such a trade as an inducement for our admitting hap-hazard a large immigration from Japan is placing the matter on a commercial basis and a very poor commercial basis indeed. But this question is one of national importance. It is not confined to British Columbia. We in the east, who have been watching the trend of events, are as thoroughly alive to the danger as our compatriots in the west. Although we are not in as close contact with that influx of orientals at present as to realize what it means, still we are in sympathy with the people of British Columbia in their desire to make that province a white man's country. The first opportunity I had, after the trouble in Vancouver, of making a public address, I expressed my conviction that this country must, in the near future, restrict the immigration from Japan to a very small number or actually prohibit it, even should we have to abrogate the treaty. The abrogation of the treaty may be considered too drastic. Some of my own friends on this side will think perhaps that it is an extreme course to take, but I can see the peril to which this country will be exposed if we allow these people to come in by the tens of thousands. In saying this, I mean no disrespect to the Japanese nation. I have not the slightest thought of doing them the slightest harm, but our forefathers have been at the expense and trouble during centuries of building up a civilization of which we have every reason to be proud, and it would be a retrograde step if, in a moment of weakness, through a desire to increase our trade, we were to ignore all the dangers of the introduction of a large population, alien in sympathies and traditions, and whose presence in our midst would be a menace to the institutions we all desire to uphold.

This is not simply a matter which affects the labouring man. Of course it affects the labouring man first and for that reason ought to have the sympathy of every member of this House. But it is a matter affect-

ing likewise the citizenship of this Dominion. It is a question for every one to consider whether or not, in the interests of the people, we should have an influx of this class of immigration to the destruction of the history, the constitution and the traditions we have all been taught to venerate. The question is indeed a national one. When I thus speak regarding this Japanese treaty, do not think that I would for a moment say anything detrimental to our present relations with Japan. We have entered into a treaty either with our eyes shut or open. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that their eyes were open, but I must confess that mine were closed to the possibilities of the question when that treaty went through the House. I am not at all shirking my share of responsibility. But having seen the evils it has brought upon the country, we should take the earliest opportunity of retracing our steps. I am not advocating that we should do anything dishonourable. As a business man I have always endeavoured to carry out every obligation, whether to my advantage or disadvantage, once it was fairly and honourably entered into. If this government has fairly and honestly entered into a treaty with Japan, there is only one thing to do and that is to carry out that treaty until it can be honourably ended. But I understand it can be honourably ended. We have not bound ourselves and posterity by this treaty, but are at liberty to abrogate it on giving six months notice. I am not saying that we should give notice immediately, but ultimately, if we cannot improve the conditions, we would be justified in taking that step. As to the danger of jeopardizing our commercial relations with Japan, these relations are not so very important that these need trouble us very much. The Japanese in fact have more to lose by the abrogation of the treaty than we. And although I am always desirous of extending our trade relations with foreign countries, I do not think that, for the sake of a few more dollars of trade, we should sacrifice what is in the best interests of the people of Canada as a whole.

It cannot be said that the government acted without full knowledge. The secretary of the home government, in a despatch, drew the attention of the government to this very question of immigration, and asked whether they were ready to accept that treaty and thus throw wide open the door to Japanese immigration. But this government apparently made no reply, and some weeks later they sent a despatch saying that they wished to accept the treaty just as it stood without any restriction regarding immigration. When I heard the explanation which was given last session, I understood that by this treaty we were simply extending to Japan the same courtesy that we expected to receive from Japan. That, I think, was the explanation given in this House. It was simply that a Canadian visiting Japan would receive in that country protection to his person and property and be free to come and go and to remain in Japan as long as he chose, and that he would be amenable to the laws of that country only in case he did something to contravene those laws.

That is as far as I thought it went. I thought we extended the same rights and privileges to the people from Japan to come and visit here their property and themselves, protected all the time they were in Canada. But I did not understand that we were taking in by the thousands, and it may be by the tens of thousands, immigrants from Japan to compete with us not only in labour, but in commercial enterprises, and, if the despatches we read in the press are correct, in agriculture as well. I have not heard this matter mentioned to-day, but there was a despatch in the newspapers a few days ago to the effect that a tract of land in the neighbourhood of Calgary was being obtained by Japanese, and that the owners had undertaken to place upon the property, in the near future, 250 families to follow agricultural pursuits. I think this land is in the irrigation belt. So, we shall find this not only a labour problem, but a problem affecting the settlement of our provinces in the Northwest. The Japanese are already in the foothills country, and they propose to come in in greater numbers. And we are told that we have taken this upon ourselves in exchange for the small trade that may be developed with Japan. I, for one, protest that, so far as I am concerned, I take no responsibility in that respect. The trade consideration did not weigh with me when the treaty was before the House. I think we should not be justified in exchange for the paltry trade with Japan, amounting to about $2,000,000 in the aggregate and about $500,000 of exports, in opening our gates and allowing them to send in any number of immigrants that they wish. If this is to be the situation, I think we are justified in viewing the question as one of great national importance. The government, having all these facts before them—and, I suppose, we must share the responsibility to a certain extent, we took part in it—and having discovered where we are, should arrange to limit the immigration that is coming in, whether it comes by way of Hawaii, or by passport direct from Japan, or otherwise. This matter was not explained to the House, and so cannot be fairly said to have been accepted by the House. I think we should take an early opportunity to relieve ourselves of a responsibility we have assumed when our eyes were not fully opened to the situation. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) has brought back a report. It is considered satisfactory by some, and may be considered the best that could be done under the circumstances. But that does not appear to be fully satisfactory. The min-

ister representing Japan in this country, Mr. Nossé, whose correspondence is before the House and who, I understood, spoke for his government, gave written and verbal assurances that a large amount of immigration was not coming in. If this is not being fulfilled we may say that false pretenses were used to a small extent by those who entered into negotiations on the part of Japan. If that were the case, I think we should take a firm stand on the question and point out to the Japanese government exactly what we understood at the time; that we did not intend—and it was not so explained to us, or, if it was I for one certainly did not so understand it—that this country was to be made a dumping ground for a large number of Japanese to come in and engage in every walk of life. But if this may come upon us, it seems to me the question is to be viewed in an entirely new light. We have a mass of information leading up to the present situation, but showing no justification for the negotiations of the treaty as it was passed last year. The British government, perhaps, could safely enter into such a treaty, because there is no danger of Great Britain being flooded as we are likely to be. They especially drew our attention to this wide-open door, and asked our government if they were prepared to take the responsibility. Apparently, our government replied that they were prepared to take the responsibility, and to receive the immigration that would come in under the treaty. In the light of these facts, it has become a question for the country to deal with as a whole. It is a national problem, a problem that affects our citizenship to the very foundation. And anything we can do to relieve the situation, to mitigate the trouble that has come upon us and lessen the responsibility that we have taken upon our shoulders when we did not fully understand the situation, we should do to make clear to Japan the position we take, that we are not prepared to take unlimited immigration from that country, whether as labourers, commercial men, agriculturists or otherwise, and that when we extended the courtesies of that treaty to them we understood that it was to be exercised by them to a very limited extent.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo). Already, the members from British Columbia have placed their policy on this important question fully before the House. We are called upon again to say something upon the question as it arises out of the settlement made by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) as a representative of this government in Japan in contradistinction to the amendment proposed by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) on going into Supply. I desire to take only a few minutes to give my own personal reasons why, after all the anxiety that we have expressed on this question, I am prepared to support the proposals of the government and vote against the amendment offered by the leader of the opposition.

Mr. TAYLOR. We expected that.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) says he expected that, I am dealing with my own reasons on this question, and I think I have good ones. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) through the whole of his speech, assumed that in the treaty with Japan, the trade advantages were secured at the expense of having tens of thousands of orientals coming into British Columbia; that it was not well to maintain such a treaty, especially as it would involve this very serious problem of Japanese immigration. From all that we know about the settlement made with the representative of this government in Japan, we have every reason to believe that the benefit of any trade in connection with Japan, important or unimportant, can be obtained and yet a restriction placed upon the immigration of Japanese labourers into British Columbia. We propose to do two things ; In the speech I made to the House on this question on December 16, last, I said all I could in favour of trade relations with Japan. I repeat what I said on that occasion—that the commercial future of the Pacific coast depends very largely upon the extension of Canadian commercial markets in the orient.

No man who understands the geographical situation, or has thought at all of the actual conditions and the possibilities of the development of commerce between these two countries, will attempt to minimize the importance of that trade. Sir, we want to do two things. We want to maintain the trade and we want to keep out the labourer. Hon. gentlemen may not be able to see how those two things can be harmonized. For myself I would support any proposition to extend our trade with Japan, and at the same time I would use all my influence to prevent the importation of Japanese labour into Canada. The exportation of Canadian productions into Japan tends to make it more reasonable why Japanese labour should be retained in Japan in order to develop that country, and the importation of Japanese production into Canada, which do not come into competition with our own productions, raises the purchasing value of the wages of the labouring men of this country. We want the chief productions of Japan, articles that are desirable for our consumption, when those productions do not come into competition with our own productions. The ever increasing export trade of this country to Japan strengthens the reason why Japanese labour should remain at home. Therefore, I say the government had a double object in view, to maintain trade relations and to restrict Japanese immigration.

Hon. gentlemen opposite maintain that the representative of Japan agreed that his government would endeavour to keep out Japanese labour. I am free to state to this House that on the strength of that assurance, that Japanese labour would be restricted, as it had been previous to the ratification of the treaty, I voted for the treaty. We have now the further assurance of the responsible minister who has personally visited Japan and entered into direct negotiations with the responsible ministers of the Japanese government, and this is a further reason why I am prepared again to vote in favour of the arrangement that has been made by the Minister of Labour, which will prove a final, satisfactory settlement of the question.

Now, the amendment of the leader of the opposition sets out with the statement that in 1895 the Conservative government provided for the restriction of Japanese immigration into Canada, and that in 1897 the Japanese government voluntarily agreed to insert a provision in the treaty that they would regulate immigration to Canada. Now it must strike the House that there must have been some reason why the government refused such negotiations. If the Liberal government could have had the treaty in 1897 with all the provisions for regulation of immigration, why didn't they take it? Because Japanese trade in 1894, and the three or four years following, was not an important factor for this country, and was not considered by the government of so much importance as the exclusion of Japanese labour. I heard the correspondence that was read by the leader of the opposition to-day. What was the underlying principle of the refusal of this government to negotiate on this question? Because there were other international trade connections of so much more importance to us that it was not necessary to consider this question in relation to Japan. But the intervening years have entirely changed the status of that country and have increased the importance of our trade relations with that country. What was a good reason in 1894 is not a good reason in 1907; what might be considered reasonable in 1894 is not for many reasons nearly so important in 1907. Then the amendment goes on to say :

That in the opinion of this House we should not be deprived of the power to control immigration.

Why, Mr. Speaker, I will show that that is exactly what the government have done. The leader of the opposition referred to my explanation of the proviso in the American treaty. Let me say that the American government made reciprocal arrangements with Japan concerning immigration. How did they operate? In 1894, the same year the British treaty was agreed to, the American treaty was made. When was the proviso placed in the treaty? Twelve years afterwards. Why did they not take advantage of this proviso during the whole of those twelve years? How is it, if that proviso was of such importance as between the United States and Japan and Canada and Japan, that for twelve long years no application was made of it until exactly twelve months ago? There is only one answer, namely, that more Japanese came into the United States during the twelve years under the treaty which contained a proviso empowering them to make their own regulations, than in any twelve years previous, which proves that the United States did not enforce their law but negotiated voluntary settlements. I want to say this, with due regard to the safety and security of the provisions that they sought to enact in their treaties, there are ten times as many orientals coming into the United States, notwithstanding the restrictions against Chinese and the proviso in the treaty against Japanese, ten times more than are coming into Canada. The provision was good, but evidently could not be enforced or at any rate was not. They passed the regulation a year ago. Did they enforce the regulation? Did they apply it against Japanese immigration? No. The very same kind of negotiations that took place in Canada took place in the United States. Why did they not apply the regulation? The treaty provided for it. They passed a law in 1907, and they sent their representative to Japan, just as Canada has sent her representative to Japan, and to-day the United States are negotiating for a voluntary understanding on this question, just as Canada has done. For these reasons I am not prepared to vote for the amendment. I will give a few reasons why I will vote for the government.

An hon. MEMBER. We all know that.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Well, we are speaking to the country through this House. If hon. gentlemen dont want to be enlightened, the people do, and that is exactly what we are here for. I am going to support the position that the government has taken on this question because of the special trade arrangement with Japan, and because I believe their agreement with Japan will keep out these people for all time. I have already said that it is of great importance. I think that can be maintained, and yet I think the arrangement can be made effective in regulating immigration into this country. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite did a great deal to press the importance of this treaty upon this House some time ago. I could read from 'Hansard,' if I wanted to take up the time of the House, how just two years ago, the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), representing the demands of an industry located in that city, insisted upon the establishment of trade relations with Japan in the interest of his constitu-

ents. I could read from this same 'Hansard' how the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) and other leaders of the opposition party who are opposing this arrangement to-day, pressed on this side of the House the tremendous importance of these trade relations with Japan being immediately entered into. I could read from the speeches of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who, in 1905, who, again in 1906, and who again on frequent other occasions pressed upon this government the importance of making these negotiations complete in the interest of the commercial relations of this country with the empire of Japan. I noticed with some amusement some of my hon. friend's statements in Toronto a few months ago in criticising the treaty after the excitement had been created in Vancouver, but he did not say that in 1905 he had pressed upon this House and before the government the practical necessity of negotiating to bring about a settlement of the question. He did not say that in 1906, a little over a year ago, he had also given expression to his views on this subject. In 1906 he said :

A person who was not acquainted with the history of this matter might very well have supposed from the speech and from the remarks that were made that this was a brand new treaty made with the young and rising empire of Japan and for which the government might very well take to themselves special credit. Well, when one looks into it, it all simmers down to this, that it is but the late confession of a blunder——

What blunder?—that they had not negotiated the treaty earlier. The blunder, according to the hon. member for North Toronto, consisted not in entering into negotiations for a treaty in 1907, but that they had not entered with negotiations for a treaty some years before that.

The fact of the matter is that in 1894 a treaty was made with Japan by the British government. This government at that time, I suppose, carefully looked into the matter and they came to the conclusion that they would not be included in the treaty and consequently would not share in its benefits. And from 1896-7 up to the present time Great Britain and Germany and France and the United States of America have all had the benefit that flowed from the treaty or similar treaties, whilst Canada has been absolutely debarred from any of those benefits, Some two years ago, I think it was, we on this side of the House drew attention to the fact that there was still a possibility that Canada might be included within the provisions of that treaty. Then, and then only, this government woke up, then and then only it stirred around, and after the lapse of two years they come to us with what is called a treaty with Japan. Well, Sir, if there is one reason now why this treaty should be hailed and acclaimed with delight and with applause as I believe it should be.

As I believe it should be ! What was the treaty ! It was the British treaty. That British treaty did not contain a provision retaining power in Canada to regulate immigration. Not at all, but the hon. member for North Toronto accepted the British treaty when he said that. He accepted it just as fully as he could have accepted it and he complimented the government upon having secured its ratification :

Well, Sir, if there is one reason now why this treaty should be hailed and claimed with delight and with applause, as I believe it should be, there were ten reasons ten years ago why it should have been adopted and its provisions taken advantage of by this country, simply because ten years of added benefit over and above what this country can now obtain would have been obtained by intercourse with that country at a period of time when probably its demands upon such products as Canada could have afforded would have been even greater than they will be in the years to come.

But, I say I support the arrangement of the government because the leaders of the opposition party were constantly pressing upon the government the importance of negotiating this treaty and not the importance of negotiating a treaty with any special provision to regulate immigration, but the importance of negotiating the treaty passed in Great Britain in 1894 which contained no powers at all in regard to the regulation of immigration into this country. Now, the government have done three things that I think ought to be supported by the House. First, they have passed an order in council preventing Japanese coming from the insular possessions of the United States, and if any member of this House looks over the records he will find that 60 per cent of the Japanese that have come into Canada during the past two years have come from the American islands. If we remember also that combined with the Japanese trouble in Vancouver has been the Hindoo question we will see at once that the government, by the operation of this treaty, have closed out entirely the immigration of orientals from this source. Then again the government have provided against the making of contracts for bringing in Japanese immigrants into this country without the consent and authority of the government. I contend that if the Minister of Labour had done nothing more in Japan as the representative of this country than to place a check upon the private arrangements of contractors for oriental labour and to bring into operation the principle that these people cannot carry on their operations without the authority of the government he would have done sufficient to justify the support of this House. For these two reasons and for any other arrangements which have been made that will accomplish the object of keeping these people out of the country I am prepared to support with my vote the proposals made by the hon. Minister of Labour. If there is any risk about it then the

risk is mine. I am willing to take that risk. I think this arrangement will have the effect of renewing and confirming confidence existing between this government and the government of Japan. I supported the treaty in 1907 on the understanding that this immigration was to be regulated within very reasonable limits, and I am prepared to say on the floor of this House that whilst I believe that six months will demonstrate that an influx of orientals into this country under this arrangement is impossible, if, this arrangement be entered into between the representatives of Canada and the representatives of Japan, is not maintained I will support the abrogation of the treaty which can be brought about by giving six months notice.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Vancouver). I do not wish to give a silent vote on this question, because after all, it is the most vital question affecting the province of British Columbia we have ever had before this parliament. In a few words I shall place my views before the House and before my constituents. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said that the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition is nothing more and nothing less than a motion of want of confidence in the government. Well, that being the case I cannot support the motion for the reason that the government have done exactly what I have been trying to get them to do for the last six months. They have carried on negotiations with Japan which have resulted in stopping for all time any further influx of Japanese coolies into our country.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you know ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I will tell my hon. friend how I know. The Minister of Labour has just come back from Japan and he has stated in parliament upon his responsibility as a minister of the Crown, that we need never fear any further immigration from Japan. That statement has been accepted by the House ; that statement has been accepted by the country.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. MACPHERSON. My hon. friend says 'no.'

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says that statement is accepted by the House and the country. Had we not years ago a similar statement from the government that the Japanese would regulate immigration, and yet the Japanese government have not regulated immigration to the satisfaction of even the hon. member himself ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) mean to say on his responsibility as a member of this House, that the mission of the Postmaster General to Japan has been fruitless ? No matter how politically prejudiced the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) may be, I doubt if he will have the temerity to state on the floor of this House that the mission of the Minister of Labour to Japan has been fruitless, and that the statement made by that hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) on the floor of the House is entirely erroneous. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will not say that.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not desire to say that at all, but I want to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Macpherson) what greater reason have we to believe that the arrangement now made will bring about the restriction desired, than we had to accept the statement of the Prime Minister when we entered into the treaty with Japan, that the Japanese would restrict immigration. The Japanese government did not restrict immigration.

Mr. MACPHERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) interrupts me to ask a question, which I do not mind, but I have some objection to being interrupted while he makes a long statement. However, the hon. gentleman has answered his own question. He tells us that he would not state that the mission to Japan has been fruitless. Therefore, I say that the people of this country are prepared to accept and must accept as a fact the declaration of our minister that the question is settled, and that he has entered into a satisfactory arrangement with Japan. In view of that declaration by a minister of the Crown I have confidence that the government will see that the arrangement is carried out. Let me quote a telegraphic despatch from Japan in to-day's newspaper, which reads :

> Replying to interpellations in the Lower House of the Diet this evening, Foreign Minister Viscount Hayashi spoke at length on the foreign policy of the government, including negotiations with the United States and Canada.
>
> He announced that the Canadian question has been definitely settled, and read the correspondence with Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, the Canadian Commissioner of Labour, wherein Japan has agreed to restrict emigration to Canada within reasonable limits.
>
> Viscount Hayashi, continuing, said it was the duty of the central government to conserve the interests of Japanese subjects resident in other countries by preventing a further exodus of their countrymen which might be prejudicial to those already residing abroad, and the restrictions therefore would be extremely rigid.

Now, Mr. Speaker, treaties have been entered into by all governments in all times and treaties have been lived up to by all nations. This arrangement is practically a treaty entered into between the two governments, and I say that so far as the present is concerned we have a settlement of this question that is bound to prove satisfactory. Of course, it may not be satisfactory to the man who wants to make politi-

cal capital out of it because he will want to keep up strife, it may not be satisfactory to the prejudiced man who would desire to see the efforts of the government unsuccessful. But, to every right thinking man in Canada, to every man who desires to see this very dangerous question wiped off the slate, I say that the settlement is hailed with delight. The hon. gentleman from East Grey looks at me askance when I make that statement, but I reiterate. There is no man in this country who has held stronger views on this question than I, and I say, Sir, that I am as convinced as that I am standing here, that were I to live for many years to come I have seen for the last time any great oriental influx from any oriental country into Canada. My hon. good friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) has shown that a great majority of the Japanese have come to Canada from Honolulu, that the majority of the Hindoos have come from Hong Kong, and those two gateways are now closed to them for all time, so long as the Canadian government keeps the present regulations in force, and there is no reason to suppose for one minute that any government would dare to change these regulations. Therefore, the amendment of the leader of the opposition is entirely needless and useless so far as this question is to-day concerned. When the Japanese treaty was put through parliament; when we agreed to it here two years ago, there was not a man on either side of the House who was not prepared to hail with delight the idea that we should enter into that treaty. Every man who spoke upon that occasion impressed on the government that they should bring this treaty into operation; every man in this country who was at all anxious to see any trade developed between the orient and Canada hailed that treaty with delight, to use the words of the hon. member (Mr. Foster). It is not the first time that governments and people have found that they could not peer into the future. But if the government were blind in this matter, the whole country was blind, the opposition in this House was blind, nobody could foresee that there was a desire on the part of some people in British Columbia to bring into Canada these Asiatic immigrants. And let it be remembered that this immigration came from within ourselves. Had it not been for our own people in British Columbia we would not have had this influx of orientals, so that we ourselves are primarily responsible. To-day, according to the arrangements entered into, it is impossible for any company in Canada to contract for a supply of labourers from any Asiatic country. That is stopped for all time. It is just quite possible that our whole experience in this matter, disagreeable as it is, has been cheaply bought in the light that we have solved a question which was a most difficult question to solve. For all time in the future we need not fear this horde of Asiatics, so that the price we have paid during the last six months may not after all be without some return. No man need try to impress upon me that any vote I might give now is going to make it one particle easier or one particle harder for a Japanese, or a Chinaman, or a Hindoo to come into Canada.

I say I regard the question as settled, and settled for all time, and therefore I vote with the government and against the opposition in this matter. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) spoke to-night with a running sob in his voice about the horrible fate that was in store for the members from British Columbia who voted with the government on this question. I do not think our fate will be very horrible if we have accomplished what we believe to be a good thing. If I am defeated, what does that amount to? Is my political life so important that I should save it at all hazards? I am only an atom in the make-up of this country; I am only a unit in this House. If I am defeated, as it is said by my opponents that I shall be, what does that matter if we have succeeded in settling a question that has been for so many years unsettled? Greater misfortunes can happen to a man than to be defeated. I am told that I shall not get a nomination from my party in British Columbia. That does not cut any ice with me, Mr. Speaker. I am told that if I do get the nomination, I shall be defeated at the polls. Will that change the trend of events in the future? No, Sir. If I had accomplished nothing in this House for the sake of being re-elected, then I would say that my political life had been barren, that its only fruit had been Dead Sea fruit. But I have agitated this question in the country, and have been very much called to task for my agitation, both on the hustings and in the newspapers; but if I have succeeded, as I think I have to a certain extent, in turning the attention of the public and of the government to a live question in British Columbia, then, Sir, my defeat will have been well repaid, my sacrifice will have been well given, and I will yield it gladly. I care not a snap of my fingers for that, Mr. Speaker. It is the last thing I consider as a member of this House.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, though it must be my duty, in the few observations which I have to offer to this House, to take issue with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, both upon the speech with which he favoured the House and upon the resolution which he has placed in your hands, yet I am free to confess that I welcome altogether both the speech and the resolution of the hon. gentleman. I welcome both the speech and the resolution, because both present, in a clear line of cleavage, the policy of the government and

the policy of the opposition upon this most important question. In the object which both parties pursue I see no difference whatever; all the difference is in the method. The policy of the hon. gentleman, the policy of his party, settled many years ago, re-affirmed on this occasion, is to obtain restriction of Japanese immigration to our shores by hostile legislation of this parliament, with all the consequences of hostile legislation upon a friendly power. The policy of this government is to obtain the restriction of Japanese immigration to our shores, not by hostile legislation, but by the voluntary, the friendly action of the Japanese authorities themselves. Sir, in a few words this is the line of cleavage between that side of the House and this side. And now it will be my duty to proceed to give to the House the motives, the reasons and the results of our policy; and when this is done I shall be content to leave the whole question to the judgment of the members of this House and of the people of this country. Sir, the central fact in this question, around which all other considerations revolve, is the fact that in all countries where the Caucasian race and the oriental races come together there is at once an antagonism. There is a sharp, well-marked antagonism on the part of all white races against the Mongolian race. Of this fact we have been well aware for a long time; but the fact has been still more clearly put before us in the admirable speech of my hon. friend and colleague the Postmaster General just a week ago today. My hon. friend, during the course of his observations, dilated at some length, though certainly not at too great a length, upon this aspect of the question. He gave us valuable information, until then unknown to us, though we have had on this point information from our colleagues from British Columbia. For my part, I had believed, as had many others, that there was at the bottom of this antagonism only a labour problem. I had thought, and many others had thought, that white labourers objected to associating themselves with oriental labourers on account of their different modes of living. But we know that there is another consideration which extends far beyond the labour problem. The population of British Columbia is a small population as yet. The flow of immigration from Europe has not yet crossed the Rocky Mountains and not yet reached the province by the Pacific ocean. The population of that province is small and sparse, and there is an apprehension, a well understood apprehension which we can all share, that if the current of immigration from Asia were to be allowed to flow in free and unchecked, the balance of power might pass from the one race to the other. This is a problem, Sir, which no government in this country can afford to ignore. This is a problem which has engrossed the attention

of all governments from the early days of confederation—I may say from the day of British Columbia's admission into this union of provinces. This problem, difficult at all times and under all circumstances, has been made doubly difficult—nay, ten times more difficult—in so far as Japan is concerned by the fact that Japan has suddenly risen to the proportions of a first-class power. Sir, everybody will concede that no event during the last fifty years of the history of the human race has been more remarkable than the sudden revolution which has changed the institutions of Japan. Japan up to fifty years ago was an isolated community; it has suddenly become one of the world's greatest powers. When I say an isolated community, I do not use the expression offensively; but I want to draw attention to the marked difference between oriental civilization and occidental civilization. The nations of the orient have been, I might say for countless ages, certainly for thousands of years, in a condition of lethargic immobility. To-day their civilization is the same as it was two thousand years ago.

Their religious thought, their code of ethics, their methods of commerce, their modes of transportation, their system of education—all these are the same as they were 2,000 years ago. While the nations of the west have been in a constant state of transition and evolution, always striving towards improvement and progress, the nations of the east have been content to remain just where they were, and the result has been that in almost every walk of life they have been left steadily behind. But all at once, without any transition, Japan has risen from a condition of lethargy to a condition of actual activity and modern life. Japan has adopted our system of education, our methods of trade and industry, and in the art and science of war, both on land and sea, she has shown herself the peer of the most famous nations of the present day. It is to the credit of Lord Lansdowne that, of all the diplomatists of Europe, he was the first to recognize the possibilities of this change in the condition of Japan. Such was the importance that he attached, and rightly attached, to this changed condition that he, all of a sudden, broke loose from all the traditions of British policy. Hitherto it had been the rule and tradition of British diplomacy that Britain would not become entangled in any foreign alliance, that she would stand alone in her insular position, and be ready in all circumstances to take advantage of her opportunities without being shackled by weighty alliances. But Lord Lansdowne attached so much importance to the new condition Japan had attained that in 1902 he did what had not yet been done for us by any British statesman, and concluded a treaty of alliance, defen-

sive and offensive, between Britain and Japan. What is the condition therefore which has existed since 1902? It is that, under the treaty negotiated by Lord Lansdowne, it is possible, if unfortunately the interests of Great Britain were to be jeopardized in the northern Pacific ocean, we might see, should unfortunately war break out, the fleet of Japan and the fleet of England riding the waves together for a common purpose and against a common enemy. It is possible that, under that treaty, we may see the fleet of Japan weighing anchor in the harbour of Vancouver for the protection of those British interests to which Canada attaches such vital importance. This is a condition which has escaped altogether the attention of my hon. friends opposite, but it is a condition that we have had all the time before our eyes. But though there may be treaties of defence, amity and peace, though on this occasion Japan and Great Britain proclaimed to the world that they were friends and prepared to fight, if need be, a common enemy, it is not to be expected that in the people, among all classes, high and low, the old feuds and antagonisms can disappear in a day. We know, by the experience of the world, that antagonisms, especially those which have race for basis, are slow to die, and we must reckon accordingly. And we had a tangible proof of this when, in this year of 1902, the year when the treaty was concluded between Lord Lansdowne and Viscount Aoki, the request came upon us, more pressing than ever, from British Columbia for a law of exclusion against the oriental races. The position we took on that occasion is well known. We had no hesitation in meeting the request of British Columbia with regard to certain races of the orient. But when it came to Japan we had to say that we could not comply with that request. We were pressed to introduce the Natal Act and we would not. Under the Natal Act no people would be admitted to British Columbia unless they could speak some of the languages of Europe. That would be a direct slap in the face of our allies in Japan. But we entered into negotiations with the Japanese authorities themselves, through the instrumentality of Mr. Nossé, the Japanese consul, then in Montreal and since in this city. We represented to the Japanese authorities that, although we were allies, they must know there were difficulties against their people coming to our country, where they could not expect to be received with favour, they must know that we could not prevent the clashing of race with race, and we asked the Japanese authorities themselves to restrict the immigration. And I am happy to say that we were successful in these efforts, and the Japanese authorities consented to restrict emigration from their country. We have been asked in the course of this debate what was the authority of Mr. Nossé. Was he a plenipotentiary? Had he any letters of credit to present? The answer is easy. We have no accredited diplomatic agents in this country. We have no power to have any ; but the fact that Mr. Nossé was authorized to give us the pledge he did, and the fact that in the years which followed this pledge—1902, 1903, 1904, 1905 and 1906—there was scarcely any immigration from Japan to British Columbia.

Mr. FOSTER. Nearly 2,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very well, let us say 2,000. How many of these went to the United States?

Mr. FOSTER. Some did.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. More than one half of them went to the United States. 2,000 landed in British Columbia, but the 2,000 did not remain in British Columbia ; and if my hon. friend wants conclusive evidence, he has it in the fact that not a word of complaint came from British Columbia during those years. A moment ago I stated that Japan had become a highly civilized country, so civilized indeed, so much in sympathy with the methods of the west, that she adopted this last product of European civilization. Japan had a universal exposition in Tokio in 1903. Canada was represented at that exhibition. We asked an appropriation from parliament, which was voted cheerfully without a word of dissent. Canada's exhibit made a most creditable effect. All the words I have had regarding it have been words of praise. So successful indeed was our exhibition at Tokio that the business men, the merchants of Canada, not only the business men of Canada, but even those who are supposed to take an interest in the trade of Canada—and in those I would include even my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden)—all those pressed upon us the advisability of having a treaty of commerce with Japan. We thought that the time had come when we should endeavour to have such a treaty. For many years there had been a treaty of commerce between Japan and Great Britain—a treaty passed in 1894, which did not include Canada, but in which Canada might be included by her own will and consent. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has told us that the Conservative government had a policy, and it was that if Canada were to be included in that treaty Canada should reserve the power to legislate against Japanese immigration. He quoted the order in council passed in August, 1905, the conclusion of which is as follows :

The minister submits that in the interests of the Dominion there should be a proviso in

the treaty of Great Britain with Japan similar to that contained in the treaty between that country and the United States.

Since the government of Canada, at that time, wanted to have a provision similar to that in the treaty between Japan and the United States, it is important to know what this provision was. It was in the following terms :

It is, however, understood that the stipulations contained in this and the preceding article do not in any way affect the laws, ordinances and regulations with regard to trade, immigration of labourers, police and public security, which are in force, or may hereafter be enacted in either of the two countries.

Now, let me come back to the conclusion of the order in council, which I read, but which I must read again :

The minister submits that, in the interests of the Dominion of Canada, there should be a proviso in the treaty of Great Britain with Japan similar to that contained in the treaty between that country and the United States, and he recommends that, when the adhesion of Canada is being given to the treaty, an express stipulation of this kind should be made, and that some further definition should be required of the term 'labourer,' so that it will definitely include artisans.

The committee advise that Your Excellency be moved to forward a certified copy of this minute to the Right Honourable Her Majesty's principal Secretary of State for the colonies.

This despatch, covering the minute of council, was sent to the colonial secretary and by him referred to the British ambassador at Tokio. We have the observations of that ambassador upon this minute of council. This is set out in the despatch of Sir Ernest Satow, of February 7, 1906. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) was extremely chary in his quotation of this document. He should have quoted more than he did in order to get the true meaning that we know was taken by the Canadian government of this despatch. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) told us that the Japanese government were agreeable to inserting a provision under which we should reserve to ourselves the right to legislate against Japanese immigration and asked why the government did not take advantage of this offer ? Because it was a qualified consent on the part of Japan to have this proviso inserted in the treaty. The despatch reads as follows :

At the request of the acting minister for Foreign Affairs, I called on His Excellency this afternoon for the purpose of receiving the reply of the Japanese government respecting the conditions on which Canada and other colonies might adhere to the treaty between Great Britain and Japan, in anticipation by some days of the date mentioned in my despatch No. 25, of the 5th instant.

And here comes the part quoted by my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) :

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

His Excellency produced a written memorandum, the terms of which were to the purpose that the Japanese government were willing to agree that Canada in signifying her adhesion to the treaty might do so with a proviso that the stipulations of the treaty should not in any way affect the laws of either country with regard to the immigration of labourers, and further, that the treaty should cease to be binding six months after notice to terminate had been given by either side.

These last words of this quotation show the qualification of the consent by the Japanese government, 'that the treaty should cease to be binding six months after the notice to terminate had been given by either side.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not as I understand it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will show that that is the correct understanding of it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I am referring to is that at that time Japan had not consented to the words covering artisans.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, but the question of artisans was a very incidental question. Japan consented to the insertion of these words in the treaty, provided that the treaty might be brought to an end at six months' notice by either party. The reason for that is given later by Sir Ernest Satow :

On my asking for an explanation of the reasons for proposing that either side should be enabled to terminate the treaty by giving six months' notice, His Excellency said that it had seemed to the Japanese government that neither party should be bound for a longer period than was desirable, and therefore the term of one year, named in the United States treaty, had been reduced to six months.

I observed to His Excellency that the United States treaty, as it was originally drafted, stipulated for a duration of twelve years, and the stipulation reducing this period to one year had been added afterwards as a sort of postscript, it being expressly stated that the amendment in question had been 'proposed by the government of the United States.' It would consequently appear that at the time of the negotiations with the United States the Japanese government were willing to concede a duration of twelve years in the case of a treaty containing a reservation of legislation upon labour, but that now as regards a colony of Great Britain they wished to reduce this to six months. I was desirous, I said, of being in a position to explain to Her Majesty's government the reason for this change in their views, as otherwise it might seem as if there was some unwillingness to accord to Great Britain what, on a previous occasion, had been readily conceded to the United States.

It is obvious what was the reason why Japan, in the treaty with the United States and in the treaty with Canada, desired to limit its duration to twelve months in one

case and six months in the other. Were the United States or Canada to pass unfriendly legislation, immediately Japan would give notice of the termination of the treaty. And the reason is made all the more apparent by the very language of the despatch which my hon. friend read, but the effect of which apparently escaped his attention.

After some further conversation on this point, His Excellency said that although the memorandum had received the approval of the cabinet, he would give the matter further consideration, and that, for the present, he would retain the document in his possession. This is the explanation of my being unable to furnish Your Lordship with its exact wording.

Now, I call attention to what follows :

It seems obvious that the Japanese government, who have taken nearly four months to consider their reply, desire to be in a position to terminate the treaty whenever any of the colonies that might accede to it with this proviso proceeded to legislate against the free immigration of Japanese labour, and I could not conceal from His Excellency my feeling that this was not a very friendly attitude to take up.

I assured him, however, that as far as I could foresee, there would, in all probability, be no necessity for either Canada or the Australian colonies placing restrictions on Japanese, who usually lived on the same scale as Europeans in foreign countries, and that no disadvantage was likely to result to Japan from consenting to this proviso. As His Excellency was aware, no such legislation had even been resorted to in the past.

Now, let me give the concluding sentence, which gives the key to the whole situation, so far as Japan is concerned, in matters of this kind :

I think it is not difficult to understand why the Japanese government feeling that such provisions are calculated to place them in the eyes of the world on a level with the Chinese, should endeavour, while apparently consenting to them, to render them practically inoperative from the beginning.

We are told this afternoon—and it has been the burthen of my hon. friend's speech, as it is the burthen of his amendment—why did not you include in the treaty the provision inserted in the American treaty, allowing Canada to pass legislation restricting Japanese immigration if she chose ? The reason is given by Sir Ernest Satow—that the moment we did negotiate a treaty with such a provision, we should be forced, under this legislation to restrict immigration and, the very moment this was done, Japan would denounce the treaty. This policy extolled by my hon. friend would have meant a treaty that would not last more than six months. But I am sorry to say that, in the despatch of Sir Ernest Satow, there is one part with which nobody can agree, but which everybody knows to be mistaken :

There would, in all probability, be no necessity for either Canada or the Australian colonies placing restrictions on Japanese, who usually lived on the same scale as Europeans in foreign countries, and that no disadvantage was likely to result to Japan from consenting to this proviso.

Was that correct? Everybody knows that it was not correct. Everybody knows that if we had agreed to this treaty and taken the privilege to legislate against the Japanese immigration, we would have been forced to exercise that power. Is there anybody on either side of the House who does not know that if we had the power to exclude the Japanese under such a treaty, we would have been forced to exercise that power? Consequently we would have lost the treaty instead of having it, as we do now.

Mr. A. BRODEUR (Dundas). Suppose they failed to carry out the understanding you have with them now, what action will you take ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, my hon. friend must have been blind or asleep during the last few days. We have taken action upon this very point. Instead of taking power ourselves to restrict immigration by Act of Parliament, we have obtained from the Japanese authorities themselves an engagement that they will restrict it voluntarily.

Mr. BRODER. The hon. gentleman does not understand my question. Suppose they fail to carry out this understanding you have with them now, what will your action be in the future?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If they fail to carry out this understanding that we have with them, then we shall have the power ourselves to put an end to the treaty. But that will be done only in the last resort, only when every method of conciliation has been exhausted, only when every other means has been tried and failed. We want to preserve peace with Japan; we want to maintain our present good relations with her; we want to maintain a good understanding with her, and we do not wish to ask this parliament to submit Japan to the humiliation of restricting her people from coming to our shores unless we are absolutely forced to do so by her own course. Instead of choosing the method which the leader of the opposition has indicated by his motion, we take another course. We negotiated with Mr. Nossé ; we asked him if it were not possible to get the Japanese authorities to continue the understanding we had already with them, and this is the letter which we received from him, addressed to the Minister of Agriculture:

Ottawa, September 18, 1905.

Dear Mr. Fisher,—I am leaving this note with you as I will be absent for a few days from the city. I learnt this afternoon from Hon. Mr. Scott, the Secretary of State, that your government was going to exact from Japan a few special concessions on becoming a party to the Anglo-Japanese treaty. Your government, I understand, proposes to restrict the immigration, coastwise navigation, and some other items. It is rather surprising to me that your government, in spite of your statement, is going to ask for such restrictions.

The Japanese government will, I am afraid, never agree to such terms, and decline to entertain the question of allowing Canada into the party, if she will ask Japan to give her special concessions. Japan gives England the right of coastwise navigation, for instance, the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers at present call at the open ports in Japan, but Japan will never ask the same privilege, and the immigration will always be restricted voluntarily by Japan, and I do hope very much that Canada will depend upon our good faith and will not try to put any restrictions by right of treaty. The Queensland treaty is quoted, but this treaty does not now exist since her amalgamation into the Commonwealth, and there is not any treaty at present between the colony and Japan.

I hope you will do your best not to make any special proposal to the English government, else your endeavours will come to nothing.

I am yours sincerely,
T. NOSSE.

Now, we relied upon this assurance of Mr. Nossé, the same assurance we had before; we had the same ground for relying upon the assurance that the restriction of immigration would continue as it had during the past four years. But, unfortunately, this year there was an influx, all of a sudden, of Japanese immigration. We did not know how to account for it, but we do know now, because we have had an investigation upon the subject. We then took the only course we could take. We did not suppose that Japan had broken faith with us; we did not suppose that this influx had taken place with her consent; we had reason to believe that the good faith of Japan had been surprised, and that if we called her attention to it she would take the necessary steps to live up to the agreement which she had made with us. That was the reason of the mission to Japan of my hon. friend the Postmaster General. How far he has been successful, everybody knows at present. He has been entirely successful; he has brought us the assurance of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Japanese government that this agreement will be lived up to, and that Japanese immigration will be restricted.

Now, in face of all this we are told, But why did you not do as the Americans did, insert a clause in your treaty reserving to yourself the power to restrict Japanese immigration? Well, Sir, the answer is this:

I claim that we are to-day in a better position than are the Americans. The American government reserved to themselves the power to restrict Japanese immigration, and, as I understand, they have availed themselves of that power, and because they have availed themselves of that power, they have had some trouble. We do not have any such trouble, but we know something about it. Last spring, I think it was in April or May, Japanese children were not allowed the privilege of the public schools in San Francisco, and the Japanese government remonstrated with the American government, and considered it an unfriendly act. Of course I may say that the American authorities were acting altogether in their right in so doing, they could exclude Japanese from attending their schools; they could restrict Japanese from going into their country. They have done so. But if they do so, they do it at their peril, and that peril is the cancellation of their treaty with Japan. At this moment they are having trouble for that reason. Does anybody in this House suppose that the Japanese people will allow American goods to enter their country freely at the preferred rate, while at the same time their own people are slapped in the face and rejected from American territory? Does any one believe that if we had passed a treaty with such a proviso as there is in the American treaty, and if we were to exercise that power so provided for by an Act of this parliament, and exclude Japanese immigrants from coming into this country—does anybody suppose that the Japanese government would endure such a humiliation or that they would allow our goods to continue to go into their country under the benefit of the treaty? Why, Sir, the thing is so clear that it is not necessary to discuss it. Japan is a proud country; she is willing to do voluntarily what we ask her to do, but she will not do it by compulsion in a treaty. So I say that at this moment we stand in a better position than do the Americans. We see to-day in the 'Evening Journal' of this city a very suggestive telegram from Tokio. It was quoted a moment ago by my hon. friend from Vancouver, but I will quote it again:

Tokio, January 28.—Replying to interpellations in the Lower House of the Diet this evening, Foreign Minister Viscount Hayashi spoke at length on the foreign policy of the government, including negotiations with the United States and Canada.

He announced that the Canadian question has been definitely settled, and read the correspondence with Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, the Canadian Commissioner of Labour, wherein Japan has agreed to restrict emigration to Canada within reasonable limits.

Viscount Hayashi, continuing, said it was the duty of the central government to conserve the interests of Japanese subjects resident in other countries by preventing a further exodus of their countrymen which might

be prejudicial to those already residing abroad, and the restrictions therefore would be extremely rigid.

So there is a difficulty between Japan and the United States, notwithstanding that the United States have power to restrict immigration, showing conclusively that, put any restrictions you please in a treaty, you must always come back to diplomatic action to settle questions of this kind. This is a policy which we have pursued. Now, we are in this position and it is very plain; we all desire in Canada to restrict Japanese immigration. All sides are agreed to that. I have stated more than once that I regret the condition of things which exists in British Columbia, but it is a condition of things which we are bound to respect and which we must give heed to. We are prepared to do so. We are prepared on both sides of the House—at all events on this side of the House—to give reasonable and generous heed to the views of British Columbia upon this question. There are two ways of doing that. One way is the method suggested by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition this afternoon and which is embodied in his amendment. One way is to legislate against the Japanese and by an Act of this parliament, by the will of the Commons, of the Senate and of the representative of the King, make provision that no Japanese shall come into this country. Another way is the method of conciliation, to ask the Japanese government to recognize the difficulties of such a question and to do what we will not do ourselves, to do voluntarily what we will not compel them to do against their wishes. I have no hesitation in saying that upon this question we place ourselves with absolute confidence in the judgment not only of the people of Canada entirely but also in the judgment of the people of British Columbia. Shall it be said in this parliament, are hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to vote to-day that we shall admit Japanese into this country only when they come with a man-of-war in company with the British fleet in order to protect our shores, and that there shall be an enactment of parliament to prevent them coming in times of peace? Is that the position which is taken by these hon. gentlemen? I have only this to say that I feel sure that when our action is known in British Columbia, when it is properly understood, when they know of the effort which we have made in order to bring about the result which they want to have brought about, they will be satisfied that this result has been brought about not by hostile legislation but by friendly conciliation.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think, Mr. Speaker, that on more than one occasion I have prefaced my remarks after the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) by saying that I was obliged to reply to an astonishing speech. I do not think I could ever do that more truthfully than I can to-night and that for very many reasons. Not only the speeches of my hon. friends from British Columbia but more especially the speech of the right hon. gentlemen have been astonishing speeches. I commend the concluding sentence of my right hon. friend's speech to these good gentlemen from the province of British Columbia who are always willing to bow to what the government say, who are always willing to vote confidence in their government whether they are slashed or whether they are solaced, it makes no difference. Just before I take up the main argument I want to have a word or two with two or three of my friends from British Columbia. The hon. gentleman from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) was most inclusive in his assertions. All these questions, according to him, had been settled for all time. Standing up in the plenitude of his years and thinking may be nothing of the uncertainty of human life, he was in a position to tell not only the people of British Columbia but the people of this country, the people of the whole of Canada, that all these questions, severally and in the aggregate, were settled for all time. The rather disturbing question was put to him by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule): How do you know, what is your reason? but the answer came with convincing power, and I am sure, no one must have felt this more than my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux). How do I know?—because the Postmaster General has been over to Tokio, he has come back and he has told me that it was settled for all time. Therefore, it is settled for all time. How can you argue against statements of that kind? Well, but he did not rest exactly there. He had another reason. It was not only settled for all time because the Postmaster General came back and told him that it was, but it was settled for all time because my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) had made the remark that he had, and my hon. friend from Grey had made a remark which he interpreted in the very same direction. Hawaii has closed out its emigration for all time! How does he know? We may know what is going on to-day, we may have a very good knowledge of what went on yesterday, we may make a very shrewd guess as to what will go on to-morrow or the day after, but when a man comes out, even though it be from the province of British Columbia and from the great city of Vancouver and tries to crowd down our mouths the assertion that this thing is settled for all time and sets himself up as an unimpeachable authority on that subject I beg leave to make my dissent, very mildly, very calmly, but still I propose to make it. The Hindoos are kept out of this country for all time to come, says my hon. friend. Ah, who told my hon.

friend that the Hindoos are kept out of this country ? The right hon. Prime Minister will not assert it; neither will any other man who knows. There is no power so far and no power has been attempted to be exerted so far to keep a Hindoo British subject out of this country. Will my hon. friend from Vancouver tell me on what he founded that assertion that the Hindoos are kept out of this country for all time to come ? I believe there has been a regulation made by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), mighty powerful sometimes in his own estimation, but not quite so powerful when he comes to be submitted to the judgment of the House and later to the judgment of the country, but I think that the only regulation that has been made in so far as the Hindoos are affected is that by the Minister of the Interior and it is simply a regulation not in reference to the Hindoo but in reference to all manners of people wheresoever they may dwell, that in order to come as immigrants into Canada they must come in directly. Suppose that a Hindoo, one, a dozen, or a thousand come to Vancouver or the ports of British Columbia and come direct from the place where they were born or where they were domiciled, is there any power in this country to keep them out ? The assertion is on a par with the assertions which have been bandied about this room on many occasions and which have been made by the right hon. gentleman as I shall endeavor to show you by and by. But, the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross) amused me. He was not nearly so pugnacious as I have heard him at other times and on other occasions. When he was kicking the Bowsers and the McBrides around this room the other day he was a power—such a power and he spoke with such a virility of language and such an appositeness of expression that the papers outside congratulated him on being —well, a little above the ordinary, but to-night he was very much under the ordinary, if I may venture the criticism. He was trying to square himself and trying to square himself on a very small and insecure footing, and I noticed that he lacked that robustness of speech and that vigour of tone that characterized him the other day. Then, we have another member from that beautiful and large country, British Columbia, and that is the member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith). I always like to hear him speak but I never admired him in his speaking less than I did to-night not because I do not believe he has the power within him and is just as good a man to-night as he is at any time, but he felt the difficulty, it weighed upon him and he unwittingly ambled into ground, which, if he had had a little better memory of what transpired not long ago, he would scarcely have ventured into.

My hon. friend (Mr. Ralph Smith) declares to-night that the immigration clause in the United States treaty is a very useless thing ; that they have had it there for ten years or more and yet during the last five or six years more Japanese have come into the United States than have come to Canada ; and he says we are better without it in Canada. And yet, lo and behold, only a few short weeks ago that same hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith) spoke in this House with great virility and great force, and one of his strongest points was with reference to the immigration law which was passed by the United States in 1907, and mark you, the United States had the power to pass that immigration law because of that clause in the treaty of 1894 which gave them power over their immigration. No one will deny that. A few short weeks ago he could find no words too strong, none too warm in their colours to describe the beneficial effects of that United States immigration law of 1907. Listen to what he said :

Now, Sir, I want to say that we have here a provision that directly affects the Japanese immigration into the United States, because in spite of the operation of that peaceful treaty between Japan and the United States, the Japanese cannot be taken into the United States under contract.

Ha, Ha! those were the words of my hon. friend then. Further he said :

That, to my mind, is a most important provision. Suppose we had had that provision in this country (as I have suggested to the government we should have), what would have happened of the oriental immigration to British Columbia? We have demonstrated to the House that the thousands of orientals that have been brought to British Columbia——

Thousands have come in, my right hon. friend, according to the authority of your very firm and very warm supporter from the city of Nanaimo.

Suppose we had that provision in this country (as I have suggested to the government we should have), what would have happened——

Ah.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, my hon. friend over there is not quite fair to a young and inexperienced speaker when he endeavours to put him out by an interruption like that. My hon. friend (Mr. Smith) continued :

We have demonstrated to the House that the thousands of orientals that have been brought to British Columbia have been brought under contract and under the influence of Canadian companies and of the Japanese authorities. If we had a provision in our immigration laws similar to that enacted in the United States in 1907, such contracts would be made illegal and it would be impossible for these immigrants to come here.

And so on for half a column is to be found that kind of laudation of that clause of the

United States legislation of 1907, and which legislation was made possible because the United States had a treaty with a clause in it which gave them complete power over their own immigration.

I ask the British Columbia members what they will think when they calmly, after the heat of this discussion, read in 'Hansard' what the Prime Minister said, and ponder upon it. He said :

> Is it to be said that a Japanese subject who could come in company of a British man of war into the port of British Columbia or of Vancouver shall be allowed to do so, and that a Japanese who comes in peace shall not be allowed to come into this country——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. By an Act of Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. By an Act of parliament. Now what do my hon. friends from British Columbia think of that. That is an abrogation of all power, all right, of British Columbia or this country to put an Act of Parliament on the statute-books to regulate its own immigration.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Might I ask : what does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) think of it ?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I have been trying to tell my hon. friend (Mr. Ross) what I think of it. I have been fairly distinct in my utterance and I have tried to put my language in intelligible form, and I am surprised that after ten or fifteen minutes of such honest endeavour on my part the hon. gentleman does not yet understand the truth. And, Sir, that is the reason why since 1900 my right hon. friend and his government have set themselves against every wish of British Columbia and every enactment of British Columbia in this matter, in, that he has year after year disallowed the Acts that have been passed by British Columbia. And now at this latest date his latest utterance is : So long as I am Prime Minister there shall be no legislation in Canada to prevent Japanese coming into this country in time of peace, unless it might happen that the alliance between Great Britain and Japan should be broken, and then no Japanese subject could come in a British man of war or in company of a British man of war and sail up into the harbour of Vancouver or the harbour of Victoria. My right hon. friend has talked a great deal with reference to the United States in connection with this matter, and he has endeavoured to show that the United States is in a worse position than Canada is because the United States has a treaty and really enacts laws while Canada has a treaty and does not enact laws. But the right hon. gentleman is absolutely confusing two questions. There is no question in the United States to-day, of any importance, with reference to immigration from Japan. It is not that question at all that has made the trouble between the United States and Japan. It is an entirely different question ; it is a question which arises out of the supposed violation by the people of the United States of a treaty right that Japan has secured with reference to the equal treatment of her subjects when once they have a place of residence in the United States of America. What did the whole trouble between the United States and Japan arise about ? It was because, under state sovereignty, a local body in the state of California proposed to discriminate between the citizens of Japan and the citizens of the United States and other countries, with reference to the grouping of their children in schools, and Japan, according to her treaty which provided that her subjects should have equal treatment with the citizens of the United States inside of the United States, protested strongly and protested rightly against the discrimination which was made against her citizens. But it is not a question of immigration at all. Does my right hon. friend say it is ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend asks me the question I tell him that if he says that the trouble to-day between the United States and Japan is what he stated, he is mistaken. There is the other question of immigration also.

Mr. FOSTER. What I mean to say is this : That from 1894 up to the time that this difficulty took place in San Francisco with reference to the school children, there had been no trouble between the United States and Japan. Now, let my right hon. friend bring a case and show us proof to the contrary. He is very fond of making assertions, and very many of his assertions fall to the ground when they are questioned. He has now made this assertion, and I put him to the proof. In 1894 that treaty went into effect ; from 1894 until 1906 that treaty was in effect ; and from 1894 until 1906 let him point out the cases of difference that arose between Japan and the United States with reference to immigration into the United States.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is my hon. friend aware that there is to-day before Congress a Bill for the excluding of the Japanese?

Mr. FOSTER. I may know it or I may not know it, but that does not affect this question in the least.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is that not an immigration question?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but the point of the question I put to my right hon. friend is this, that from 1894 to 1906 you cannot point to cases in which discrimination has arisen involving international complications between Japan and the United States with reference to the immigration of Japanese into the United States. That was settled in

1894. Does my right hon. friend say it was not? Did the Japanese sign that treaty? Are the Japanese an honourable people? Do they keep the treaties they sign? The whole basis of my right hon. friend's appeal to parliament and to this country is that Japan is an honourable country and keeps its promises when they are not put into a treaty. If the Japanese people keep their promises when not in a treaty, they may be relied on to keep their promises when in a treaty. Was that a part of the treaty between Japan and the United States? They have kept that treaty from 1894, and the article of that treaty to which they assented, and to which they have never objected since, is that the United States has an absolute right to control its own immigration. The difficulty that took place was when the San Francisco school trustees denied to the Japanese people residing there equal rights of citizenship with citizens of the United States. Why the same thing would take place now.

Mr. GALLIHER. If my hon. friend will allow me. While agreeing with him that the San Francisco trouble was the first that arose and that it was with regard to the school children, let me point out that the negotiations now going on between Japan and the representative of the United States are in regard to immigration.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend may be quite right in that. There are numerous questions, which, when negotiations come up, slip in and form part of the general negotiations. But the statement I made is true. Nobody believes that between any countries there are perfect relationships. All of them may be made better, and it is the design of nations which wish to have friendly relations and to extend commerce with one another, to make more complete and more workable the relations which exist between them, by treaty or otherwise. It may be quite true, I am not going to deny it, that under the stress of the diplomatic efforts which are being made, and which arose because of the incident with regard to the school children, when that question comes up, immigration matters are talked over as well, and there may be many things which may be made better between the two countries. But my assertion still holds good.

Now, let me ask my right hon. friend another question. You have not the United States clause. You could have had it; it was offered to you; you refused to take it. But you have adopted the treaty, and one article of that treaty is that Japanese subjects residing in Canada shall have equal rights and treatment with Canadian subjects. Is not that right?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I am right in that. Suppose that to-day we had school trustees in the city of Vancouver who undertook to do just what the school trustees in San Francisco undertook to do—discriminate against the Japanese children—would my right hon. friend be held by the treaty? Would Canada be held by the treaty? There is no doubt, I think, about that. My right hon. friend does not dissent from that. But if in one case you say, No treaties, but let us rather depend on the good will and voluntary action of the contracting power, the argument would go so far with reference to the rights of citizenship, that if it is as good for one as for the other, Japan ought not to have treaty rights, but ought to rely upon the good will and voluntary action of the people of Canada; and we ought not to have in that treaty a clause peremptorily affirming the rights of Canadians in Japan to equal treatment with Japanese subjects—that ought to be a matter of voluntary good will towards our people in Japan. The argument of my right hon. friend goes so far that it is sufficient to state it to show its absolute absurdity. I tell my right hon. friend that on his doctrine the world has been mightly amiss in all these thousand years that nations have been growing and fading and growing again. I do not think there has been any time in history when treaties have not existed between different powers. But my right hon. friend takes a position which if it is carried to its logical conclusion goes against having any treaty, but would leave nations to the good will and voluntary action of the one to the other. There is no escape from that argument. Is this the new diplomacy which my right hon. friend has been crying for, and now that he has got it in a certain degree in respect to this one case, is going to put into operation? No more treaties. He draws the line between this side of the House and that side of the House. On this side of the House, he says, we do not believe in coercion; on that side of the House you do; we want no treaties; you want things laid down in black and white, in the shape of a treaty; there is the difference between the two parties, there is the differece between the two policies. Well, Sir, I am ready, if my right hon. friend is, to submit that doctrine to the cool common sense of public men and sensible men generally in this country or any other. What is the reason that treaties are better than voluntary arrangements? Here is one instance that shows it. Not more than ten days ago the Japanese government were supported in their parliament on a vote of want of confidence by less than ten votes. What does that illustrate? The transitory nature of promises made by public men for the time being in office. To-day my right hon. friend who leads this government might just as well say to the people of Canada who are asking for a law in regard to certain matters: No, we do not want laws; I am in favour of voluntary good will. I say to you that I

will do just what you want a law to be enacted to compel to be done, but I will not go to the extent of putting it into an arbitrary law. If the people were foolish enough to accept my right hon. friend's dictum in that respect, they might do so and he might be in power to-day and carry it out, but he might be out of power to-morrow—and who then would carry it out? So it is with treaties and promises. Treaties are things which bind a nation ; promises are things which bind the individual who, for the time being is in a position to make and implement them. If Viscount Hayashi were to go out of power to-morrow and an adverse party came in with a different policy on immigration, what then would become of Viscount Hayashi's promise? Of what use would it be?

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend has just stated that there is a treaty between Japan and the United States to give Japanese subjects, resident in that country, the same rights as American citizens. Is that what the hon. gentleman did say ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. CONMEE. Does that treaty bind the United States, and did the United States carry out that treaty ? What then has the hon. gentleman to say about the value of treaties ?

Mr. CONMEE. Does that treaty bind the out, before he is very much older, that he is up against a little difficulty to which the United States is subject under its federal and state constitutions. President Roosevelt will answer my hon. friend and tell him that the United States is bound to carry out in good faith that treaty.

Mr. CONMEE. I think it knocks the bottom out of your theory.

Mr. FOSTER. If the bottom of my theory is knocked out so easily as that, let it go. But I do not think it is, with all due deference to my hon. friend. Let me ask the Prime Minister this question. Suppose that to-day, in this country, the rights of a Japanese resident were discriminated against, would he feel that it was his duty to vindicate these rights ? That is the question. We are not taking into account the difference between our constitution and that of the United States. Let me give another instance which is more apt. Great Britain and Japan have a treaty between them since 1894, which guarantees equal treatment to the citizens of each country. Let a Japanese citizen be deprived in England of equal rigts with the British citizens, and let the Japanese authorities make their protest, has my right hon. friend any doubt as to what the answer of England would be ? England is not a federation but has absolute centralized power. Treaties are sacred things, meant to bind nations, whereas the sayings or promises of a consul or Prime Minister, for the time being, are not things that are sacred or permanent but merely transitory ; and no great country would dream of putting any of its great interests at the haphazard of the simple statement of a man who, for the time being, might be in office and who might be out of office at any day. Has France or Germany or Great Britain subserved their great interests in that way ? Is there a country in the world which has ever adopted the insane policy enunciated by my right hon. friend to-night, which would make the rights and privileges of his citizens depend on the word of mouth of some foreign representative instead of being guaranteed by a solemn treaty ? My hon. friend knows that there was a treaty passed in 1818 between the United States and Great Britain. He knows that we have appealed to and sheltered ourselves behind the treaty of 1818 for the vindication of some of our dearest rights. He knows that Great Britain has stood by us when we appealed to that treaty. Would he extend his doctrine so far as to say that it would have been much better if in 1818 Great Britain had simply taken the friendly word of a United States senator or representative as to the unassailable rights and privileges of the people of Canada to the fishing on our coasts ? There is a country called Alaska and a boundary between Alaska and Canada. Why did not my right hon. friend carry out this new theory of his with regard to that boundary ? Why did he ask that a treaty should be framed between Great Britain and the United States with reference to the boundary of the territory of Alaska ? The United States are a proud people and a great country. United States has not simply been fifty years but two hundred years and more in the progress of its evolution. Its people are mighty and proud, but we have never heard that they felt themselves demeaned because they were asked to put in the shape of a solemn treaty the boundary line between Alaska and Canada. I never heard my right hon. friend advocate that it would have been better if that had not been put in the form of a treaty, and if instead Mr. Elihu Root had made a certain promise as representing the United States. I have never heard that my right hon. friend would have been better satisfied with his word. There is not a dear interest of Canada to-day which is not buttressed around by solemn treaty; and had my right hon. friend been sufficiently wide awake to avail himself in 1896 of an instrument then ready framed, there would have been no trouble over this immigration business and we would have had the same defence and protection which the United States enjoys to-day. Why it is simply the most astonishing political argument, contrary to all history, and there is no other statesman in the wide world who would advance a doctrine

of that kind. My hon. friend had something to say with reference to Satow's despatch.

Mr. DEVLIN. Does the hon. gentleman advocate the exclusion of the Japanese from Canada ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is wonderful what a thirst for information my hon. friend has suddenly developed.

Mr. DEVLIN. I would ask the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an old saying that any fool can ask a question which no man, however wise, can answer.

Mr. DEVLIN. Will the hon. gentleman tell me in what part of the resolution now before the House there is anything which deals with the exclusion of the Japanese or any expression asking this government to exclude the Japanese ?

Mr. FOSTER. If my right hon. friend—I mean my hon. friend, he is not a right hon. yet, but I suppose that is in prospect—if my hon. friend will read the resolution, he is quite as good an interpreter of the English language as I am.

Mr. DEVLIN. Will the hon. gentleman point it out ? I have read it.

Mr. FOSTER. I have more important work on hand just now than undertaking the tuition of my hon. friend. I would be quite willing to give him free tuition as far as I possibly can; but when it comes to instructing him in the English language, I shall have to take him outside and administer schoolmaster's tuition to him and require a fee therefor.

Mr. DEVLIN. I take it that the hon. gentleman refuses to answer.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I have no objection to my hon. friend taking it that way. My right hon. friend in taking up Satow's despatch advanced this idea, and gathered that the ambassador's view was that the aim of Japan in cutting down the time required for denunciation of the treaty to six months was that, should this country pass legislation adverse to the Japanese coming without restriction into this country, they would at once give notice of the denunciation of the treaty, and so we should lose the benefit of the treaty. But he took occasion to entirely dissent from the ambassador's opinion upon another subject mentioned in the same despatch. So my right hon. friend is an eclectric. He has the same despatch written by the same man ten or twelve years ago, and he undertakes to say that one part of it is all right and another part all wrong. At the very most, it is not stated, except as an inference of Sir Ernest Satow's, that this was the prime object Japan had in view. But it is not unusual for short terms for denunciation to be included in treaties. The right hon. gentleman says that if that clause had been there we should have been obliged to legislate for the exclusion of the Japanese. Why so? In the period from 1900 to 1906 my hon. friend was restricted by no treaty, no pledge, yet during these six years he disallowed five separate Acts of the British Columbia legislature calculated to restrict Japanese immigration; yet he argues that the moment that clause was put into the treaty, he would have been impelled, of necessity, to legislate in restraint of this immigration and so we would have offended a proud people. Suppose he were pressed for legislation of this kind by the hon. members for British Columbia—the same delegation that is here—does he say that he would have been obliged to legislate restricting Japanese immigration? He certainly need not be afraid on that score. He has not legislated to this effect for the last eight years and these hon. gentlemen have supported him during the whole time. These hon. gentlemen are here to support my right hon. friend, and whether that clause is in the treaty or not, if he did not wish to legislate he would not be obliged to do so by any consistent and uniform pressure brought upon him by members representing British Columbia now in this House. My right hon. friend started out as though he was going to traverse the whole of history. I could not follow him, but there are one or two points to which I shall refer in passing. In the first place, he laid down the principle to which I have adverted, that the policy of the government was not restriction by hostile legislation, but restriction by voluntary and friendly action by the power with whom we are dealing. To-day, under that policy, where are we in this country? We have absolutely handed over to the Japanese authorities for the time being our own rights to legislate restricting immigration into our country. Under that arrangement, Canada no longer stands at her gateway on the Pacific with the power that every nation has as a basic right to say who shall enter her doors and upon what conditions; she stands there, hat in hand, and asks the Mikado and his government if they will please keep out this one, if they will restrict this class or that class and so on. My right hon. friend once discovered a nation—he discovered Canada. He has alluded to that before. He has been crying out for the power to regulate our own affairs. To-day he declares that this country is a nation, and the very first step he takes in semi-independent diplomacy is to take from this new nation the basic power which every nation must have to be a nation, the power to control her own internal affairs as regards immigration.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. What about Great Britain?

Mr. FOSTER. In what respect?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. That provision of the treaty applies no more against Canada than against Great Britain.

Mr. FOSTER. But I have not heard—has my hon. friend (Mr. Duncan Ross) ? he has sources of information that I may not have at the present time—that there is any question of Great Britain having a secret arrangement with Japan as to what immigration should come from Japan into Great Britain ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. No, but she has a public arrangement with Japan.

Mr. FOSTER. What public arrangement has she with Japan with reference to immigration?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. The arrangement is such that to-day Great Britain could not legislate against Japanese immigration into Great Britain. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will surely admit that?

Mr. FOSTER. What of it?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. The hon. gentleman (Mr Foster) made the statement a moment ago that this was a very extraordinary power to give another nation so far as Canada was concerned

Mr. FOSTER. I make the statement—and the hon. gentleman knows it is true—that the question of immigration as between Japan and Great Britain is not a question of any importance. Hon. gentlemen on that side have made the very same statement over and over again. It is Canada that has to face this problem of immigration from Japan. It is Canada that has to bear the brunt of whatever there is contrary to the best interests of the country in that unrestricted immigration. It is not Great Brtiain, but Canada that comes to that point where she has to decide as the threatened party—if there be any threatened party—whether she shall depend upon a treaty stipulation or shall rely entirely upon the good-will and promises of consuls general of Japan and Prime Ministers of Japan. If you take all these assurances which have been given by the consul general there is not one that stands the test of permanency. How was the consul general to bind the Japanese government? Has there been a single document of any kind presented by the government here or passed between the government of Japan and this country which puts to the test the promises or statements of the consul general of Japan as being binding upon the Japanese government?

Mr. PATERSON. How long does the treaty bind?

Mr. FOSTER. For the term that it is in existence. If the treaty is in existence to-day it binds. Is my hon. friend adopting the same doctrine as my right hon. friend, and arguing against all treaties and against the protection of a country's rights, by treaty, but by voluntary and fleeting and temporary promises of parties who, for the time being, happen to be in power? His question would indicate that that is the trend of his thought, and I warn him off from that, because it is a dangerous trend, and I think that in his heart he does not believe that kind of doctrine. The existence of Canada to-day is the best proof that we live in the exercise of most of our dearest rights and privileges by virtue of treaties, so far as those are held in reference to other nations.

Mr. PATERSON. Are we not under a treaty now with Japan?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, we are under a treaty in some respects. But in the main object of our interest we are not under a treaty, and we rely, as I have said, simply upon the good will of the people of Japan.

Mr. CONMEE. Have we not a good and sufficient remedy, if we choose to take it?

Mr. FOSTER. What is the remedy?

Mr. CONMEE. The treaty can be put an end to.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the very thing the right hon. gentleman does not want done.

Mr. CONMEE. The time has not come.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the very thing that he says he does not want put into the treaty, otherwise he might lose the benefit of the treaty. Now, suppose that these promises are not carried out, that after six months we find they are not carried out, what will be the result? Will the right hon. gentleman give notice for denouncing the treaty with Japan? If so, then he will lose the benefit of that treaty and pay the penalty that he does not want to pay. Or will he continue to temporize, and to draw his followers from British Columbia obediently behind him in his temporizing policy of giving up the rights of this country?

Now, let me ask another question. I want to discuss the question of the success or otherwise of my hon. friend's mission to Japan. We have heard a good deal of that, we have heard it called a very successful mission, my right hon. friend has paid tribute to it to-night. Hon. gentlemen from British Columbia have designated it as very successful. Will the House think over with me for a moment just what my hon. friend went to do, and just what he has done? Sum it all up, what has he brought back? Has he brought back anything more than the assurances which my right hon. friend has had for the last five years, and upon which he has relied in all

this business with Japan? If he has brought back anything more, let him state it now. As I understood him, and he will correct me if I am wrong, he enumerated three things, one of which he brought back from Japan, and the other two he did not. He says he has a letter from Count Hayashi, and that letter is the extent of the pledge that the Japanese have made; that there are certain secret arrangements which carry out that general statement and the documents are deposited with the British ambassador. He has been good enough to give us a little inkling of how far they go, that is, that labourers and artisans shall not be allowed to come into Canada unless with the consent of Canada. That, he says, is all that he can divulge of these regulations. Now, is that anything more than the pledges and assurances that the right hon. gentleman has had from the consul general during the last five years, any more embracing, any more inclusive, any more extensive? I do not understand that it is. My hon. friend has gone to Tokia, has conducted himself with great propriety, he has had his conferences with the British minister and, through the British minister, with the Japanese authorities; and he comes back and is able to say to this parliament: I have brought renewed assurances from Tokio that what has been promised to the first minister will be carried out. Is there anything more than that? If there is, let us have it. Oh, yes, says my hon. friend, there is another thing. What is that? There can be no further immigration from Hawaii of Japanese who have gone to Hawaii, and therefore are in an alien country. Why? Because he persuaded the Mikado that that should no longer take place. Because he prevailed upon Viscount Hayashi to make that arrangement? No, he has told us himself; because the Alien law covers that class of immigration, and the Alien law was in force before my hon. friend went to Japan, and will be in force for many years after.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will my hon. friend allow me? I went further that that; I said that not only did the Canadian Act concerning alien labour apply against Hawaii, because Hawaii was an American possession, but that I had received the assurance from the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Japan that as long as Canada did not discriminate against the Japanese they would not object to the Japanese being kept out of the country, whether they came from Hawaii or whether they came from Europe. I also said that the avenue of Hawaii being barred and the avenue from Japan being regulated by the Japanese government, the two sources from which the Japanese influx had come in were thus barred for the future.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend mentions two avenues that are closed. One was closed by the Japanese themselves and the other was closed by the Alien Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not completely by the Alien Act.

Mr. FOSTER. Why not?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Because article 1 of the treaty mentions the fact that Japanese can enter, reside and travel in the Dominion, and we might not perhaps be able to apply the Alien Labour law against Japanese coming from Hawaii, because they might say that the treaty supersedes the Canadian Act. But the Japanese government themselves do not object to our applying the Canadian Act as against the treaty in that respect.

Mr. FOSTER. Cannot my hon. friend go a little further? He says that the Japanese government does not object to our applying the Alien Act. If I understood him aright, he said that the Japanese government admit that the Alien law applies. Very well, if they admit that the Alien law applies, it is not by grace of the Japanese government, it is by virtue of the Alien law. There is no doubt about that. The Japanese are not so unstable as my right hon. friend. What they say they stand by. What they declare they believe they really believe.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite willing to say that; I have never said anything else. The Japanese, who are students of jurisprudence, who have great acumen in these respects, look over the law and they say, as has been said by my hon. friend, the alien law governs in any case, they say it because the law does so and not because of our granting a favour or that they are giving something to my hon. friend. So that, I think the only avenue which has been absolutely closed by the Japanese is the avenue of emigration out of Japan itself and as my right hon. friend says and has said for years in this House we have already had the assurance of the Japanese government and in that we have absolutely confided. Another thing I will say and it is that I believe the Japanese have kept honourable faith with this country.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. After reading the correspondence, after seeing all the circumstances detailed I do not blame the Japanese government one iota. I could not do it. We gave them the treaty without putting any restrictions about it, they took it as being the honourable gift of Canada and they have performed their part. Every government is liable to have its regulations go a little awry. Its instructions might be disregarded and the most that can be said against the Japanese government, if any-

thing can be said, is that, having given instructions, they were not as careful as they might have been to see that their prefects and others under them carried out these instructions to the letter. But Japan herself has honourably done what she has agreed to do. So that is the only thing which my hon. friend has brought back and that is a thing that the right hon. First Minister has declared from 1900 up we had. Just here I wish to remind my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) that he has not yet laid on the table of the House that written assurance which he said he had.

I had the assurance of government there personally and in writing, that that policy would be maintained.

He made that statement the other day when this matter was being discussed, he was asked for the written assurance and he said that he had it and would bring it down.

Mr. FISHER. As regards the last quotation of the hon. gentleman, 'Hansard' is wrong. I said that I never had it; I did not say that I had it. The occasion referred to where I made the statement that I had the assurance in writing was in the year 1903, and the statement is contained in the 'Hansard' of that year. It is quite true that at page 4634 I said that I had an assurance from the government there personally and in writing that that policy would be maintained. I do not know what was in my mind when I made that statement but I suppose I thought that I had such a writing. Since the reference to this question in the early part of this session I have had a careful search made among the papers which I brought back with me from Japan and I have not been able to find any document which would justify the statement that I had that assurance in writing. I wish to make that statement and I would have made it before if I had had the search made to which I now refer.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that only after the matter was called to his attention he came to the conclusion that he never had that written statement?

Mr. FISHER. I could not find anything that would show that I had that written statement. I have no such document. I cannot find any such document amongst the papers I brought back from Japan. I do not know whether what I said on that occasion—it is now more than four years since I made the statement—was a slip of the tongue. whether I was misrepresented, or whether I believed at the time that I had such a document. But, I have not that document. I have searched carefully through the papers that I brought from Japan and no such document has been found.

Mr. FOSTER. It is rather a grave statement for a minister to make. In 1903 there were no ifs and buts about it. It was rather a grave crisis and in 1906 it was the same. We were called upon as a parliament to vote a treaty, and we were asked to vote that treaty on certain assurances. We had two assurances, one by the right hon. leader of the government that there would be no emigration except a very limited one, so many from each province and that we might rely upon that. The other was one which we equally regarded—a statement by the Minister of Agriculture that he had a personal assurance and that he had an assurance in writing. Consequently, parliament was led by these two statements, I myself was led by these two statements and I think members of parliament on both sides were led by these two statements to cease their criticisms of the treaty very much and to rely upon these as being true. Now, I do not want to say that my hon. friend designed to mislead the House but it only shows how careful a minister ought to be in making statements upon which great questions hinge that those statements are founded on fact. Now my hon. friend has made, after the whole business is over, what is really a retraction of the statement that any such authority was placed in his hands. I cannot blame my hon. friend too much, but I do say that it is rather a grave matter where a minister of the government so unhesitatingly makes these promises and then, when a certain course has been laid out and followed on the faith of these promises, we are told in the House that it was a mistake and that this assurance never was given to him. One other thing which my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) is said to have brought back is an order of the Immigration Department that only direct passage should entitle an immigrant from any country to come into Canada. That was made much of by the hon. member for Vancouver to-night but my hon. friend will be the first to agree with me that it is a mere regulation of the Department of the Interior and does not depend in any way upon his mission to Japan. Why could not that have been done before? Why could not the alien law have been enforced before? Why could not the assurances of the Japanese government have been enforced before they were enforced? Then, I ask again. what really has my hon. friend brought home from Tokio? He has gained knowledge by going there. He has become acquainted with the public men of Japan and the public men of Japan have become acquainted with the representative from Canada. In that respect good feeling between the two countries has been helped by that mission and I have no doubt that the explanation given by my hon. friend has done much to give fuller information to the Japanese authorities than they otherwise would have had. I give him the full credit

for all of this, but as to his having succeeded in bringing anything new or permanent back, anything fresh from Tokio, my opinion is that he has not been successful in doing that, and I do not see very well how he ever could have hoped to have done so under the present circumstances.

Now, I have taken up time with a cursory discussion of this matter. One thing further I wish to bring to the attention of the House and that is to point out the part British diplomacy has played in this matter. British diplomacy and the good sense of the Liberal Conservative government in 1895 blocked out for these hon. gentlemen a path, which, if they had taken it, we never would have had this trouble in British Columbia during this last year. The Liberal-Conservative cabinet in 1895, although they had not passed into the troublous times with Japan and Japanese immigration, had some knowledge of the Chinese difficulty and they looked forward to the same from Japan, and they absolutely named the requisitions which were necessary to protect this country. The British government aided the Canadian government in that, and it went so far as to the preparation of a protocol which they had agreed to by Japan, and if that had been made part of the treaty it would have absolutely protected Canada in all this trouble which has come since. More than that, on two occasions Mr. Chamberlain himself, in 1888 and in 1889, brought to the attention of this Canadian government the advisability of passing something like a Natal Act for the protection of this country, something like a general Natal Act, so that it would have the authority of the Dominion parliament and would not be a constantly recurrent source of trouble in legislation from the province of British Columbia, which felt the brunt of this immigration. My right hon. friend is conversant with these despatches. On two occasions Mr. Chamberlain brought that way of escape to the mind of the Canadian government. More than that, after they had decided that they would ask the British government to find out from Japan whether they would be allowed to adhere to that treaty, Lord Lyttelton again gave a warning, and offered a chance for protection to this government. He said in effect: you have an opportunity to have the same conditions as were in the Natal Act; do you wish to take that or do you wish to unreservedly and absolutely adhere to the treaty. And not content with bringing that once to the attention of this government, after two months had passed and they had not answered that telegram, an inquiry is again made as to whether the Canadian government would take that method or whether it would take the method outlined by Mr. Fisher who made a speech in the Canadian House of Commons on the lines of unreserved and absolute adherence to the treaty. So that in the first place, by making a treaty which did not include Canada unless Canada wished to be included, by Mr. Chamberlain's two suggestions as to the protection that Canada should make as against Britain's ally, Japan; two attempts made by Lord Lyttelton to lead this government as it were into the lines of that same protection; after all that had been done and pointed out by the British government, the Canadian government instead of carrying out that line of policy and protecting the country in that way, chose to unreservedly and absolutely adhere to that treaty. British diplomacy did not make any mistakes in that respect. My right hon. friend says: but we could not go against an ally. Who are the allies? They are Great Britain and Japan. And here was the British government forming the very channel and method of escape and of protection; the British government who was co-ally with Japan. Does my right hon. friend think that the chief ally of Japan, the ally mainly interested, the ally upon whom the brunt of the treaty obligations absolutely fall, does my right hon. friend think that what she suggested might be done, was an affront to the people of Japan. It seems to me that the principal ally of Japan should be the best judge of that. I believe firmly that my right hon. friend at this late date is trying to cover his retreat under this new doctrine, for the delay and the negligence which prevented him in some way or other from carrying out the straight line of policy which was laid down in 1896 and which was fathered by the British government itself.

Mr. PATERSON. Were you in favour of the treaty as it was passed?

Mr. FOSTER. Another man thirsting for information; I will have quite a class after a time. My right hon. friend ventured a disquisition as to the Caucasian and the Mongolian races. The Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) believed, according to his speech, that the difficulty arises in the settled and eternal antagonism there is between the Mongolian and the Caucasian races. I do not subscribe to that doctrine in its entirety. I know that races differentiate themselves in ideals, standards of life, methods of civilization and methods of government, so that there is a distinct channel between the two which it is more or less difficult to cross. But I do not believe all that there is an eternal and irradicable antagonism between the Caucasian and Mongolian races, nor do I believe that this question which we are discussing arises from that cause chiefly or in its entirety. I believe that the question is an economic one, and I believe that the economic question comes to be a serious question the moment competition touches a class which is jealous of its rights, and which is powerful, or thinks it is powerful, to enforce its rights. The Japanese students circulated throughout

the United States and Canada in greater or lesser number and we heard no voice raised against them. The race was there, the antagonism should have been to the front but we heard no indication of it. The Japanese merchant came over into Victoria and Vancouver and he set up the sale of his wares alongside and in competition with the Canadian merchant, but we heard nothing of riots and the antagonism of race. The competition was not such that it made itself felt, and the economic question did not come to the front, and so Japanese doctors, and lawyers, and travellers, and students, and scholars in numbers may have come and circulated throughout this country and you would not have heard much about the antagonism of race. As they took part in our affairs the ideals of the two and the ideas of the two would be contrasted, but the difficulty took place when the economic factor entered in a clean straight-away competition, where standards of life, rates of wages, and ideas of family are the impelling causes and the basic reasons for that difference of opinion and that class of interests, it is really a clash of interests. My own belief is that primarily it is an economic question, and I think prudence must be exercised and great care must be taken in order that that economic question should be properly solved. It is a large question. It is not merely a local competition between the Mongolian and the Caucasian on the streets of Victoria or Vancouver. The question is a wider one and it is daily broadening. Our front door may now be said to be almost on the Pacific. Right across our waters are our neighbours, and the fluent passage between the two is a bond that unites rather that a chasm which separates them. And so there is looming up in the awakening races on the other side of the Pacific, our next-door neighbour, our front door neighbour—there is looming up in these awakening millions a promise of a contest on competitive economic lines first and foremost, which some time or other may be very apt to emerge and expand into a clash on other than economic grounds—on grounds of nationality and the balance of power. There are the great factors in the future of the world. I believe that Europe has played her greatest comparative part in the history of the world. I believe that the future of this world and its most vexing questions lie in that dense mass of population awakening to life—now awakened to life in one nation, more than half awakened in another nation of three or four hundred millions, with inexhaustible resources, with a population hardy, born to labour, with at the present time not a high scale of living by any means or a high ideal of life in respect to social or family requirements. Within a decade or two decades that four hundred millions of people will be all alive; today every indication shows it. When they become alive, with their immense labouring power, with their low wage, with their adaptability to any employment, with their strong inventive or imitative genius, whichever you have a mind to call it, there is preparing a problem which we Canadians, as having a strip of coast on the Pacific are vitally interested in, and in which either we or our descendants will have to play a prominent part. When that contest comes on it will test the power. By and by I believe that the contest and the clash, if it does not get beyond economic questions, will largely by the flux and change, equalize the conditions of the east and the west, and therefore do away with the great cause of the trouble. The Japanese are not going to be satisfied long with a few small coins per day for their labour; they are not going to be satisfied very long with a low scale of living, the ideals and ideas will expand, and a few decades of this pervading, enterprising civilization and adaptation of their wonderful resources, will change the base of their competition with other countries, and will put them more on an equality. But that is a good while in the future maybe—not so long as some of us may think, but yet a good while; and during the time that equalization is being made there will be strenuous times. There is more than that in it, and therein lies another grave question not only for Canadians but for the American people as well and maybe also the British people. Australia and New Zealand lie exposed; the shores of Canada lie exposed. When that four hundred millions of people wake to life, their own country will not contain them; their populizing, emigrating hordes will spread out somewhere, and whether will they spread? Will they crawl over those immense table lands which divide them from Europe, and attempt the conquest of European countries, or will they glide easily across the waters on which float navies which will compete with the greatest navies of the world thirty or forty years from now, and colonize on the easily-accessible shores of America, of Australia, of New Zealand? These possibilities, which loom up in the future, may seem to be a long way ahead. But Canada is said to be becoming a nation; if she is, she must take long looks forward and seriously study her policy towards what she may think lies in the future. The Japanese race is a dominating race; it is a powerful race; to-day its army and its navy bear comparison with the best army and the best navy in the civilized world. Its population is enormous. Its soil is poor in part and restricted greatly. Formosa it has, Saghalien it has subdued with population, Korea it is filling up, parts of Mongolia it will take to itself; but when Japan and China together become emigrating countries, then we may look out for other things than the economic question; and there is where I draw one lesson at

least—that it is arrant folly for us in Canada to take the least step which would disintegrate us from the mighty power of Britain which must be our great protector. Without a navy, without an army, with no prospects of a near navy or a near army, we must not, by veiled allusions and ill-meant criticism and childish strainings after power that we cannot carry out, disintegrate the bond that holds Britain and ourselves together; and further, we must do what we can to strengthen the bonds between the great British people on this continent and the people of the United States. I am glad my hon. friends cheer that sentiment. I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will cheer it. I hope it is a sentiment that all my hon. friends on that side will always cheer. But I thought I observed a litttle derision in the cheer; why was the derisive note ? I cannot think why, except that they look upon this statement as being a prop to the policy of my right hon. friend, who is cultivating good will with the Japanese and sacrificing the rights of Canada to be the arbiter of her own immigration policy. If Great Britain bears the brunt, then Great Britain's advice may well be followed, and Great Britain's advice was in the line of the protection of this country in the matter of immigration by a clause in the treaty the same as Queensland had and particularly the same as the United States had.

I cannot help but think that in this first essay of this new diplomacy—if it be the first—a mis-step has been made, and that mis-step consists in putting our trust in ephemeral promises and fleeting assurances rather than in the guarantee of a solemn treaty. All nations have at all times used this means of guaranteeing their respective rights. No nation would dream of rejecting the form of a sacred contract, backed by the influence and the power of the parties to it and trusting its rights and interests to the mere promise of any personality, who may disappear at any moment and whose word is not binding on those who succeed him. Yet this latter course is the one which my right hon. friend has chosen to follow, and the evil consequences of which this country has already begun to experience.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). It is gratifying to find that after my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has spent over an hour in showing wherein he and his party differ from the government on this question, he was forced, in his peroration, to endorse the position taken by the right hon. the leader of the government. He was forced, I will not say by his own eloquence or his own arguments, but by stress of circumstance, by the facts of the case, to come to that conclusion. The hon. gentleman says that we must hold together the bonds of the British empire and that, for the safety of Canada we must keep close, to the mother land. Well, I venture to say, that in no way can we better keep under the aegis of her protection and the wings of her fleet than by having respect for and confidence in the greatest ally which the mother country has to-day in all the world.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the gloss you put upon my speech ?

Mr. FISHER. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman express that opinion. I am glad to find that the whole trend of his argument, his whole attack upon the government, leads him directly to a goal opposite the one he wished to reach. Neither the hon. gentleman nor his leader has been able to rise to the occasion and set aside their desire for party advantage or personal advancement ; but I am sorry to find that, in their zeal for party and personal advantage, regardless of the public interest, they should have given expression to their resentment in the form of an amendment to the motion to go into supply. These hon. gentlemen spoke of their friendliness for Japan, they admitted that Japan was a country which lived up to its obligation, and yet in the very body of this resolution is the implication that Japan has broken faith with our country. But the facts, Sir, prove the very reverse. What is the complaint of hon. gentlemen opposite ? They complain that the ratification of the treaty by Canada in 1906 was almost immediately followed by a great influx of Japanese labourers into British Columbia. That is true, but what has that to do with this motion unless hon. gentlemen opposite mean that Japan was particeps criminis in that immigration. The implication is however both disingenuous and unfair when we consider the report made by the deputy Minister of Labour after the investigation he held at Vancouver into that very Japanese influx. What was the agreement entered into by Japan through her consul general ? It was that only a limited number of labourers from each province or prefecture of that empire should be allowed to leave it for Canada in each month of the year. Take the numbers which were allowed to come in each year. They have been variously estimated at 500 or 600. Well, what were the facts? In the ten months of 1907 —the statement is to be found on page 11 of the report of Mr. Mackenzie King—there was a total arrival of 8,125. Of these 77 were rejected, 3,619 were admitted to the United States after passing through Canada, and 4,429 remained in Canada. Of these 2,779 came from Hawaii, 9 from Mexico and 1,641 from Japan direct. If we analyse these 1,641, we find that 900 came in under agreement with the Tokio Immigration Company. One hundred and fifty-one were immigrants to the United States who were rejected by the United

States officers and allowed to remain in Canada; about 300 were formerly resident in Canada, and of the remainder, 290, 100 were merchants, students and travellers, and 190 were friends of the Japanese in Canada, admitted on certificates of the Japanese consul.

Let me first say a word with regard to the 900 who came in under agreement with the Tokio Immigration Company. It is improper and unfair for any Canadian to accuse the Japanese government of being responsible for these, because every one of them came to Canada, at the request of prominent Canadians, under a contract given to a Japanese company—a company incorporated under the laws of British Columbia, a company authorized by Canada to do this very work and which entered into contracts with gentlemen of the highest position in Canada to bring these Japanese into our Dominion. To accuse the Japanese government of allowing these people to come improperly into Canada, under their arrangement with Canada, is a most disingenuous statement of the case.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the alien labour law ?

Mr. FISHER. That only applies to a country which has an alien labour law against us. It does not apply to Japan, but it applies to the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. And Hawaii belongs to the United States.

Mr. FISHER. I will come to that in a few minutes. The contract labourers did not come from Hawaii. The 900 contract labourers came from Japan and it was the Canadian Nippon Company which brought them. This leaves us with only 190 Japanese who came into Canada during the ten months of that year under the arrangement made between the right hon. leader of the government and the consul-general of Japan. During that time and under that arrangement, the Japanese would have been perfectly justified in granting passports to as many as 600 Japanese coming into Canada. I say again that the accusation that the Japanese broke faith in 1907 and departed from the arrangement made with us is not a fair accusation against the Japanese, and no Canadian is on good ground who makes that accusation.

Now, a word as to the case of Hawaii, from which my hon. friend says, a large number of Japanese come. It is true a large number have come from Hawaii. The alien labour law would apply in such cases if Japanese came under contract ; otherwise, they had the right to come. Under the old arrangement, we have no right to deal with the Japanese that come into this country who are not under control of the Japanese government. Now, the whole country know that, just lately, the Americans have begun to plead with the Japanese to give them an arrangement. My hon. friend says that the Americans have a treaty under which they have the right to restrict Japanese immigration into the United States. If the Americans believe they have that right under the treaty, a right so highly extolled by hon. gentlemen opposite, as one that we ought to seek to obtain, why is it that, to-day, the representatives of the American government are doing their best in Tokio to obtain an arrangement exactly similar to what my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) has obtained for us ? It has been stated in recent telegraphic reports that the Japanese have absolutely prohibited emigration from Japan to Hawaii by arrangement entered into with the United States. We know that the regulation of immigration into Hawaii was a voluntary arrangement of the Japanese government regardless of the treaty. And the American government, with that clause, are pleading with the Japanese government to give them something which they have not yet given them, but which they have given to Canada, as represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux). My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) speaks of Hawaii as a danger spot. We know that as far as Hawaii is concerned, the Canadian government is free, under the arrangement with Japan, to deal with Japanese from Hawaii the same as they deal with other people who come from the United States. And the Alien Labour law, and more than the Alien Labour law, applies in regard to Japanese coming from Hawaii, because the Japanese government, under the arrangement made with my hon. friend, is giving us a free hand to deal with the Japanese from Hawaii, and exclude them if we wish.

My hon. friend expressed, at the beginning of his remarks, astonishment at the course and the speech of my right hon. friend the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I do not quite know the cause of that astonishment ; I can only conceive it to be the astonishment of a man who cannot understand a greater man, the astonishment of a man who keeps on the low plane of party politics and cannot rise to the higher plane of a national obligation. But if those hon. gentlemen would learn from experience, if they would watch his course, they would understand that the head of the government of Canada is able to deal with international matters and able to maintain the dignity and credit of Canada in a way that perhaps they cannot understand, and that astonishes them, but in a way of which the people of Canada are proud. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden), in his motion, gives evidence that he cannot understand these things. He speaks in a laudatory manner of the Japanese. These gentlemen profess friendship for Japan at the time when they throw insult in her face. By this resolution

they seek to declare a policy here in favour of the advantages of a commercial treaty with Japan, while they throw insults in the face of a sensitive and proud people. Is that the way to deal with international obligations? Sir, if this Canada of ours is to assume a position amongst the nations of the world, if we are to play the role of a nation, we must see to it that we assume the responsibilities of a nation, and that we act in accordance with the necessities and practices of international negotiations between great nations, and not try to drive a hard bargain, or seek to make conditions unworthy of a great nation. Hon. gentlemen opposite apparently cannot rise to this position. But it is a happy thing for the people of Canada that we have at the head of affairs a man who can, and does, and will.

Hon. gentlemen opposite consider that assurances from such a people as the Japanese are not worthy of confidence. That is the whole tenor of their amendment. If they do not hold that view, they may as well give up argument upon that question. But we have not only had the assurances, we have had the practice. The leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) obtained by arrangement with Mr. Nossé, in 1902 or 1903, an arrangement restricting immigration. That restriction has continued from that day to this. It is true that during a few months last summer, under circumstances very exceptional—circumstances for which, as shown by the investigation of Mr. Mackenzie King, if any people were to blame they were Canadians and not Japanese—there was an increase in immigration. Under these circumstances, it is unworthy of the opposition, and would be unworthy of the government or people of Canada, to say that the assurances of the Japanese are not worthy of confidence, for they have lived up to their assurances during all this time. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has spoken about treaties and about foreign policies, and has stated—and, if I remember right, the leader of the opposition stated practically the same thing—that if a change of government were to take place in Japan, the pledges given to-day by Viscount Hayashi might easily be gone back upon.

My hon. friend read a few minutes ago a statement of some high official in Japan, which would indicate that the government of which Count Hayashi is a member has not a very large majority in the Diet; and I can only conclude that he thinks it is possible that a new government may arrive in Japan shortly which might not continue to fulfil the pledges of Viscount Hayashi. Well, Sir, I regret to think that a gentleman holding the position of leader of the opposition in the Canadian parliament, or his first lieutenant, should take such a low view of the obligations of the constitutional government of a self-governing people, as to suppose that international obligations only last as long as the government which has assumed them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not speak of it in that way, but from a very different consideration.

Mr. FISHER. I understand him fully, my hon. friend spoke of assurances.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not. I spoke of forbearance, and insisting upon their rights, which is a very different thing.

Mr. FISHER. A letter of Viscount Hayashi contains an expression on that point which I will read in a few minutes. But it augurs badly indeed for the future of Canada if, by any misfortune, these hon. gentlemen ever get to the treasury benches and attempt to carry out the principles which they now say would be quite proper and right for the Japanese people to carry out. I think the people of Canada will consider long before they allow these gentlemen to cross the floor and come to this side of the Speaker.

Mr. FOSTER. That is high politics.

Mr. FISHER. Well, I am trying hard to get down to the hon. gentleman's level. This is another reason amongst the many I have heard why, before the opposition can succeed in obtaining the confidence of the people of Canada, they will have to change their leaders.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We will not make statements about written documents and have to take them back.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend says that one government in Japan may not fulfil the pledges made by another government. Does the hon. gentleman know that the government which, through Consul General Nossé, gave to Sir Wilfrid Laurier those pledges, is not the present government of Japan, but one of the opposite party, and that to-day Viscount Hayashi is fulfilling the pledges ,and more than fulfilling the pledges. which were given through Consul General Nossé by the government of Count Katzura who is head of the opposite party in Japanese politics. The present government in Japan have proved that they do realize their international obligations, and are determined to carry them out, even if the opposition in Canada does think that it is not incumbent on them to do so. Sir, a moment ago the hon. gentleman spoke about Sir Ernest Satow's despatch, and said that the right hon. leader of this government was quite willing to take his opinion on one question and ignore it on another. It is true that Sir Ernest Satow did make a statement in regard to the colonies of Great Britain which my right hon. friend did not

consider as carrying much weight. Sir Ernest Satow did say this :

I assured him, however, that so far as I could foresee there would, in all probability, be no necessity for either Canada or the Australian colonies placing restrictions on the Japanese.

That is quite right. And again, in the same paragraph, but a little before, he says :

It seems obvious that the Japanese government, who have taken nearly four months to consider their reply, desire to be in a position to terminate the treaty whenever any of the colonies that might accede to it with this proviso proceeded to legislate against the free immigration of Japanese labour, and I could not conceal from His Excellency my feeling that this was not a very friendly attitude to take up.

My hon. friend says, yes that is perfectly true, but there is this difference. Sir Ernest Satow had been British ambassador in Japan for over a decade. He thoroughly knew the Japanese character and Japanese thought, and he is to-day the greatest living authority on Japanese traditions and Japanese literature. Even amongst the Japanese themselves he is accepted as the best authority upon their legends, their history and their literature. And surely after living for nearly twenty years in Japan, having had no social relations during that time with the British people and the self-govern ing colonies, his opinion of what Canada and Australia may desire to do with regard to oriental immigration is of no value at all. He knew nothing of the sentiments and feelings of the British self-governing colonies. But he was the greatest authority upon purely Japanese questions that there was at that time, and this is the reason why the Prime Minister was quite justified in accepting Sir Ernest Satow's opinion in the one case, and rejecting it in the other.

My hon. friend a few minutes ago spoke about our wishing to deny to the people of Canada the right to legislate in regard to immigration. We do not desire to deny them that right, but we find that we can accomplish the desired object in a different way, in a better way. If we were to undertake to legislate as they would have us do, we would immediately find that treaty denounced, and the commercial classes and the labouring classes in Canada would lose the advantage which they now possess in that treaty with Japan under the most favoured nation terms. I want here to say a word with regard to the interest of the labouring classes with regard to the Japanese question. Most people in Canada seem to think that the labouring classes must necessarily be opposed to oriental immigration. I will not discuss that question in detail, but I want to point out that if, in the near future, the glorious picture painted by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) of the progress and advancement of oriental nations comes true, there is no other market on the face of this earth that will be so valuable to Canadian industry and Canadian labour as this oriental market, and it is only by a treaty of this kind that we can obtain the advantages of that market. Sir, the labouring men of Canada are perhaps more interested than anybody else in getting access on favoured terms to the Japanese market. They are going to reap the benefit of sending Canadian products to that market. The labourers who work in our mills, in our factories, on our farms, in our mines, these are the men who are going to reap the profit arising from access to the markets of Japan, and it is only by a treaty of this kind that this market can be opened to our products. It is true that men whose capital is invested in Canadian industries will reap an advantage ; but on the whole it is the labouring men of Canada, through whose toil and intelligence Canadian industries are developed, who will reap the greatest advantage of a commercial treaty with Japan. And if, by conciliatory methods by taking care not to offend the sensibilities and affront the feelings of the Japanese people, we can maintain a good understanding with them and preserve their market for our products, surely we ought to take the conciliatory course, and oppose every proposition in this parliament that would tend to deprive us of that advantage.

Sir, I will not deal further with the points at issue, but I do want having studied this Japanese question and the people of Japan, to say a word or two in reference to what the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said at the end of his speech. There is nobody in Canada who has a higher opinion of the Japanese people than I have. I have had the opportunity of studying them in their homes, I have had the opportunity of enjoying their hospitality. I have had the opportunity of intercourse with their leading men and of mixing with a large number of their men who have gone abroad, who have studied European and American civilization, and who have introduced the methods of that civilization in a highly successful form into the empire of Japan. I know that to-day the whole world is standing admiring the Japanese. I am one of those who do that. I appreciate that the Japanese, for long centuries, were a highly cultivated people and a people with the highest civilization—not the same civilization as ours, quite different in its development, quite different in many of its characteristics, but a civilization enduring through the centuries and based on study, science, art, and literature. Suddenly they threw open their doors to the world, rather by the coercion of the outside world and they came into contact with the western civilization, a civilization which in some respects had made in certain lines greater progress than they had, a civilization which in mechanical

development, in industrial development, in the manufacture and in the use of arms, had gone far ahead of them. They, at first, when they came into contact with that civilization, tried to see how they could adapt it to their own conditions. The outside world went to Japan, people travelled in Japan, and the Japanese were talked about and written about as barbarians. A few, like Sir Ernest Satow, studied their literature and art and gave them full credit for the splendid development which they had achieved in these branches of human knowledge, but they were at this time held of little account amongst the nations of the world. They went to work, adopted the methods of warfare of the western nations. they adapted them to their own conditions and they did that work so well that in a few years, after a few struggles of a minor kind, they suddenly showed that they were able to grapple with and defeat one of the greatest empires on the earth. Then, for the first time the Christian world began to admire the Japanese because they know how to fight, not because they had excelled in art, not because they had a literature of a thousand years, not because, when our forefathers were barbarians their forefathers were highly civilized, not because they had a scientific training, not because they had a history, traditions and inspirations of patriotism that western nations cannot emulate and cannot equal, but when they were able to show that in the barbarism of war they were equal and superior to the western nations the western nations bowed down and worshipped them. It is a commentary on western civilization and on Christianity but it is the truth.

Now, Sir, I say these things as a preface. My hon. friend the member for North Toronto who is a fine word painter is the spokesman of a great many people in the western world when he expresses the views which he has presented as to the Japanese. I do not share those views. To-day there is no doubt that in so far as war is concerned, in so far as national force is concerned, the Japanese are amongst the greatest nations of the world, but, Sir, as they go on changing their civilization, as they go on adapting themselves more and more to our kind of progress and advance in that direction I believe that they will become weaker and weaker. I believe, Sir, that the evils which have sapped the manhood and the vital force of many of our western nations will spoil the Japanese in the present strong vigour of their newly adapted military regime, and I have still confidence that whether it be on the Pacific coast, whether it be on the continent of America, whether it be on the broad Pacific or whether it be on the Asiatic continent itself, the Anglo-Saxon will come out on top and will be able to hold his own against Chinese, Japanese or anybody else. It may be that at times we will falter, that we will be behind, but I have no doubt that as has often been said of the Briton he will blunder through and we will come out the victors in the end. I am not afraid on this continent of America of the inroads of these people or that hundreds and thousands of Japanese may come to Canada and rule this continent—not a bit of it. Many of them may come in. I am not so much afraid as some people that many of them will come in. There was an allusion made this afternoon to a proposal to take 10,000 acres of land in the Northwest and cultivate it as a Japanese farm. I do not know that it will be any great injury to the people of Canada to take 10,000 acres of the Northwest which is not highly cultivated and which is not highly productive and place it under Japanese methods of cultivating. I do not know that it would hurt, and I have confidence that if a few thousands, or a few tens of thousands, or I do not hesitate to say, if a few hundreds of thousands of Japanese came into Canada the present Canadian people will still rule this land and our ideas of constitutional and representative government will be maintained and the Japanese will have to come to our ideas and our views if they are going to become citizens of Canada and we not to theirs. For these reasons I am not so very much afraid of Japanese immigration as some people are, but at the same time I appreciate and I know, as has been so well said by my right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that there are times for all things and that with the prejudice in the minds of many we cannot force these things against prejudice. If, Sir, by reason of the arrangement, by reason of the understanding, which is no uncommon thing amongst the nations of the world, apart from and outside of the treaty obligations, we can reach a point where all the prejudices and fears of those who have prejudices and fears in Canada are cared for and not trodden upon or interfered with, and at the same time we can reap the advantage of the best treatment in the Japanese market for our industrial and commercial wares I think we have solved the question. I know that the line of argument and thought of this amendment will fail of the object and that it would bring about a condition of affairs which would be disastrous to Canada, disastrous to the entente cordiale between the motherland and Japan and also of that cohesion in the British empire, which we on this side of the House, desire so much to uphold. But, Sir, we wish so much to uphold it that we work for it instead of working against it as he and his friends do. Sir, I leave this matter in the hands of the House and the country and I am satisfied that this amendment will be voted down by the majority which will only increase through the length and breadth of Canada the better is understood the policy of my right hon. friend the leader of the government and the policy of the hon. leader of the opposition.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I do not think the Minister of Agriculture will deny that the policy of the Conservative party on this question is in harmony with the wise suggestions which were made to Canada by the mother country, and that the policy of the Liberal party is antagonistic to the course recommended by the British statesmen who advised this government to take precautions which they foolishly neglected. The Minister of Agriculture, as did his leader, argued in this way. That we cannot afford to treat Japan now as we did years ago, because Japan has recently proved herself a first-class fighting power and demonstrated her ability to defend her rights. Well, that reminds me of the little boy who says: I cant hold my own against that big boy, he is too much for me and I am afraid to assert my rights. That is just the kind of argument that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture have addressed to this House. It is just in line with the statement of the Prime Minister to the people of British Columbia when he said: When I telegraphed to British Columbia that I was prepared to take the advice of her representatives with regard to Chinese immigration I did not intend to take their advice with regard to Japanese immigration, because Japan has suddenly become a first-class fighting power and we would have to treat them differently from the Chinese who are insignificant and can be treated just as we wish to treat them. The Minister of Agriculture tells us that we should rely upon the assurances that have been given by the Japanese authorities to Canada, and I take it that these are verbal, because we have no knowledge that there are any written assurances. Let me remind the Minister of Agriculture that several years ago he stated in this House that he had certain written documents in his possession that justified the course of policy then taken, but to-night, although we have relied upon that statement for years, he tells us to-day he does not think he ever had these documents. May we not find ourselves in the same position a few years hence with regard to the assurances said to have been given by Viscount Hayashi to the Postmaster General. We may find, as in the case of the solemn statement made by the Minister of Agriculture upon his honour as a member of this House and on his responsibility as a minister of the Crown, that these assurances amount to nothing at all. The whole trend of human affairs, in national matters, or in commercial matters, or in relation between individuals, points to committing all agreements to paper, because the human memory is deceptive and treacherous and the written instrument is necessary to fall back on if there is a difference of opinion as to a bargain. International agreements are always committed to paper; treaties are preserved in writing, and even conferences between the representatives of nations are set forth in protocols. But in the case which we are now discussing, which is a matter of the greatest international moment, we are told by the government that we have nothing to depend upon except the promises made between individuals, every one of whom may be dead within a few years. The Minister of Agriculture was rather annoyed because the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) pointed out that recent events seemed to show that the present government of Japan may cease to hold power within a short time, and because the hon. member (Mr. Foster) asked: What then is to become of these verbal agreements? Well, the obligation upon Japan to perpetuate these agreements is merely founded on the policy announced by an existing government, and what is to prevent the successors of that government saying: This was the policy of Viscount Hayashi and his colleagues, but it is not our policy. Then the Minister of Agriculture endeavoured to make the people of Canada believe that it would be a great advantage to Canadian labouring men and artisans if the markets of Japan were open to Canada. But every member from British Columbia has pointed out that even on this Canadian soil the Canadian labourer, familiar with the conditions and working in his own land, is unable to compete with Japanese labour here. If that be so in Canada, how much more would it not be the fact in the markets of Japan. It is, therefore, not such a wonderful thing that the artisans and the labourers and manufacturers of Canada should have the Japanese market thrown open to them. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been boasting for many years past of what the Liberal government has done, and the Minister of Agriculture is reported in the 'Globe' newspaper as having said at a banquet tendered him in Montreal :

> One of the greatest advances made by the Liberals was that Canada achieved the right to make her own treaties.

This he claimed was achieved by the Liberals since they came to power They had either the power to negotiate that treaty or to come in under a wise treaty made by England. But they ignored the advice of England and entrusted the rights of Canada to verbal negotiation. England drew attention to the matter twice. Here is the despatch that was sent to the Governor General on the 14th of July, 1905 :

> Referring to your confidential despatch of June 7 should Japanese government be informed that your government wishes to adhere to treaty of 1894 and supplementary convention of 1895 under same terms and conditions as Queensland in 1897 which Japanese government then agreed to extend to any

other colonies adhering within prescribed period namely (1) that stipulation contained in 1st and 3rd articles of treaty shall not in any way affect laws, ordinances and regulations with regard to trade, immigration of labourers, artisans, police and public security which are in force or hereafter may be enacted in Japan or in colony.

When the mother country said that according to her judgment it would be wise to have this provision put in the treaty, they entirely ignored her advice. They had become a great power and achieved the right to make a treaty themselves, and they decided to go on and make a verbal treaty. And they have done in this case as they have done over and over and again before —given away the rights of Canada ; and we will live to learn of the folly they have perpetrated. The hon. Minister of Agriculture went on to say :

I have here at my right hand our worthy Postmaster General, who has but recently returned from Japan after having completed a most satisfactory arrangement with that empire.

Satisfactory to whom ? To himself and his colleagues, but to nobody else in Canada that I know of. His supporters from British Columbia say : We accept it in the absence of anything better ; we are inclined to rely on it rather than support a motion of want of confidence in the government for not looking properly after the interests of Canada ; it may be that we will be enlightened in the future that our judgment was wrong in relying upon it ; but at any rate we cannot do better, and we will run the risk and accept it. Then he went on to speak of the treaty they had made with France—what a wonderful thing they had accomplished ; how Canada had been elevated to the status of a nation since the right hon. gentleman and his friends had got charge of the government. And yet go over the history of that government from 1897 to the present, and I say, and say it advisedly, that you will find that they never undertook to negotiate anything with any nation of the world that they did not make a bungle of or give away Canada's rights. They did it in connection with their first tariff, when they gave England a preference in our market. Sir Charles Tupper warned them that they were taking a great risk upon themselves. The Minister of Finance said he had no fear whatever that they were incurring any danger. What happened ? Later on we found that Germany made her protest against the action of this government, and the result has been that we have been deprived of the advantages of the German market from that day to the present time. This was done by people who claim to be elevated to the dignity of a nation, to have acquired the right by their tariff arrangements to negotiate with other nations as they saw fit. I say that was a bungle, and they have been endeavouring year after year to recover what was then lost, and they have not recovered it yet. The next step they took was to settle our disputes with the United States. They went to Washington, and spent a lot of time and wasted a lot of money, and then came back and admitted that they could not accomplish anything. What became of their boasted power as a nation, of their prescience, their sagacity, their diplomacy ? It all came to naught, and they found in the end that they were obliged to ask England to do what they could not do. Their next boast was that they were going to settle the Alaskan boundary question, and that England, in obedience to our request, appointed two Canadian plenipotentiaries to look after Canada's interests so that her rights would not be sacrificed as they had been when England undertook to settle our disputes with other countries. What was the result in that case ? The present Minister of Justice was one of the great and able men who went to look after Canada's interests. What happened ? A give-away of a large portion of our territory; we got nothing at all ; and they came back humiliated like whipped children and refused to sign the agreement. They admitted that they had absolutely no power, that they were entirely unfit for the business in which they were engaged. There was never in history a greater example of incapacity of men to represent a nation than we had on that occasion. It has been the same with everything they have touched in the line of international agreements, whether it is a treaty with Japan or a treaty with France or a treaty with Germany. Whatever they touch seems to be stamped with a want of business acumen, a want of intelligence, a want of knowledge, a want of diplomacy, a want of statesmanship. This sinks them lower than the level of the ordinary politician, if we judge them by their acts. It is to be hoped that after this we shall hear no more boasting of what they have accomplished. I venture to predict that before many years pass they will be obliged to come to this House and admit that in the present instance they were not equal to the task that they had undertaken, that they did not safeguard Canada's rights, that they had nothing to fall back upon to indicate what Japan was to do or what Canada was to expect from her. We have accepted a mere verbal agreement. Either of the contracting parties may recede from the position it has taken ; there is nothing to indicate that both parties were to be bound by anything. Is that creditable to the present government ? I think it is not Should it be satisfactory to the people of British Columbia ? I think it should not. A few weeks ago the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) came through Canada talking about what would result if the government did not control the impor-

tation of Japanese. He threatened that if they did not, there might be another Boston tea party. But what a change has come over the hon gentleman. His fighting vigour has all vanished into thin air and he roars about as loud as a sucking dove. He admits that this verbal agreement may not bind the Japanese government, but he is willing to trust them. The hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross) takes exactly the same ground and talks in exactly the same strain. This may not bind the Japanese government, he says, but we will trust them. The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) is equally confiding. He even goes so far as to say that the agreement which the United States entered into would not have been of any value to Canada at all. Yet in his last speech on this question, the hon. gentleman regarded the government as improvident because they did not embody a similar provision in our treaty. Had they done that, he said, we would have had something to fall back upon, whereas now we have nothing. To-night however he performs the swallowing act and recants all he previously said.

We have heard a great deal to-night about that treaty and what it is going to accomplish. Well, we have heard many similar boastings in the past, and I have no doubt that time will demonstrate the unwisdom of what the government has done. Time will demonstrate the folly of our relying upon a verbal agreement with any other nation instead of having the stipulations embodied in a treaty. And the Canadian people will then realize the folly of this government in having refused to accept the advice of the mother country, and insert in the treaty a provision restricting immigration.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny). I must apologize to the House for detaining it at this late hour, but I do not think I ought to give a silent vote on this question, the more especially as my views on immigration in the past have been what many hon. gentlemen would describe as rather narrow. In fact, had my views been followed, the immigration, not only from Japan, but from all other countries, would have been more than restricted. But, unfortunately for the country, in my opinion, they did not prevail, and to-day we find ourselves confronting the problem of dealing with an influx of people from a country entirely foreign to ours in every respect, and between whom and us there is not the sympathy common to all Caucasian races. Two reasons have been given for our having acceded to the treaty under which this immigration from Japan has been permitted. The first plea is the commercial interests of Canada, and the second is the political interests of the empire. Japan, it is argued, will furnish a market for Canadian manufactured goods, and in addition the interests of the empire demand that we should have more intimate relations with her great ally. But if I may quote the language used by Mr. McBride, in a letter dated Victoria, January, 1900, to the First Minister, not only imperial interests, but also local interests, should be taken into account. That is the position I take to-night. In my opinion, not only imperial interest should have been discussed in this House when the treaty was passed, but more particulary Canadian interests. The treaty, however, was passed by the unanimous consent of the House, because it was thought important for Canada and the empire. I do not think we had all the information which should have been given, but the House agreed to the treaty, and we have now to take the consequences.

We are told that this is simply a labour question and the outcome of labour agitation. I take a different view. In my opinion, it is a national question. It is not only important that the labouring element coming from Japan should be prevented entering this country and coming into competition with white labour, but it is still more important that this immigration should be restricted from a national point of view. I think it is far more dangerous perhaps that we should allow Japanese settlements on farm lands. It is a current report that the Japanese will come in and settle in the Northwest. If that be the case, we will not only have to deal with the labour question, but with the more important question of having in Canada settlements of people of an entirely different civilization from our own, with different ideals, and who consider everything from a different point of view. To-day in British Columbia there are 75,000 white people and 25,000 people of oriental extraction. According to those figures, the problem is still greater than we thought it, and I take issue with the hon. gentleman for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) when he says the question is only an economic one. I think it is more than that. If I quote rightly the words of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), the question is whether British Columbia is to be a white man's country or not. It is even more than that. The question is whether Canada will be a white man's country or not.

On one hand is the material progress of our country. We all know that, under the Japanese treaty, we have received material favours, which we should not have received if that treaty had not been made or if it had been denounced. But there is not alone the material progress of our country to consider—there is the moral and intellectual progress as well. It seems to me that we have been sacrificing the moral and intellectual to the material progress. But I suppose that what is done is done, and that remedies are only for an evil that we have

brought upon ourselves, and that each side of the House can accept a share of the responsibility in bringing to our country an influx of oriental immigration. The gravity of the situation increased up to what has been called the crisis which took place in Vancouver last autumn, when there were riots and the populace of Vancouver raged against what was called an influx of oriental or yellow immigrants. To make a long story short; the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) was sent to Japan to negotiate, not a treaty—there was already a treaty passed by unanimous consent of this House—but what I think may be called a modus vivendi. What has been the result of the hon. gentleman's trip? I think I can say it in two words: The treaty is maintained. The Postmaster General has brought us from Japan assurances. He has brought what he calls two remedies for Japanese immigration—first, the route by Hawaii is barred, and, second, the Japanese authorities themselves agree to restrict emigration to Canada. The Postmaster General has read here the letter from the Foreign Minister of Japan, Count Hayashi, giving assurance that the Japanese government could restrict emigration of Japanese to this country. State reasons, we are told, prevent the Postmaster General from telling us exactly what were the assurances other than those given in the letter of the Japanese minister. It is too bad that state reasons have closed the eloquent mouth of the Postmaster General. I am sure the country would have been grateful to our Canadian plenipotentiary if he could have given us some details about the assurances which he has received verbally from Count Hayashi. I understand that it was impossible; and I perhaps guess right when I venture the thought that the reasons of the Canadian minister's secrecy are to be found in the negotiations by which the United States are trying to make a treaty with Japan. But we may well discuss the result of the trip of the Postmaster General and what he has brought back to remedy the evil of which the people of British Columbia complain. If we read the correspondence, we learn that, before the treaty was accepted by the Canadian government, Mr. Chamberlain, acting in the name of the imperial government, asserts—I think in a letter written in 1900—that Japan would not be opposed to the enactment by the Canadian parliament of the Natal Act. The Postmaster General tells us also that Japan was opposed to emigration to Canada. That being so, one would suppose that Japan would not be opposed to the enactment by Canada of the Natal Act; but the Postmaster General has told us also that Japan is a very proud and sensitive nation, and that discrimination by our country against Japanese subjects would have been most annoying to the imperial government of Japan. I think the Postmaster General has not made quite clear why Japan accepted the Natal Act from Queensland, but would have been much annoyed by an Act of that kind if passed by Canada. I think we can find the explanation in the correspondence. It is to be seen there that Mr. Nossé, offered every guarantee and every assurance, that he (if I may put it) used every caress and every blandishment, to cause the Canadian government to acquiesce in the treaty which had been made between Great Britain and Japan. It looked as if Japan would do anything in relation to emigration to Canada if this country would acquiesce in that treaty. I would not, I hope, insult the Japanese nation, but I must say that I think the compliments paid to Japan in this House are only half deserved. In this treaty the Japanese government seems to have played a double part. I may be told that I am a barbarian in diplomacy; I may appear to be treading on dangerous ground; but it seems to me that the part played by Japan in the negotiations or correspondence which preceded the treaty was not quite fair, and that the assurances we have now received from the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs may be taken with a grain of salt. We cannot be too sure that we have not received a Greeks' gift, and, by taking the word of the Japanese minister, have brought within our walls the wooden horse within which are concealed the forces of a hostile army. But we must take the correspondence as it is. We find ourselves faced with what the hon. member for North Toronto would call the imperial home policy on the one side and Canadian interests on the other side. It seems to me that we have been sacrificing Canadian interests for the imperial policy of Great Britain for the sake of an ally of Great Britain, which ally may appear in the near future as a most dangerous enemy, a nation which has its eyes upon Australia as well as a great desire to colonize British Columbia. However, we must take the situation as it is. The treaty is passed; it has been accepted with the unanimous consent of this House. Now, under the resolution of the leader of the opposition, we find ourselves face to face with a choice of three courses—one, to keep the treaty as it is; two, keep the treaty and have the Lemieux agreement; or, three, denounce the treaty. The leader of the opposition does not go so far as this latter, if I read his resolution aright. I may call the resolution not over-sweeping—it is a very tame resolution. I think it is admitted by everybody that in the interests of British Columbia the treaty cannot be kept as it is.

At the same time the resolution of the leader of the opposition does not go so far as to denounce the treaty; if it did, I would have no hestitation in supporting it. I would support it on this principle, that commercial relations and material interests are secondary to the intellectual, moral and

national prosperity of our country. I cannot see that the resolution of the leader of the opposition has any other purpose than to blame the government for passing this treaty. The blame may be well deserved, but if it is deserved, it is deserved by both sides of the House, and by myself as well as by the leader of the opposition and the Prime Minister. Then I find myself face to face with this position, either keep the treaty under the Lemieux agreement, a treaty which brings material advantages to this country, or without the agreement. Now, if we keep the treaty we must necessarily keep it with the agreement which has been entered into between my hon. friend the Postmaster General and the Japanese government. If I understand rightly the letter read by the Postmaster General, it seems to me that no Minister of Foreign Affairs in any country could have given more satisfactory assurances of good will than those given by Count Hayashi to the Postmaster General. As I have said, if the leader of the opposition had moved for the denunciation of the treaty I would gladly have voted with him, because my policy—and in that respect I go beyond the leader of the opposition—is British Columbia for the British Columbians, Canada for the Canadians and Canada to remain a white man's country. I do not accept the agreement of the Postmaster General as being perfect, but I accept it as the only solution offered us at the present time. I agree with one of my hon. friends from British Columbia, that we might give the agreement a fair trial for a few months, and if we find it does not work satisfactorily we can denounce the treaty. It has been said during this debate that Japan is a growing power, a great nation, and that we can rely upon her word. Sir, I will not go that far. I will not look at Canadian interests from a Japanese point of view, nor from a foreign point of view at all; I look at Canadian interests from the narrowest point of view I can find. If my views could prevail in regard to immigration, I would restrict it from all countries to the narrowest possible proportions, so as to keep Canada for the Canadians. But this is not the point of view of the leader of the opposition, his resolution is practically only one of censure of the agreement of the Postmaster General. As I consider that is entitled to a fair trial, I shall vote against the resolution.

Mr. JOHN HERRON (Alberta). Owing to the lateness of the hour I shall speak but a few minutes. I listened with great interest to the Minister of Labour when he presented his report to this House. I give him credit for making an honest effort to extricate the government from the very unpleasant position in which they find themselves in regard to this Japanese question. It is only another case among many of this government locking the stable door after the horse has been stolen. In my opinion the government has made a bad bargain in the negotiations they have been carrying on with Japan. They have had years in which to consider this important question, and have made a very poor job of it. In the discussion on this question on the 16th of December last it was stated, I think by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith), that this Asiatic question began to be a serious one for British Columbia in 1884, at the time the Canadian Pacific was built, thereby connecting the Conservative government with the trouble in his province. Later it was stated, I think by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy) that it was a live question in 1877. I can say that it was a live question in 1875, for I was in British Columbia at that time in a mining camp where there were over 500 Chinamen at work. Of course I rank the Chinamen and the Japanese together when considering this question from a labour point of view. The question has been a live question ever since among the labouring classes in British Columbia. The Minister of Labour stated in his report that there were 75,000 white people in British Columbia and 25,000 Asiatics. He also stated that from the 1st of January last year to some time in October there came 8,125 Japanese into the province of British Columbia. Now at that rate of increase in population and adding to that the Chinese and Hindoo population, I suppose you could safely say that there would be——

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to make a statement that is not warranted by the facts.

Mr. HERRON. No.

Mr. LEMIEUX. When he says that I stated to the House the other day that 8,000 or about that number arrived in British Columbia, he forgets that I went on to say that 8,000 Japanese landed in British Columbia, 4,000 of whom, I hazarded, went to the United States, so that only 4,000 remained in British Columbia ; and I explained at the same time how many of the 4,000 came from the Hawaiian islands and how many from Japan direct.

Mr. HERRON. Of course, that makes a slight difference in the calculation ; but nevertheless we may not have a full account of all the Asiatics who have landed in British Columbia. There are several ways by which they can get into that country, and I have no doubt that they do get in in several ways besides landing at the seaports. So that my statement may not be very far out. But even taking it at half that number, within seven or eight years the Asiatic population would predominate in British Columbia, which I think any rea-

sonable man will admit would be a very serious problem, not only for Canada, but for the empire as a whole. Good wages in British Columbia and plenty of work have always been a great attraction to Asiatics. That province is easy of access, they have come from the earliest days in great numbers, and they have invariably driven out the white labouring classes wherever they have come into contact with each other. That makes it a very serious problem. I am sorry there are not more hon. members in this House who at some time in their lives have had to earn their living by the work of their hands or by the sweat of their brows. If they had they probably would be able to appreciate this question more than they do at the present time. They would know what it is to earn a dollar, and they would therefore have more sympathy with the labouring man. The principle of protection is one which predominates in the legislation of this House. We give protection, in the form of bounties, on iron, steel, lead, coal oil and binder twine, and in the form of duties to manufacturers and also to farmers to some extent. I do not think it is right that the labourer, who does the bulk of the work, should be left entirely unprotected. I do not think that he should have to compete against Asiatic labour in any portion of this fair Dominion of ours. I cannot say so much about the Japanese immigrant, but it is a well known fact that although the Chinese is always ready to work for lower wages than the white man, he will get the best wages he can, and when he has earned a certain amount of money which enables him to go home and live in his own country in affluence he leaves our country. He is not in that regard like the white man. It is estimated that a Jap can live on one-fifth of a Canadian's wages. The better the wages earned by the white labouring man the more money he has to spend and the better he provides for his family. It is not so with the Asiatic, and that is one reason why I think it is wrong that our labouring classes should come into direct competition with the Chinaman, the Jap or the Hindo.

Now, I am only going to add one word more and then I am done. I would like to refer to the statement made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) here to-night in regard to a settlement of Japanese in Alberta. He would seem to welcome a large influx of Japanese into that province. I take issue with the minister right there. I never did and never will favour any class of people coming into our country and settling in bulk or as a colony. I do not think that is a good principle. I think it is wrong, but particularly to bring in a class of Asiatics and place them in our fair province of Alberta would be something that I for one am prepared to vote against. I understand that it is proposed that they shall enter into the manufacture of beet sugar. In case of that being done we may get cheaper sugar in the province of Alberta and in other parts of Canada perhaps, but we will certainly be at the loss occasioned by the probable closing up of our other sugar factories and the driving out of our white population. The Japanese, by the force of competition, will drive the white labour out as snow is driven back by an Alberta chinook wind.

Mr. J. B. KENNEDY (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, I only wish to detain the House for a very few minutes. There is one consolation that the British Columbia members have, and that is that we have got both sides of the House at last to understand this question to a great extent, and to understand that we have always had a grievance in this line. All agree with us now that this is an evil that should be cured. We have heard some strange things from the other side of the House to-night. Some hon. members have told us that we must not suggest that they did not know all about this thing, while others have displayed their ignorance of the whole matter. But judging from the speeches which have been delivered, I think the opposition must be credited with possessing a fair amount of knowledge of the whole situation, and how they can reconcile this knowledge with their silent vote when the treaty was passed through the House less than a year ago is what I cannot understand. Let us suppose that there is a stranger sitting in the gallery here to-night listening to this debate, and let us suppose that he compares the statements which have come from the other side of the House with the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite when they allowed this treaty to go through the House without a dissenting voice; what will his conclusion be? His conclusion would be that either there was dense ignorance on the other side of the House on this whole question when the treaty passed the House, or that these hon. gentlemen are not sincere in what they say to-night. I think the government is making a fair attempt at a solution of this question, and I think that they should be allowed to put it into execution for a time at least without throwing any cold water upon it. For that reason, I mean to vote against this amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). I said at the beginning that I would not take up much of the time of the House, and I simply wish to make this explanation as to why I shall vote against the amendment, and why I want to see this matter get the fair trial that I think it is entitled to.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I do not think that at this late hour or, I should say, at this early hour

in the morning, I should detain the House at any length after this long and protracted debate. Yet, as this amendment has been presented by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) after I have made a statement to the House, it is my duty to give a few reasons why it should not be adopted. I believe that the amendment drafted—I may say ably drafted—by the hon. leader of the opposition is nothing less than a subterfuge. I can find no other word in polite language to properly qualify it. There are only two policies discussed to-day in this country by the political parties with reference to oriental immigration. One policy advocates the exclusion of the orientals, and the other pronounces for the restriction of oriental immigration within reasonable limits. The policy expressed by the leader of the opposition during his campaign in western Canada, last fall, was a policy of complete exclusion. He argued before the British Columbians that if he were in power he would have a white British Columbia, which I understand to mean the exclusion of oriental labour, and which applied to the case in hand, means the exclusion of the Japanese.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the hon. minister whether his policy is not for a white British Columbia?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, sir.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not.

Mr. LEMIEUX My policy is to respect the treaty to which we have adhered unconditionally and unreservedly, relying, as regards immigration, on the assurances which have been given by the Japanese government. It is very easy for the hon. gentleman to provoke an answer, yea or nay, on the question whether there should be a white British Columbia or a yellow one, but the fact is staring us in the face that not only since this government has been in power but during the time of the previous Conservative government a large influx of yellow labour has gradually settled in that province. The policy of this government is for the restriction of oriental labour into British Columbia. The amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition may mean exclusion or it may not. In fact, my hon. friend can select any audience in any part of Canada, and according to the necessities of the case, he can argue that the amendment means exclusion or that it means restriction. Hence it is that I describe the amendment as a subterfuge, and as one drafted solely for the purpose of attacking the policy of the government. There is one other thing which I do not understand in the policy of the leader of the Conservative party in this instance. He has attacked this government because, forsooth, we have adhered unconditionally and unreservedly to the treaty with Japan, thus refusing to discriminate against the ally of Great Britain. For generations it has been said that the Conservative party was par excellence the party of imperialism. In the Conservative press and elsewhere time and again the Liberals have been accused of being the associates of those who in England are called 'Little Englanders.' The Conservative party in Canada was lauded as being the exponent of imperial ideas, but after what I have heard that day seems to have passed. Here is an occasion, if ever there was one, when the two political parties in this Dominion could sink petty political advantages and take sides with the mother country. Here is a question which should unite all Canadians, and yet the very party which for so many years has advocated an imperial policy takes quite a different line of action on the question of the Anglo-Japanese treaty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In what respect?

Mr. LEMIEUX The hon. gentleman has advocated the exclusion of the Japanese from Canada, and the exclusion of the Japanese from Canada means a serious breach in the Anglo-Japanese alliance. Will my hon. friend deny that if the Dominion government should denounce the existing treaty it would mean a serious breach in the Anglo-Japanese alliance? The hon. gentleman knows fully well that it would bring to an end that Anglo-Japanese alliance.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. To what words of mine does the hon. gentleman allude ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Take the speeches delivered by the hon. gentleman in British Columbia last fall ; take this very amendment drafted so ably by the hon. gentleman. Take the last paragraph ; I do not say it is an insult to the Japanese government, but it is an insinuation of bad faith against the Japanese government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In what words ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. In that the amendment says :

> That this House while expressing its profound appreciation of the friendly intentions and courteous assurances of the Japanese government, and while declaring its sincere desire for the most cordial relations with the Japanese people, desires nevertheless to record its strong protest against a policy under which our wage earning population cannot be protected from destructive invading competition except by entreating the forbearance and aid of a foreign government.

What is the meaning of this ? First of all the hon gentleman does not speak of the formal and candid assurance given by the Japanese government ; he speaks of the friendly intentions and courteous assurances of the Japanese government; then he refers to the danger to which our wage earning population is exposed, when he knows that

it is part of the arrangement with the Japanese government that no contract labour can enter this Dominion coming from Japan, unless that contract labour is requested by the Dominion government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is the insinuation of bad faith ; that is what I want to know.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. gentleman in his amendment says : 'That this House while expressing its profound appreciation of the friendly intentions of the Japanese government desires nevertheless to record its strong protest against a policy under which our wage earning population cannot be protected.' It is all the other way ; the wage earning population of this country is specifically protected by the new arrangement, and the hon. gentleman seems to ignore that.

Mr. R. L BORDEN. Let us assume that is so; where is the charge of bad faith ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend knows that no contract labour—and that includes artisans—can in future enter this Dominion without the consent of the Dominion government. Yet by his amendment he wishes to record his protest against the policy under which our wage-earning population cannot be protected from destructive invading competition. Will he still ask me where is the insinuation of bad faith?

Mr. LENNOX. You have not shown it yet.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, I think I have made it very clear. I will show it again. My hon. friend states in his amendment that he wishes this House 'to record its strong protest against the policy under which our wage-earning population cannot be protected from destructive invading competition.' Besides, Sir, he speaks of the forbearance of a foreign government when, as a matter of fact, I have a straight agreement with the Japanese government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Where is the agreement ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That no contract labour can come into this Dominion without the consent or permission of the Dominion government ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Does not that letter say that the Japanese government has a perfect right to insist on free entry, but does not for the present insist ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will read the letter. of Count Hayashi. Really my hon. friend is not in earnest, or he would not treat with such levity the assurance given by the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Japan.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am treating the hon. gentleman's statements with levity, not those of the foreign minister—a very different thing.

Mr. Lemieux reading :

In reply to your note of even date, I have the honour to state that although the existing treaty between Japan and Canada absolutely guarantees to Japanese subjects full liberty to enter, travel and reside in any part of the Dominion of Canada, yet it is not the intention of the imperial government to insist upon the complete enjoyment of the rights and privileges guaranted by those stipulations when that would involve disregard of special conditions which may prevail in Canada from time to time.

My hon. friend is a constitutional lawyer of great ability, he will tell me it is possible for the foreign nation with the population and the status of Japan in the world, to speak more generously than she has spoken by the mouth of her Minister of Foreign Affairs ? Japan, under that treaty, has secured full rights for her subjects to enter, to travel, to reside in the Dominion ; yet, Sir, through her minister, she declares that she does not intend to insist upon the complete enjoyment of these rights and privileges. How can my hon. friend speak lightly of that letter and insinuate that there is nothing in it ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Nothing in it except the statement that they will forbear to insist completely on their rights.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Sir, the attitude of the Conservative party on this question is all against the traditions of its former leaders. Without imputing motives to the hon. gentleman, without belittling him in the least, I dare say that if Sir John Macdonald, Sir John Abbott or Sir John Thompson were occupying the seat of my hon. friend we would not have had this debate, but the House would have been unanimous in ratifying the agreement which we obtained at Tokio. Sir, this is not a party question; it is a national question before which party differences should sink. What is the question from the Canadian point of view ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the hon. gentleman leaves that, might I ask him one question ? If he considers that an insistence upon the reservation to Canada of a right to control immigration is against imperial interests, will he explain how it was that Great Britain, apparently without any suggestion from the other self-governing colonies, asked for them precisely the same thing ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. First of all, my hon. friend is probably not aware that it was after difficulties had been experienced in Australia and New Zealand that Mr. Chamberlain himself suggested the Natal Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not talking about the Natal Act ; the hon. gentleman

misunderstands me. I have already read of the attitude taken by the Canadian government in August, 1895, when they desired the imperial government to inform Japan that Canada desired a certain proviso which would retain in her own parliament the control over immigration from Japan. The hon. gentleman thinks insistence upon that is against imperial interests. I ask him then how it was that Great Britain, without any suggestion from the other self-governing colonies of the empire, made on their behalf precisely the same request of Japan? Why should Great Britain do this if it were against imperial interests ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The circumstances in 1895 and those of to-day are quite different, both as regards Canada and Great Britain. We adhered to the treaty after Great Britain had made an offensive and defensive alliance with Japan. In 1895 there was no such alliance between Japan and Great Britain, so that the circumstances were totally different.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is on account of the changed circumstances. Why was it that the imperial government, on the 14th of July, 1905, and again on the 6th of September, 1905, called the attention of Canada to exactly the same stipulation ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend refers to the Queensland protocol. If he were as conversant with that correspondence as I happen to be, he would not make that statement. In 1905, when Mr. Lyttelton was colonial secretary and when Canada manifested a desire to adhere to the treaty, Mr Lyttelton, without committing himself to anything, simply asked the Canadian government if we desired to adhere to the treaty, with the Queensland protocol, or without it. That question was asked by Mr. Lyttelton for his own information, but my hon. friend infers that if we had replied to Mr. Lyttelton that we would adhere to the treaty subject to the Queensland conditions, we would have obtained them. Sir, during the negotiations at Tokio, we inquired from the Queensland government if that arrangement had ever been enforced and we were answered most categorically and emphatically that the arrangement only existed on paper and was simply a dead letter on the statute-book. We also know that the Queensland arrangement was agreed to by Japan under the circumstances explained by the right hon. gentleman in his speech last evening.

Let me recall again a few dates and a few facts. In 1894, Japan revised her treaty. Great Britain was the first power to accede to the new treaty. By clause 19 of that treaty Canada had an option of two years in which to accede or not to the treaty. In 1905, under totally different circumstances from those suggested by the hon. gentleman, we decided to adhere to the treaty unreservedly and unconditionally. And why, Sir ? Because in 1900 we had obtained from the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Japan the formal assurance that there would be no influx of Japanese immigration to Canada. I read the other day the letter of instructions sent by Viscount Akoi to the several prefectures of Japan. In that letter he states positively that in future no passports will be issued to Japanese emigrating to Canada. From 1900 until 1907, the year when parliament sanctioned the treaty, we had a perfect chain of assurances given by the representative of Japan in Canada that there would be no influx of labour immigration into British Columbia. We have the evidence in the report of the deputy Minister of Labour that these assurances were kept. But we are told : Why did you accept the assurances of a consular agent ? Why did you consent to treat with a man who had no authority to speak for the Japanese government? The hon. gentleman has read the correspondence which was laid the other day on the table of the House. I have not seen that correspondence of late, but I know that amongst Mr. Nossé's correspondence there are letters from the Japanese government and the Japanese ambassador in London to His Excellency the Governor General and the Prime Minister of Canada bearing on this most important question. The other day I stated to the House that in one of those letters the government of Japan instructed Mr. Nossé to hand His Excellency the Governor General and the Prime Minister of Canada the memo. of Japan, in which she gave her reasons why war was declared against Russia. Sir, if Mr. Nossé was allowed to be the channel of communication between his government and the Canadian cabinet on such an important question, had he not the right to speak on behalf of his government on a less important question, namely, the immigration question? We had that chain of assurances from 1900 to 1907. Suddenly, during the last months of 1907, we had an influx of Japanese immigration. About 4,000 settled in the province of British Columbia. I indicated the other day the source whence these came. They came, through the agency of the Nippon Supply Company, from Japan direct, and about 3,000 came from the island of Hawaii. It was under those circumstances that I was delegated to make such an arrangement with Japan as would in future prevent any such influx. What has been the result of that mission ? The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) declared that it was a failure and the hon. gentleman who leads the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) said practically the same thing. I do not wish to bore the House with the details of the agreement. But let me recall to you its

general features. First of all, I have obtained from the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Viscount Hayashi—the same gentleman who negotiated with Lord Lansdowne the articles of the alliance between Great Britain and Japan in 1902—I obtained from him a formal written assurance that in future Japan will not take advantage of the letter of the treaty but will restrict immigration and will see that the local conditions in British Columbia are taken into consideration and the desires of the Canadian government met. This is a written assurance. It is not a mere conversation. It is a written assurance given by one nation to another.

Mr. LENNOX. The letter does not in any one sentence say it will restrict emigration.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have read the first paragraph. Let us see the second paragraph :

Acting in this spirit, and having particular regard to circumstances of recent occurrence in British Columbia, the imperial government have decided to take efficient means to restrict emigration to Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read on.

Mr. LENNOX. That is not the end of it.

Mr. LEMIEUX Well, I will read it:

In carrying out this purpose, the imperial government, in pursuance of the policy above stated, will give careful consideration to local conditions prevailing in Canada, with a view to meeting the desires of the government of the Dominion as far as is compatible with the spirit of the treaty and the dignity of the state.

Some hon. MEMBERS Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) cheering the last sentence? If that is the case, let me say to him that if a minister of Japan did not safeguard the dignity of his country in giving such an assurance to another nation I should pity Japan. Should any hon. member of this House happen to be Secretary of State or Prime Minister of Canada and being called upon to give an assurance of this nature to another nation on behalf of his country would not take care to safeguard our national dignity, he would not be worthy of public support.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to ask——

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. gentleman can speak after I am finished Now this assurance is one feature of the agreement. If this were the whole agreement I would say it was amply sufficient. My hon. friend may criticise——

Mr. LENNOX. You won't allow me to.

Mr. LEMIEUX. —he may quibble, he may twist the assurance as much as he pleases, but I can tell him that public opinion in Canada, public opinion even in British Columbia, accepts in good faith the assurances given by the Japanese government. But, Sir, that is not all. We have this written assurance from the Minister of Foreign Affairs. It is the more binding because it is given of Japan's own free will. We also have the declaration that we may stop any immigration of Japanese originating from the islands of Hawaii, whence this great influx of labour came. Still more than that, we have the formal declaration that no contract labour will come to Canada from Japan or Hawaii or any other place where Japanese are colonized. The only limitation is that this contract labour shall not be allowed unless the Canadian government agrees to it. Of course, the Canadian government will not agree to it—I can say that, as Minister of Labour.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. minister (Mr. Lemieux), but perhaps he will allow me to ask a question regarding the interpretation of the letter. What is meant by the words 'spirit of the treaty?'

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) is not worthy of himself. He is not serious in asking that question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, the hon. gentleman is quibbling on three words in the letter, a letter which has been duly appreciated and endorsed by sound public opinion as reflected in the independent press of Canada. I will come back to the objections of the hon. gentleman in a minute. I declared to the House on Tuesday last, that as an evidence of the good faith of the Japanese government, they had suppressed the immigration companies which were the chief cause of evil. Moreover, Count Hayashi has declared to parliament a few days ago that he had prohibited the three remaining immigration companies from carrying on any propaganda of immigration to Canada or the United States. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) says that this is a fraud ? That we must not trust the Japanese government ? That, forsooth, another government may come in office in ten days' time and upset that policy ? Then, Sir, my hon. friend does not know the parliamentary system of Japan. And he has a very poor opinion of Japanese statesmanship of either political party if he believes that, in matters of foreign relations, a new government would ignore a policy adopted by its predecessors. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that, in matters of foreign policy—yes, and in anything which shows the civilizing influence in Japan—the Japanese have as keen a sense of honour

as the citizens of any other part of the world.

I have shown that this arrangement stops the immigration from Hawaii, excludes and suppresses the immigration companies. This I am authorized to state publicly. But why I particularly take issue with the hon. gentleman, and why I regret to differ with him is because he knows pretty well there is more than that in the agreement. Far be it from my mind to belittle him, but I say that, if Sir John Macdonald were standing in his place, both parties would be united in ratifying this treaty. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who does not know all there is in the agreement, yet should suspect that there are such things in national affairs as secret agreements. And what is the policy of a British statesman in matters relating to secret treaties? Ah, though I was not brought up in Britain, yet a knowledge of British parliamentary institutions came early to me. I gained that knowledge during the last eleven years reading the books on parliamentary government and following the debates here and in the House of Commons in England. Men like D'Israeli, men like Gladstone, Russell, Balfour, Lansdowne, even though in opposition, and even though they might see an opportunity to gain political advantage out of an acute foreign situation, would not call in question the good faith of a minister or of a government where the interest of the Crown would be involved. Sir, shall I be required to quote authorities? It is not necessary. I may, however, remind the hon. gentleman that Todd, on intercourse with foreign powers, volume 1, page 357, says:

> While it is necessary that parliament should be informed on all matters which are essential to explain or define the policy of the government it is equally necessary that a minister should be able, upon his own responsibility to withhold from the public such information as he may judge could not be afforded without detriment to the public service.

Again, Todd, vol. 1, page 359,

> Any attempt to coerce a government into producing to parliament all the papers they may possess upon a matter of foreign policy, without regard to their being confidential or unsuitable for general publication could only result in compelling the agents of the government to have recourse to 'private correspondence' for the communication of everything but mere ordinary information. This would occasion not only much public loss but also permanent injury to the state, for when one administration succeeded another it would be unable to discover among the official papers of the public departments the real grounds of action and motive for decisions upon great public questions.

Again on page 375, Todd discusses the internal concerns of foreign nations in connection with the right of either House of parliament.

> It is obvious that if any diplomatic negotiations are called for they can only be exercised through the recognized official channels of international communications, direct interference by either house of parliament, in the domestic or municipal concerns of a foreign country would be highly irregular and unconstitutional.
>
> He points out that while the House is entitled to information under certain circumstances that 'such proceedings, however, must be restrained within the limits of political expediency and should not be persevered in if opposed on this ground by the responsible advisers of the Crown.'

Again, on page 440, vol. 1, we quote the following:

> Consideration of public policy and a due regard to the interests of the State occasionally demand, however, that information so called for by members of the legislature should be withheld at the discretion, and upon the responsibility of the ministers.

This very question of the Anglo-Japanese agreement, in 1902, which had been recently signed, was a matter of discussion in the imperial House, and a reference to the British 'Hansard' will show that the government took the position that only such matters as should be made public would be published. Now let me give the answer of Lord Cranbourne to Mr. Labouchère, in volume 114 of the British 'Hansard' page 1350. He wanted to know the nature of some secret arrangements between the government of Great Britain and the government of Japan. Mr. Labouchère asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs:

> Whether His Majesty's government has given any pledges or entered into any reciprocal agreements with any foreign power in regard to China or Japan, to which this House has not been made cognizant.

The answer of Lord Cranbourne was as follows:

> I venture to hope that the hon. gentleman will forgive me if I am only able to reply that I have no statement to make upon the inquiry which he has addressed to me. Any other reply he would allow me to say would be contrary to public interest.

Enough, Mr. Speaker, there is a wealth of authorities on the subject in the British House of Commons. I am really astounded to see the hon. leader of the opposition speaking of this assurance with so much levity as he exhibited this evening, insinuating that the Japanese government had written a very nice letter, indeed, but that they meant to cling to the spirit of the treaty because these three words 'spirit of the treaty' were part of the phraseology. Sir, the hon. gentleman has not shown himself worthy of his high reputation in taking advantage of three words in the magnificent

assurance, yes, in the noble assurance, given by the Minister of Foreign Affairs for Japan to the government of Canada. We are told that this is a promise of a transitory nature. Sir, let us suppose that the provision of the hon. member for North Toronto is correct, let us suppose that in a few days, because the present Japanese government has gone too far with us, suffer defeat under the assaults of the opposite party. That would only show that we have obtained so much from them that they are defeated by their opponents in the Diet.

Mr. FOSTER. The division might be upon some other question.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, but if the hon. gentleman takes as much stock in the present despatches from Tokio as he took at first from the same correspondence coming from Tokio, representing my mission as a huge failure, he cannot fail to realize that on this very question the Japanese government is in danger. Let us suppose that Japan fails to abide by the assurances she has given, and that in a few months we are invaded by another influx of Japanese immigrants. My hon. friends know that even we have always a remedy for a contingency such as that. The last clause of the special convention embodying the treaty between Japan and Canada is to the effect that either of the high contracting parties can at any time denounce the treaty by giving six months' notice. Mr. Speaker, this agreement having been given in good faith by the Japanese government, is it not worth while for us to give it a trial during six months ? Let us wait until the expiration of six months, and if they fail to carry out their assurance it will be time enough for Canada to give notice.

Mr. FOSTER. In that letter of Viscount Hayashi there is an allusion to certain demands that were made by the Postmaster General. Would the Postmaster General have any objection to telling us what these demands were that he made and were not acceded to?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend then would like the Postmatser General to break the promise which he has made to the Minister of Foreign Affairs ?

Mr. FOSTER. What promise?

Mr. LEMIEUX. To make to the Canadian parliament the statement I made the other day and nothing else. Would my hon. friend think well of me if I would not stand or live up to the promise I made? Conferences were held and there were documents exchanged. I have promised that I would do certain things. I have done them; and no invitation, graceful as it is, charming as it is, would deter me from deviating from the code of honour.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think my hon. friend quite took that question fairly. In every negotiation that is carried on there are certain things which are asked and a sort of statement is made—a protocol, as we call it in a regular conference. Surely my hon. friend made no promise that is binding, or that Count Hayashi would consider he ought to regard himself as being honoured in reference to the demands which he made or the requests which he preferred outside of the seat of agreement. No one has asked my hon. friend to violate the secret agreement. He has read a lot of constitutional authorities. What had the authorities to do with it. I have never and no one else has, asked that the secret agreement should be divulged. We have scrupulously avoided that, but there were certain demands made that Count Hayashi could not conform to. Is there any objection that these should be sacred? Is there any binding promise that the minister shall not divulge what these are?

Mr. LEMIEUX. If I could read more of the documents or the memoranda that were exchanged at Tokio, or if I could divulge what took place during the several interviews, I would certainly answer the question of my hon. friend, but I have stated very carefully, in fact I read that part of my statement the other day to the House, what it was agreed I should state before the House of Commons and before the country. My hon. friend knows full well that I cannot say more. Otherwise I would not be what I esteem I am—a gentleman—and I would not have been a worthy representative of the Dominion in the negotiations which lasted for nearly two months. I have made publicly what I could public. But as to the documents, that I cannot publish, I should not even allude to them, but I have been drawn this evening by the remarks which have been made and by the amendment which has been offered to the House by the hon. leader of the opposition. No, Mr. Speaker, I believe that, as I stated a moment ago, the hon. gentleman does not wish to announce to the country that he favours exclusion. He does not wish to say either that he is in favour of restriction. He has an amendment which might serve his purpose in any part of the country. He has not stated a policy in that amendment except that of condemning the government. The hon. gentleman stated in so many words this afternoon that the mission to Japan had been a failure. I quite understood that that was the assertion of the hon. gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I think that my hon. friend was bound to say that it was a failure ; in fact, I believe that the word was given from the moment I left Tokio on the 26th December last that the mission to Japan was a failure. I was startled when I landed at Victoria to read the 'Mail and Empire,' the organ of the

Conservative party in Canada, the ultra loyal organ. My mission was characterized as a huge fiasco and a huge failure, because forsooth, I had shown so much inexperience, that I had forgotten, in dealing with this very important question to knock at the door of the American ambassador at Tokio.

Yes, Sir, I was expected to unite with the American ambassador in handling this question. I am not exaggerating ; the hon. gentleman can read that statement in the Toronto 'Mail and Empire.' Yes, the mission was a failure because the Canadian representative did not solicit advice from a foreign embassy. Of course, if under such tutelage the mission had been a success I am sure that the hon. gentleman and those who support him would have said that the success was due to the foreign ambassador, and if it had been a failure how would the Canadian representative have been received on his return ? No, Mr. Speaker, I simply did my duty. I went to the British ambassador, I solicited and accepted his advice, and I may say that I not only received his advice but also the full support of the British government, and I claim that if I have succeeded in settling this vexed question, it is because I received the support of Great Britain and the help of her ambassador at Tokio. When I am told that the mission has been a failure I am amazed, because, knowing Sir Claud Macdonald, the British ambassador, as I know him, knowing what his reputation is in the far east, occupying the high and exalted position that he does occupy, I am amazed, I say it again, at the assertion made. Sir, I not only had his help but I also received, after the negotiations were completed, his sincerest congratulations. I know that Sir Claude Macdonald has commended the agreement that was arrived at as the best that could be obtained under the circumstances, an agreement which did credit to the Dominion government and the Japanese government as well. With the authority of Sir Claude Macdonald I may very well let these insinuations of the Toronto 'Mail' pass. Sir, with the British ambassador at my elbow and knowing what I know of all the features of this agreement, I can announce to the country that the question of Japanese immigration is finally settled. We have restored order, peace and harmony in the province of British Columbia, and we have succeeded in removing from our national parliament a vexed question which if discussed and disposed of in the spirit that hon. gentlemen opposite would deal with it, might perhaps in a day which is not far distant draw not only Canada but Great Britain herself into international entanglements. We know that such is not the wish of the fair-minded Canadian people, and, Sir, I believe I am not mistaken when I say that my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has let the golden opportunity pass in not taking on this great issue the imperial stand taken by his predecessors, Sir John Macdonald, Sir John Abbott, Sir John Thompson and Sir Charles Tupper with regard to other international questions of a like nature.

House divided on the amendment.—(Mr. R. L. Borden).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lake,
Ames,	Lefurgey,
Armstrong,	Lennox,
Barker,	Macdonell,
Barr,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Beattie,	Marshall,
Bennett,	Morin,
Bergeron,	Owen,
Blain,	Perley,
Borden (Carleton),	Pringle,
Brabazon,	Reid (Grenville),
Bristol,	Roche (Marquette),
Broder,	Schaffner,
Chisholm (Huron),	Sproule,
Cockshutt,	Stansfield,
Crocket,	Staples,
Daniel,	Taylor,
Elson,	Walsh (Huntingdon),
Foster,	Ward,
Ganong,	Wilmot,
Herron,	Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Hughes (Victoria),	
Jackson (Elgin),	Wright (Muskoka)—45.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Archambault,	Lavergne (Drummond & Arth.),
Aylesworth,	
Beauparlant,	Lavergne (Montmagny),
Beland,	
Black,	Law,
Bourbonnais,	LeBlanc.
Boyer,	Lemieux,
Brodeur,	Logan,
Brown,	Loggie,
Bureau,	Maclean (Lunenburg),
Burrows,	Macpherson,
Calvert,	McCarthy (Simcoe),
Carney,	McColl,
Caron,	McCraney,
Carrier,	McIntyre (Perth),
Carvell,	McIntyre (Strathcona),
Cash,	
Chisholm (Antigonish),	McKenzie,
	McLennan,
Clarke,	Marcile (Bagot),
Conmee,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Copp,	
Crawford,	Martin (Wellington),
Cyr,	Mayrand,
Delisle,	Michaud,
Demers,	Miller,
Desjardins,	Paterson,
Devlin,	Pickup,
Dubeau,	Pugsley,
Dugas,	Ratz,
Emmerson,	Reid (Restigouche),
Ethier,	Rivet,
Fielding,	Robitaille,
Finlayson,	Roche (Halifax),
Fisher,	Ross (Rimouski),
Galliher,	Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Gervais,	Rousseau,

Gladu,
Graham,
Guthrie,
Harty,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Savoie,
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Talbot,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turcotte,
Turgeon,
Verville,
Walsh (Montreal, St. Anne),
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—100

PAIRS :

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Telford,	Tisdale,
Parmelee,	Worthington,
German,	MacLaren,
McLean (York, C.),	Martin (Queens, P.E.I.),
Gordon,	Kemp,
McCool,	Christie,
Grant,	Boyce,
Oliver,	Monk,
Schell (Glengarry),	Lancaster,
Greenway,	White,
Meigs,	Henderson,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Northrup,
Sifton,	Haggart,
Dyment,	Maclean (York, S.),
Watson,	Seagram,
Pardee.	Osler,
Stewart,	Porter,
Ross (Cape Breton),	Avery,
Bickerdike,	Leonard,
Power,	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Caldwell,	Clare,
Hall,	Lalor,
Wilson (Russell),	Clements,
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Forget,
Proulx,	Paquet,
Turriff,	Lewis,
Finlay.	Thompson.

Amendment (Mr. R. L. Borden), negatived, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 3.05 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 29, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. CLARKE moved that the third report of the Public Accounts Committee be concurred in.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I would suggest, although it is not in accordance with the usual practice, that when the Public Accounts Committee are in session, and have not concluded the matter in hand at the hour of adjournment in the morning, they have the discretion, on the vote of the majority of the committee and with the concurrence of the chairman, to sit in the afternoon while this House is in session, without being obliged to ask permission of the House on each occasion for one day only as is done in this report. Witnesses are obliged to appear before that committee, sometimes at great trouble and expense to themselves, and they may be obliged to wait here for several days, or perhaps having almost completed their evidence, owing to succeeding meetings of the committee being assigned to other subjects they may be obliged to return to Ottawa ten days or two weeks later.

Mr. FIELDING. Is it not generally expedient that committees should sit while the House is in session ? To make a general rule contemplating such sittings might be open to objection. The present system is that the permission of the House should be obtained.

Mr. BENNETT. This would be only arranged in the morning with the consent of the chairman.

Mr. FIELDING. It is generally considered not good practice.

Mr. BENNETT. I may have to bring in a motion on it.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS—FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 86) to incorporate the Northern Empire Railway Company.—Mr. Caron.

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company. —Mr. Sloan.

QUESTIONS.

CUSTOMS DUES ON FRENCH BOOKS.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE asked : (Translation.)

1. What are the customs dues on French books imported into Canada ?
2. Will the new French treaty cause a reduction in the duty on books ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. The customs duty on books in the French language, under item 171 of the tariff of 1907, when imported from France into Canada, is 10 per cent ad valorem.
2. The duty on these books, as specified in schedule 'C' of the new convention with France, is 5 per cent ad valorem.

BEAR RIVER DWELLING HOUSE.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN—by Mr. Lefurgey—asked :

1. Who were the tenderers for the dwelling house for the station master at Bear River, Prince Edward Island, and what was the amount of each tender?
2. Whose tender was accepted?
3. What is the total expenditure to date?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

1.

F. S. MacDonald, Souris.. .. ..$1,295
James G. McLellan, Hermanville.... 1,373
McLean Brothers, North Wiltshire.. 1,440

2. F. S. MacDonald.
3. $1,507.99.

Note.—The difference between the amount expended for dwelling for station master, and the amount of contract is for land purchased, legal expenses, advertising and miscellaneous expenses.

HOME GUARDS AND SCRIPS.

Mr. BARR asked :

Have the Home Guards, who did service in the Northwest Territorier in 1885, the right to scrip for said services?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). No. Section 1 (a) of the Act of June 2, 1886, makes provision for the issue of scrip to 'every officer, non-commissioned officer and man of any irregular force raised by authority and actively engaged and bearing arms in the suppression of the said outbreak, other than a home guard for the protection of property at or near their place of residence.'

MARCONI STATION, GLACE BAY.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE asked :

1. Is the Marconi wireless telegraph station at Glace Bay at present in operation? If so, since when?
2. How many messages have been sent and received at that station?
3. How many messages have been received from and sent to Europe?
4. Has there been an interruption of service since the establishment of the station at Glace Bay?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). As the government has no official knowledge that the wireless station in Glace Bay is in operation other than that appearing in the press, the following questions were submitted to the Marconi Company, to which they have replied as follows :

1. Yes. The Marconi wireless telegraph station at Glace Bay is at present in operation. Wireless messages have been exchanged between Glace Bay and the company's station in England for a long time past, but work of a commercial nature was established on October 17 last and has continued since that date. The service has so far been confined to the exchange of press despatches and messages on both sides of the Atlantic. It is expected that the scope of service will shortly be extended to the transmission of ordinary commercial messages as well as press despatches.

2. The number of messages daily sometimes contain several thousand words a day, sometimes less, according to the business transacted.

3. Same answer as to No. 2.

4. The land wire connections have, in one or two occasions, been interrupted by storms, and the service at such times was slightly delayed. Except for delays of this nature, however, there have been no interruptions in the service.

JAPANESE SYNDICATE—PURCHASE OF LAND IN ALBERTA.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE asked : (Translation.)

1. Is the government aware that a Japanese syndicate intends acquiring land in Alberta in order to settle colonists there ?
2. If so, what stand does the government propose taking in regard to such syndicate ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Members of the government have seen in the press a report to the effect mentioned, but the government has no other knowledge of the alleged syndicate.
2. In default of other information the government has no announcement to make.

MR. J. E. MARIER AND THE TRANSCONTINENTAL COMMISSION.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE asked : (Translation.)

1. Is Mr. J. E. Marier in the employ of the Transcontinental Commission ?
2. If so, since when and at what salary ?
3. On whose recommendation was he appointed ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

1. Yes.
2. January 8, 1908. Salary, $45 a month.
3. On the responsibility of the Commission.

BUTTER AND CHEESE EXPORTS.

Mr. MORIN asked :

1. How many pounds of butter and cheese each of the product of the province of Quebec were exported in 1907?
2. What prices did it realize?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I regret that the department is unable to answer this question. The Trade and Navigations tables do not show the place of origin of Canadian products exported nor the prices realized for such products.

NIAGARA CAMP, 1907.

Mr. NORTHRUP asked :

1. How many troops were transported for annual drill in 1907, to and from Niagara camp?
2. What were the various starting points, and the number of troops in each case?
3. What was the amount paid to each transportation company, by land or water, for such transportation, and the date of payment in each case?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence) :

1. 5,418 officers, non-commissioned officers and men.
2.

Starting point.	No. of officers, N.C.O.'s and men.
Toronto	1,188
Hamilton	63
Brampton	103
Aurora	136
London	161
Courtwright	64
Kingsville	71
St. Catharines	95
St. Ann's	70
Burford	72
Welland	70
Barrie	149
Oakville	72
Riverside	39
Seaton Village	36
Newmarket	34
Toronto Junction	37
Parkdale	37
Weston	38
Milton	31
Oakville	37
Stewarton	13
Georgetown	28
Campbellville	26
Burlington	34
Acton	34
Hornby	34
Parry Sound	52
Kearney	23
Sundridge	19
Loring	25
Callender	24
Powassen	22
North Bay	30
McKeller	22
Owen Sound	160
Meaford	38
Durham	22
Flesherton	28
Clarksburg	16
Whitby	65
Greenwood	39
Oshawa	39
Beaverton	23
Uxbridge	27
Brooklin	42
Cannington	26
Brechin	13
Collingwood	35
Orillia	58
Vespra	18
Elmvale	35
Penetanguishene	31
Port Credit	31
Cookstown	23
Albion	38
Bradford	25
Alliston	24
Shelburne	34
Orangeville	27
York	46
Cayuga	25
Caledonia	58
Hagarsville	70
Dunnville	41
Oshweken	32
Simcoe	69
Hartford	30
Wallingham Centre	21
Kingslake	39
Waterford	22
Fairground	25
Delhi	25
Niagara Falls	89
Beamsville	26
Thorold	24
Fort Erie	41
Welland	38
Niagara-on-the-Lake	14
Grimsby	36
Dundas	41
Watertown	19
Binbrook	39
Ancaster	32
Stoney Creek	38
North Glanford	31
Rockton	42
Freelton	16
	4,935

There is no information available as to the respective starting points of the following :

	No. of officers, N.C.O.'s and men.
*Quartermaster parties	236
*Bands	221
3rd, 4th, 5th Infantry Brigade Staffs	12
Corps of Guides	9
Signalling Section	5
	483

* These were drawn from the various company quarters, so many from each headquarters.

3. The returns from the various railroads for land transport are not yet all in. The

Grand Trunk being the largest carrier. The water transport paid to date is as follows :

1907.

Aug. 1. To A. F. Webster, contractor for transport, 34th Regt., Whitby to Niagara and return.. .. .. $ 560 00

Dec. 2. A. F. Webster, agent Niagara Navigation Co., for transport of troops, horses and stores from Toronto to Niagara-on-the-Lake and return.. 4,702 82

TREATY OF WASHINGTON—BEHRING SEA COMMISSION.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What was the time occupied by the negotiations at Washington in 1887?

2. What was the duration of the Behring Sea Commission at Paris and London in 1892-1893?

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

1. From 22nd of November, 1887, to 15th of February, 1888.

2. The duration of the Behring Sea Commission was from 23rd of February to the 15th of August, 1893.

MILITIA—BOARD OF OFFICERS.

Mr. MACDONELL asked :

1. Has the board of officers appointed by the Minister of Militia on July 16, 1907, to consider and report upon certain questions in regard to pay and allowance of the permanent force and active militia, held any sittings? If so, when, and where, and was any opportunity given to the members of the permanent force and militia to attend and state their case?

2. Is it the intention of the said board to hold sittings throughout the country?

3. Is it the intention of the board to afford members of the two forces above mentioned an opportunity to attend such sittings and be heard?

4. What is the general scope, object and purport of the said inquiry?

5. Is the question of an increase of pay and a more equitable adjustment of the present pay system to be considered and reported upon?

6. Will the report when made be laid on the table of the House, and distributed?

Hon. Sir F. W. BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence) :

1. Yes, on 9th and 10th August, 1907, at Petawawa camp. All ranks, officers, non-commissioned officers and men of units in camp were notified that the board would be pleased to hear their views, and a large number of officers, non-commissioned officers and men attended and were given every opportunity of stating their views. In addition to this, officers commanding commands were notified by letter on 19th July, 1907, that this board would meet, and requested to bring the matter to the notice of the officers commanding units of the permanent force, in order that a comprehensive expression of opinion on the subject of pay and allowances might be presented to the board. In addition to the above several informal meetings have been held at the department.

2. If found desirable, further meetings may be held at militia centres.

3. Has already been done. If further meetings are held every opportunity will be given.

4. (a) To consider all questions of pay and allowances of permanent force.

(b) Removal of anomalies in certain cases existing rates of pay.

(c) Consideration of allowance in consequence of increased cost of living.

(d) General consideration of any needed revision of present regulations.

5. Not necessarily any increase of pay ; possible reductions in some cases.

6. Report will be submitted to the minister, and any changes decided upon will be submitted for the approval of His Excellency in council before promulgation in Militia Orders.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—FRUIT AND DAIRY DIVISIONS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Is the government aware that the fruit men of Canada are in favour of having the fruit division of the Department of Agriculture separated from the dairy division?

2. Has the government any intention of separating these two named divisions?

3. What reason, if any, does the government give for not separating the above named divisions?

4. Has a government weigher been appointed at Montreal?

5. If not, is it the intention of this government to appoint such an official?

6. If it is not the intention to appoint such an officer, what reason, if any, does the government give for not making such an appointment?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. The fruit division and the dairy division are separate and distinct, stand in exactly the same relation to each other, and with the markets division and the cold storage division compose a branch of the department of Agriculture under the administration of the dairy cold storage commissioner. Some time ago the Minister of Agriculture was requested by some fruit men to alter the status of the fruit division to that of a branch of the department but the government is of the opinion that the fruit men of Canada as a whole are satisfied with the present arrangement.

2. The two divisions are separate now. The government does not contemplate any change in the present arrangement.

3. The work of the four divisions above named is so closely related and overlaps to such an extent that the present arrangement promotes efficiency and economy and is generally satisfactory.

4. A weighmaster has been appointed under the Inspection and Sale Act but his powers are confined to grain. No weigher of dairy products has been appointed by the government.

5. It is not the intention of the government to appoint a weigher of dairy products unless there is a greater need for the appointment than there appears at present.

6. The government does not consider that the conditions of the dairy produce trade are such as to warrant it in causing the necessary legislation to be passed to enable it to make such an appointment.

HOMESTEAD ENTRY.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. When and to whom was homestead entry for the southwest quarter-section, 16-28-1, west 3rd meridian, granted?

2. Has patent been issued for this land? If so, what were the dates of the recommendation for issue of the patent and of the patent itself?

3. What duties had been performed at the date of the recommendation?

4. Were there any considerations of any kind other than the performance of homestead duties for the issue of the patent?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Homesteaded on the 25th April, 1905. To William B. F. Whitesides.

2. Patent has not yet been issued. No recommendation for patent issued.

3. The following improvements are claimed :—15½ acres broken and cropped ; a house, 14 by 16 ; a stable, 14 by 16 ; a well; also six months residence from the first of June, 1905, to the first of December following. Some losses were sustained from prairie fire, and on the 19th July, 1906, the homestead inspector reported : a lumber house 12 by 12, $40. 10 acres cropped.

4. On representations that after a long illness the health of the homesteader was such as to require his removal to a milder climate he was permitted to purchase at $3 an acre.

CATTLE EMBARGO IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What action, if any, has been taken by this government since 1896 which would have for its object the removal of the cattle embargo placed upon Canadian cattle entering Great Britain?

2. Is the government aware that a resolution was passed some years ago by the Committee on Agriculture, which requested that the Minister of Agriculture of the Dominion should invite the ministers of the different provinces in the Dominion to form themselves into a committee, whose object was to lay before the government of Great Britain the importance of removing the cattle embargo?

3. If any efforts have been made by the Minister of Agriculture to comply with the wishes of the above-named committee so expressed, when will a report of the same be given to the House, and if no efforts have been so made, what reason, if any, does the government assign for not taking action in the matter?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The answer to this must be in the form of a return. The correspondence and papers to be brought down by a return will answer this question, but I wish to state that already such correspondence and papers have been laid on the table of the House up to the 19th of March, 1903. I would therefore ask that the hon. gentleman put his question in the form of a notice of motion for a return, amended so as to include only correspondence and papers since the 19th of March, 1903. I will then be very glad to facilitate the bringing down of the return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion, as amended for a return.

APPLICATIONS TO CUT TIMBER.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

Who were the twenty-one applicants who were refused permission as granted by order in council, passed on May 16, 1906, for sawmill owners to cut timber?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

Northwest Lumber Company, William D. Dutton, Blain & McKelvey, L. S. Caverly, M. Otterbine, Wm. C. Caverly, James W. Kelly, Murdock McKinley, Honoré Therien, James A. Powell, Jean Couture, James Larose, W. H. Bell, E. R. Brill, John McDonald, Alex. Bernier, Joseph Peter, Francis De Rocher, Guilbault Brothers, Henry Clemes, Wm. O. Bates.

MINISTERIAL TRAVELLING EXPENSES.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked :

1. Who accompanied Sir William Mulock to Australia in the year 1901, to be present at the opening of the Australian parliament?

2. What was the amount of travelling, living and other expenses in connection with his mission?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. The only persons who accompanied him officially were his private secretary and a messenger.

2. $6,900.

LAND PATENT OF JOSEPH LITTLE.

Mr. HERRON asked :

1. Has the patent been issued for the south-east quarter of section 2, township 8, range 4, west of the fifth meridian?
2. If so, what was the date of the issue of said patent?
3. What was the date of the recommendation of patent, and to whom?
4. Is the government aware that a portion of the said quarter-section has been used as a graveyard for upwards of three years?
5. In the issue of the said patent, what reservations, if any, were made?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Patent has been issued for the E. ½ of the S. E. ¼ of Section 2, Township 8, Range 4, west 5th meridian ; no patent has been issued for the W. ½ of this quarter-section.
2. 23rd October, 1907.
3. 30th September, 1907, Joseph Little.
4. The government had been informed that a portion of the said quarter-section had been used as a graveyard and was prepared to withhold this area from patent to Little on receipt of description from the interested parties. In default of such description the patent was issued without such reservation, but on the department learning that the reserve was still desired a caveat was filed against the patent, and steps are now being taken to adjust the matter so as to provide the desired reservation.
5. The usual reservations,—navigable waters, mines and minerals, the rights of fishery and fishing, and proviso under the Irrigation Act.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS IN THE BRITISH ISLANDS.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked :

1. Has the government of Canada any special immigration agent or agents in the British islands?
2. If so, what are their respective names, and from what parts of Canada do they come?
3. What arrangements were made by the government with the said agent or agents as to salary and expenses?
4. What is the date of their respective appointments, and at what time did they leave this country to take up their work?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I would ask the hon. gentleman to let this stand as a motion for a return, as the information is quite voluminous.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Once before this session the Minister of the Interior answered a question put by myself as to the agents in Great Britain, giving their names, salaries and expenses, and the answer to this question would not I think be as long as that was.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all orders in council, correspondence, evidence, memoranda and other documents and papers of every description relating to or touching the conduct of all persons who have acted as public administrator in the Yukon Territory, or who have had charge or control by reason of their official position, of the estate of deceased persons in the Yukon Territory. And a copy of all such documents and papers aforesaid as set forth and describe the action, if any, of the government in respect of any claims, charges or proposed proceedings against any such official in respect of his duties, acts or dealings as public administrator.—Mr. Lennox.

For a copy of all correpondence, telegrams, memoranda and reports, between the government and its officers and solicitors and the provincial or territorial governments, in regard to the cases taken to test the liability for taxation of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the cases Rural Municipality of North Cypress vs. Canadian Pacific Railway; Rural Municipality of Argyle vs. Canadian Pacific Railway; Springdale School District vs. Canadian Pacific Railway; together with copies of all judgments of the courts before whom the cases were tried, and of the refusal of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of the application for leave to appeal to that court.—Mr. Lake.

For a return showing (a) a statement of all public buildings or other public works built or initiated by the present government since 1896, (b) the original estimated cost of thereof, and (c) the actual cost of same.—Mr. Boyce.

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, or reports, respecting the refusal of the Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia to give his assent to a Bill passed by the legislature of that province in 1907, respecting immigration and commonly referred to as the Natal Act.—Mr. Ralph Smith.

For a return showing the expenditure directly and indirectly for dredging in the St. Lawrence river and Montreal harbour from 1896 to 1907; the expenditure by the government from 1896 to 1907 in building docks at the harbour of Montreal; and the expenditure by the government in building elevators at the harbour of Montreal from 1896 to 1907.—Mr. Schaffner.

For a copy of all applications, tenders, correspondence, telegrams, or written communications of any kind, in connection with the sale of certain lands in the Ocean Man, Pheasat Rump, and Chasastapasin Indian reserves, on November 15, 1901; together with a copy of advertisements of sales, the names of the newspapers in which they were inserted, and the dates of insertion.—Mr. Lake.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and petitions, in possession of the government, or any member or official thereof, respecting the dismissal of Mrs. Mary Finlay as postmistress at the head of St. Peter's bay, and the appointment of her successor.—Mr. A. Martin (Queens).

For a copy of all reports, plans, specifications, tenders, correspondence, telegrams, and

all other papers, documents, and other information in connection with the construction of the Hillsborough bridge and approaches, including land purchases necessary therefor.—Mr. Lefurgey.

For a copy of all orders in council now in force with respect to immigration from every country from which immigrants come to Canada. Also a copy of all circulars issued at the present time with reference to immigration—Mr. Uriah Wilson.

For a copy of all correspondence, applications, recommendations for patent, and all papers in any way relating to the disposal of or granting of privileges in connection with the southeast quarter of section 2, township 8, range 4, west of the fifth meridian—Mr. Herron.

For a return showing to whom, and when, the National Transcontinental Railway Commission awarded contracts for the transportation of supplies on district 'E,' between the following points, namely:—(a) Grassett to Cache 9, (b) Montizambert to New Cache 9a on Negogami river, (c) Jackfish to Caches 10, 11a and 12, (d) Nipigon to Caches 12a, 13, 14, 15, Ombabika and Wabinosh warehouses and Cache 16, on district 'F'; the distances in each contract, the contract rate and terms; the amounts that have been paid to date on each contract; who erected the cache and dwelling house at the line crossing on Kebinakagami river, also the new buildings at line crossing of Negogami river, and the warehouse at Jackfish; the cost of these buildings respectively; and if tenders were invited for above transportation and building contracts.—Mr. Boyce.

PUBLIC WORKS—PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P.E.I.) moved for:

A return showing the total expenditure by the Department of Public Works in Prince Edward Island over the following periods: 1873 to 1878; 1878 to 1896; 1896 to 1907; and the total expenditure by the Public Works Department in Prince county over periods 1873 to 1878; 1878 to 1882; 1882 to 1887; 1887 to 1891; 1891 to 1896; 1896 to 1900; 1900 to 1907, respectively.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.) moved in amendment that the following words be added thereto:

And the expenditures by the Public Works Department in the counties of Queens and Kings for the years and the periods of years above mentioned.

Also the total expenditures in said province by the Post Office Department, the Department of Railways and Canals, and the Department of Militia and Defence. And further, the total expenditure by the Department of Marine and Fisheries including the development, propagation and preservation of the fisheries, and in the maintenance of winter communication across the Northumberland straits, for the years and periods of years above referred to.

Mr. U. WILSON.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I would call the attention of the First Minister and the leader of the opposition to the number of returns called for, involving a good deal of useless labour. This return simply calls for the total expenditure by the Department of Public Works in Prince Edward Island during certain years. There is nothing to prevent any hon. gentleman from going through the report and adding up the figures for himself. I have just had placed in my hand a return in response to a motion made by the leader of the opposition last session, asking for many things in connection with the St. Andrews rapids. This return covers a thousand type written pages, and I can assure my hon. friend that we have not in the department a staff to prepare the returns in any thing like the time in which the hon. gentleman would be likely to find them of much use during the present session.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It has been the practice with a number of ministers to communicate with any member, who has moved for a return which might seem to involve an oppressive amount of work in any particular department. The right hon. the First Minister this session called my attention to a return which I moved for from the Department of Railways and Canals, and in reply to his communication I at once eliminated a very considerable portion of it and asked that the balance might be brought down, leaving the rest an open question. I am quite sure that any hon. member would be prepared to take a similar course in any particular case. Over and over again in returns brought down, there have been a number of formal documents absolutely of no use whatever. In connection with the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, there is in the return some one hundred to a hundred and fifty pages taken up with notices of absolutely the same character sent out to individual settlers. Of course in framing these motions for returns, it is necessary to make them comprehensive in order that they may cover all the documents required in the public interest, and they must necessarily include a number of documents of no possible service. In any case of that kind, I shall be most happy to take the matter into consideration and endeavour as much as possible to facilitate the work of the department. Our object is to obtain information and not impose unnecessary work. As regards the return respecting the St. Andrew's rapids, I have no doubt that if my attention had been called to it, I would have been able, without any detriment to the public interest, to lighten considerably the work of the clerks in the department. As regards the return now ordered, it is for the purpose of obtaining an efficient and authoritative computation of certain expenditure covering a

series of years. The accuracy of such a computation cannot be questioned, but the accuracy might be questioned of a computation made by the proper officials. Therefore it has been the practice to ask for these computations, which cannot be obtained by any hon. member from the public returns without considerable labour. I am inclined to think that the practice, while it is open to abuse, is of some service, as many of us owing to the long hours devoted to the session and the work of the committees, are unable to make these computations ourselves. But in the present instance, the amendment calling for additional information is moved by one of the hon. gentleman opposite.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no objection whatever to the motion passing, but I wish to impress upon the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite that the chief accountant has informed me that it is utterly impossible within a reasonable time to prepare and have submitted to the House the large number of very voluminous returns called for.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) will notice that this very considerable amendment comes from his own side of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I observe that. That is the difficulty about it.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE REMOVAL OF CROPS.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). moved :

For copies of all papers, representations, memorials, and correspondence had with the Minister of Finance or any other member of the government in reference to the proposed action of the government through or in conjunction with the banks, to facilitate in a financial way the movements of grain from western provinces of Canada.

He said : This motion has stood on the Order Paper for a long time. After some communication with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) at various times, and again to-day, I think that probably it will be well to get the matter out of the way. Before, or about, the time the House met in November, there had been rumours, some appearing in the public press, of an abnormal condition of things in the west in the movement of the grain ; and more or less definite statements were made concerning the inability of the ordinary banking and financial machinery to move the grain speedily, to prevent as much as possible of loss. Other considerations, of course, came into the case. The year was an abnormal one in respect of the quality of the crop, and consequently a good deal of the grain graded below what may be called the commercial standards. If I remember well, it was chiefly with regard to the marketing of these lower grades of grain that this assistance by the government had been proposed. The banks seemed quite able to make arrangements for the transport of the commercial grades of grain, as these commanded a ready sale, and when deposited in elevators, were subject to bills of lading and other negotiable instruments and the delay between the shipment and the return was not very great. But as to the lower qualities of grain, these did not command a ready sale, there being some question as to whether they would keep for a sufficient length of time to render an investment in them reasonably safe. Rumours gained circulation that deputations had come down from the west and that there had been pourparlers with the Minister of Finance or the government, and that, in some way, the government would come to the rescue with reference to these low-grade grain products particularly. A question immediately arose as to the real efficiency of this aid if granted—that is, would it reach its objective point and relieve the primary seller of the article ? The danger was recognized that the advantage might inure mainly to the middleman. Of course, the sympathy of the country was with the farmer who produced the article, and so it became a matter of some moment, that, if any relief were granted, the benefit should inure to the farmer primarily and chiefly. The returns of the banks and the government, which are given regularly to the country, did not show that any surplus money remained with the government to be devoted to this object, nor did they show that any extraordinary means had been taken by the government by which the necessary amount of money—said to be $3,000,000 or $4,000,000—had been raised or could be made available. Later, however, it did transpire, I think through the returns, that there has been some changes in some items of these returns which indicated a method by which the government might have made some provision for this object. Numerous inquiries were made across the floor of the House, and the Minister of Finance, as he had a perfect right to do, asked, from time to time, that explanations might be deferred. I acceded to these requests, and so did other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, out of regard for the interests involved. However, in view of the inference to which the returns point, I think the matter assumes a somewhat grave aspect. It is a serious thing for the government to interfere in the general financial and banking arrangements of the country. Certainly, such a step should not be taken except for the very strongest reasons. The grave consequences which may result from such interference has been not inaptly shown in the United States of America. We remember that, at the time of the banking crisis, some few weeks ago extraordinary mea-

sures of relief were devised by the United States Treasury by the sale of Panama canal bonds and the distribution of the government surplus amongst the banks. For the time being, that may have had its effect ; but it is an open question, so far as I have followed the controversy, whether, in the end, there was a noticeable balance of good from the temporary and artificial remedy which the United States sought to apply. I know that this matter has been very keenly canvassed, and that some of the best opinion in the United States is expressed in favour of the view that the situation would not have been made worse even if this extraordinary fillip had not been given by the United States treasury.

However, that is a matter which I think is most delicate and involves great responsibility for the government as a government to interpose itself at all between the business of the country and the recognized, and official, and systematic machinery which it has for carrying on those affairs. Now, the Finance Minister evidently has interfered, and if it proves in the end that he has interfered in this matter, it will be incumbent upon him to show that the crisis was a sufficiently grave one to authorize him to intrude in the matter, and if it transpires that the minister has had to act contrary to the laws of the country and thereby has put himself in the position of being obliged to this parliament for indemnification, so to speak, then I think that as parliament has been here present during the whole of this crisis and during nearly the whole of these negotiations, it was the part of the Finance Minister to have taken parliament into his confidence in that respect, and thrown himself, as he will after this have to throw himself, upon the good will and support of parliament in the way of indemnification. So, if that has been done, and if that were the only method by which it could have been done, the minister could have gone that far and taken parliament into his confidence without at the same time making any revelation which would necessarily have interfered with the carrying out of his project; only there would have been an entente cordiale, which is now a very favourite term, between the Finance Minister and the representatives of the people, instead of the reticence, which I do not think was altogether necessary, although the Finance Minister may be able to give reasons therefor.

One of the difficulties that obtruded itself early was the difficulty to which I have adverted, that is, the channel that was to be chosen for the distribution of this relief, and the point of the relief. It had been rumoured in the papers that certain influential friends of the government from the Northwest and certain friends who had large interests in the transport of grain, or the purchase of grain in the Northwest, were especially prominent in pressing upon the government the queston of aiding transportation, and there were indications of their having been, as they thought, partially or altogether successful in winning the government to their side of the case, and there were indications that it was noised abroad in a way which would ennure to the benefit of the government and of the party which supports the government. Now, of course, if that was done, it was an improper thing, in a financial crisis of this kind. The government can only be justified in coming to the aid of interests which are menaced on the ground of public benefit, and above all things the party consideration and colouring should be entirely left off. So the matter having gone on until this time, and by the statement of the minister himself the fact having been ascertained that the aid has been given, and the added fact that there was a certain way in which that aid might have been given, I think the time has come when I had better move this motion and press for the correspondence and these papers. If the minister thinks that it is not yet quite time to have these brought down, he can state his reason, and if the reasons commend themselves to the House, I am sure this side of the House will be reasonable as to the time in which they should make their appearance. But I do not think it is premature now to move the motion and get whatever statement we may get from the Minister of Finance, with the assurance that I hope he will be prepared to make, that the papers will be brought down at an early period.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). There is no objection to passing the motion at the present time. I have intimated to my hon. friend that though the motion may pass to-day, there may be a few days delay in bringing down the papers. There is very little in his remarks to-day to which I can take exception. Indeed the only thing I would care to object to is his allusion to some party advantage that was thought possible by some individuals in this matter. Of course it is not possible to discuss this matter fully in the absence of the information. But I hasten to give my hon. friend the assurance that from beginning to end there was no party interest and no party consideration involved in any shape or form. Whatever was done was done under the belief that there was a very serious condition of affairs in the country, and the aid was given in the way that seemed to be the most convenient and desirable. I did feel, at a time of considerable financial stringency when all our financial institutions were strained to the utmost, that it would have been unwise to precipitate a discussion of this matter which would have led almost unavoidably to a

discussion of the financial position generally. At an early stage of the session I suggested to my hon. friend opposite that I thought it might be well to delay his motion for a little while, and I am glad to see that, although here and there there was some general reference to the financial situation, that particular matter was held aside, for which I desire to express my appreciation. I will endeavour to bring down the papers at an early date; I trust they will soon be down, and very likely a measure will have to be submitted to the House dealing with the subject, as I have already intimated. I will see that with the least possible delay the information is brought down, and in the meantime I do not think it would be wise to make any further remarks.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I wish to make a few observations on this subject, because I think it a proper time to do so. We have been passing through a somewhat stringent financial era in Canada, from the effects of which most individuals and corporations have suffered considerably, and it naturally suggests to one's mind the relationship of government to banks, and especially to the Department of Finance, which above all others is more intimately connected with the finances of the country. It suggests as well the question: What accounts for the financial stringency through which we are passing, and in addition to that the other question, what are banks for? What are their duties to the people, what are their functions, are they properly discharging their duties to the people, and are they carrying out the legitimate functions of banking in a way to promote the interests of the people and of the state? What is the relation of governments to the banks? What should be the relationship as between the banks and the toiler and earner? They have a duty to the one and a duty to the other. What position are they holding with regard to both? Now, in the first place, I ask the question: What are the banks for? We incorprate banks and give them important and extensive rights and powers. Is that not done in order that they may provide a medium of exchange to enable the people to carry on the trade and commerce of the country, and that they may afford a place of safe-keeping for the accumulated earnings of the people where those who are able to make and save money, but who are not financiers and therefore cannot invest it so as to be sure of a fair rate of interest and the preservation of their capital, may deposit their savings and receive a fair return in interest upon them? One function which the banks should in my judgment perform has been sadly neglected by them. Where a branch of a chartered bank is started in a community it receives deposits, the accumulated savings of the people in the district. Surely this capital should be available for the use of the people in the district who are engaged in industrial enterprises, to enable the carrying on of industry and the employment of labour. But, that is not usually done; instead of that we see that a demand is made upon the branches by the head office, to send these deposits to the head office at Toronto or Montreal or Winnipeg. Then where does the money go? There is a demand for call loans on Wall street and as there is a tempting offer of a high rate of interest on these call loans the accumulated earnings of the people of that locality are transferred to Wall street and placed out on call. Thus there is not sufficient money available for the wants of the people in the small locality, and the banks that should be charged with the responsibility of providing the circulating medium, although they have received the accumulated earnings of the people, cannot provide funds to pay the wages of workmen and to carry on the industry of the locality. We are accustomed to say that our banking system is superior to that of the United States, that it is more stable and safer; and possibly it may be, but in this respect the banks of the United States are superior to ours and endeavour as far as possible to meet the demands of industry in their localities.

The chartered banks ought to be prepared to furnish a circulating medium on fair and reasonable security. They should not at all times demand and accept nothing but the very highest and most gilt edged security. There is much which represents security which is not composed of lands or stocks or mortgages; there is the integrity, industry and economy of the individual, his reputation in a locality, as an honest and faithful man who desires to pay his debts; and these assets of the individual should be available in the way of security to the banks and on them they should be prepared to supply him to a reasonable extent with the medium of exchange in the hour of need. Why is it that to-day the private banks of our country are found to be of much more service in many localities than the chartered banks? It is because any honest man within a radius of several miles of a private bank, who desires from $25 to $100—and it is seldom more than that—can obtain it from the private banks upon his own security; whereas in a chartered bank he would be required to obtain an endorser or to give gilt-edged security of some other kind. The ordinary farmer does not want to get any one to endorse a note. I have in mind the case of a man who owned a farm of 200 acres with good buildings and not a dollar against it; he was practically out of debt, he did not owe $200; he was known to always pay his way promptly and yet a

chartered bank refused him a loan of $25 unless he got an endorser.

Are the chartered banks of the country discharging the proper functions of banks? Was it for such purposes as this that we gave them the rights which they enjoy under their charters and their power to issue paper money under which, by placing their stamp on a piece of paper which is not worth the one-hundredth part of a cent, they can sell it for $100 and earn interest on it for every day the money is in circulation? They should provide a medium of exchange upon fair and reasonable security.

The effect of the difference in method between the chartered and private banks is shown by the figures, and I am speaking of what I have frequently observed for the last five years or more. We find that in the rural districts for forty-seven to forty-nine per cent of the applicants for small loans are accommodated by private banks and would be refused by the chartered banks. Why? Because the borrower will not get an endorser and his security is not sufficiently stable to satisfy the chartered bank. The farmer does not offer sufficient security for the banks; the transaction is small and requires a great deal of bookkeeping; the banks will not give the accommodation, and therefore the farmer has to go to a private bank. I am within the mark when I say that forty-seven out of every fifty people in the rural districts and villages who are obliged to seek accommodation in this way go to the private banks instead of to the chartered banks, and although they have to pay a higher rate of interest they believe that it is the best thing for them to do. I therefore say that the chartered banks of the country are not fulfilling the conditions for which we have given them the extensive powers they possess. Now, the ordinary procedure of these chartered banks is to gather up the accumulated savings of the people in the local banks, then transfer them to the head office, and thence to Wall street or somewhere else where they can get high interest. What was the condition during the worst times of the recent financial stringency? It was not that there was not money enough in the banks, because the banks had all that was necessary to handle the grain in the Northwest five times over; but the fact is that the Canadian banks had over $63,000,000 invested in Wall street on call loans or otherwise. Suppose a crisis had taken place similar to that during the McKinley presidency when 450 of the American banks went down in a few months, what would have been the condition of the Canadian banks and what would it mean to Canada? And yet, such a crisis might have occurred and it undoubtedly would have occurred were it not for the action of President Roosevelt, and that Morgan and Rockefeller and other moneyed men come to their assistance and enabled the banks to tide over the emergency. But for that there would have been a financial crisis in the States that would have tried the financial standing of that country to an extent unparalleled in its history. And where would the $63,000,000 belonging to the Canadian banks be? Why did they call upon the Finance Minister, as was stated in the newspapers, to come to their aid and to provide some circulating medium to enable the grain dealers in the west to buy the grain and send it to the markets of the world. The very fact that $63,000,000 of the money of the people of Canada was not available at that time and was outside of the country, is an evidence that there is something wrong in our banking system. It indicates that parliament, and especially the government through its Finance Minister, should devise some means of controlling these banks so that we may not be confronted with a similar condition at any time in the future.

Mr. SCHELL (Glengarry). Has the hon. gentleman any basis for saying that $63,000,000 were invested outside the country? I understand that statement is entirely wrong.

Mr. SPROULE. I have taken my information from the Canada 'Gazette' and the daily papers of Montreal and Toronto and I believe it to be absolutely correct. If you ask a banker why he sends Canadian money out of the country he will tell you: We can lend our money in this way in larger amounts and have it available at any time; these are call loans and we are getting a larger rate of interest than we can at home; that is a legitimate part of our business and why should we not have the right to do it? But during the recent financial stringency were the New York banks ready to pay this money back to the Canadian banks if it was demanded? Not at all. They issued clearing house receipts instead of cash, and Canada could not get one dollar of that money at the time. This of course produced a stringency in Canada and that is why I say that the present system is improper. Now, let me ask what relationship there is between the banks and the Minister of Finance and his department. It is the duty of the Finance Minister to have supervision over these banks, to keep an eye on how they carry on their transactions, sometimes to come to their aid by distributing the money of the government amongst them so as to enable them to handle the cash of the government and profit by it. The Minister of Finance has a further important relationship to the banks, and it is to see that they provide a safe place for receiving the accumulated earnings of the people and give the people a fair interest in return. Let us inquire into how far the government has fulfilled this duty. Shortly after the Minister of Finance came to power

in 1897 he reduced the rate of interest in the Post Office savings bank and the government savings banks from three and a half to three per cent, and he gave it as a reason that this money should go into the coffers of the banks of the country, that as the government banks paid a higher rate of interest than the others the money was deposited in them, and I think he said he had done this at the request of the banks. Well, to my mind, the poor people of this country are entitled to the very greatest consideration in a matter of this kind. To induce them to deposit their savings it is the duty of the government to put a premium on their industry, frugality and economies, by paying them the very highest rate of interest. The Post Office and government savings banks afford them a safe deposit for their money. The people are not financiers and if they are induced to take risky investments there is a great danger of their losing their savings. Hence it is that the government should encourage them to frugality and thrift. I have before me a record which shows the deposits put in the government banking institution since 1897, when the Minister of Finance reduced the rate of interest.

In 1897 there was $32,000,000 in the Post Office Savings Bank and $16,554,000 in the government savings banks, making together $48,934,000 of the savings of the poor people of this country in the coffers under the control of the Finance Minister; because it is only those who have small amounts to invest who will avail themselves of the post office and government savings banks. The hon. Minister of Finance, by reducing the rate of interest, compelled these people to invest their money in the banks of the country, because he said we should teach the people to invest their money in the banks. I say that it is not a good or commendable system. Let us look at another phase of the question. Having regard to the accumulated interest not paid out, that sum of $48,934,000 has only been swelled by the sum of $13,606,000 in ten years. Why? Because of the reduction in the rate of interest from 3½ to 3 per cent. Had the deposits gone on at the same rate as before—and they would have gone on at a greater rate because of the good times we have had from 1897—instead of the addition to the deposits being only $13,000,000 it would have been over $60,000,000. Had the government that $60,000,000 in their possession to-day, would there have been need for the Finance Minister to peddle our credit all over Europe to raise money which he can only get by paying an exorbitant rate of interest. On $1,500,000 which he has overdrawn from the Bank of England he is paying 7 per cent, while he denies the right of the poor labourers of this country to greater interest than 3 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend; but a correct statement of that would be that by an engagement made many years ago overdrafts in the banks in London were to bear the current Bank of England rate, whatever it might be. The Bank of England rate was 7 per cent for a few weeks; but I am glad to say that we did not pay 7 per cent, though the contract with the bank would have justified it in claiming that rate; but we entered into negotiations, and the rate we paid was not 7 per cent, but only 6 per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. I took it from the public press that the Finance Minister stated in the House that he was paying 7 per cent, the Bank of England rate of interest.

Mr. FIELDING. That was the engagement.

Mr. SPROULE. Then he is paying the bank rate of interest now?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, but the bank rate to-day is not 6 per cent. I do not complain of the statement of my hon. friend. He was justified in making it, in view of my statement that the Bank of England rate was the rate that the bank was entitled to charge the government, but I said that regarding that as an excessive rate we entered into negotiations, and the rate agreed upon at the highest point was 6 per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. And 6 per cent is the rate now?

Mr. FIELDING. No. The Bank of England rate is 4 per cent, and that is the rate we now pay on any overdraft in England.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The rate for some time was 7 per cent, then it was reduced to 6, then to 5, then to 4.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, I think it stood for about six weeks at 7 per cent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When was the arrangement made to which the hon. minister refers?

Mr. FIELDING. I am not quite sure that it was covered by a written engagement. It was the understanding that prevailed in the Finance Department before I came in.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I was justified in basing my argument on the statement of the Finance Minister, which I took to be correct. He admits that that is the agreement, if the bank saw fit to enforce it.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, I ask what justification is there for the government borrowing money at 4½ per cent only a short time ago to renew a loan of $2,500,000 when they could have got that same money from the

poor people of Canada at 3½ per cent? I do not think there was any justification for it. I think it was their duty to allow the poor people of this country to take advantage of the situation and lend their money at the rate of interest the government is paying in England. It seems to me that would be a policy that would be very acceptable to the labouring man and it would be a good policy from a commercial point of view. It would be a profitable transaction carried out by a sharp and shrewd financier. I want to make another observation in regard to the action of the Finance Minister in reducing the rate of interest from 3½ to 3 per cent. I said he did it in order to induce the poor people to invest their savings in the banks of the country. If one of these people goes to a bank for some accommodation, what is he obliged to pay for it? According to the accounts of the annual meetings of the banks this winter, which I have gone over very carefully, these banks have paid dividends, some 10, some 11, some 12, some 13, some 15 and some 16 per cent for the year, upon the amount of money invested in their stock. In other words, we incorporate banks and give them great powers to handle money, to issue paper which is stamped as money and for which they get money in return, and loan it out at interest the next day after they get it if they have the opportunity, and give to these banks which ought to be for the benefit and use of the country, the power to force down the rate of interest allowed to the poor man to 3 per cent while they pay to their stockholders dividends of fifteen and sixteen per cent. Is that just to the poor man, or is it not discrimination in favour of the rich as against the poor? It may be due to custom that has prevailed from time immemorial; but I think that human ingenuity ought to be equal to devising some means for overcoming that discrimination and bringing about greater equality between the rich and the poor. While the poor man who puts his money into the bank is allowed only 3 per cent interest on it, these same banks charge him 7 or 8 per cent for any accommodation he gets. Our boasted banking system, while I admit that it is very good in many respects, is in other respects very defective. The Finance Minister has had to renew one loan for which he paid 4½ per cent interest. The loan was for $9,276,000. For the renewal or extension of that loan for three years, he has given to the holder the right to take permanent 3 per cent government bonds at the rate of $105 for every $100 loaned. That means that for the renewal of this loan, the government had to pay, over the amount of money they got, $868,000 as a bonus. They had to pay that amount for the renewal of this loan for the short space of three years. Not only are we paying the 3 per cent, but a bonus of $5 on every $100 besides. I have one other observation to make in this connection. We have been frequently told that the present government have brought good times to Canada, that Canada has gone on improving in wealth and industrial pursuits by leaps and bounds, that she is immensely richer than she was eleven years ago, and that her people are earning money at a rate they never did before.

Mr. PATERSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs says, hear, hear. Then I would ask him to explain this fact. In 1897, the first year the present government came to power, they had to renew a loan, and the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) was able to borrow the money at 2½ per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. No, the hon. gentleman is too kind. The rate of interest on our bonds is 2½ per cent, but they did not go at par. The rate is equivalent to 2·83 per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. At any rate it was under 3 per cent. But how is it that the government have not been able, during the last three or four years, to borrow at the same rate? Our wealth has gone on increasing steadily, according to these hon. gentlemen, yet we have to pay more interest when we want to borrow. That is exactly the reverse of what happens in the case of an individual. According as an individual becomes wealthier, his credit stands better, and he can borrow on more favourable terms. It may be said that we are passing through a period of financial stringency. That stringency has not lasted however three or four years, and yet we have been compelled to pay higher rates of interest when we borrowed money than we did in 1897. How does the Minister of Finance account for this? Owing to his improvident business management, the credit of Canada is not what it should be, if it be true that the country is much wealthier than it was ten years ago. One cannot account for our lessened credit in any other way. Why is it that this government cannot borrow money as cheaply to-day as it could when it succeeded to office? Can we ascribe that fact to any other cause than the extravagant expenditure of this administration—an expenditure which cannot fail to arouse the anxiety of capitalists? Every year the hon. gentleman has asked us for immense sums and we have generously voted them. Then he has devised the ways and means of raising the revenue to meet these expenditures. And during the last eleven years, the revenue of the country has been $93,000,000 more than the Finance Minister declared he needed. That has been the total of the surpluses over the revenue he expected to receive from the taxation he imposed. The

Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), when in opposition, laid down the doctrine, to which hon. gentlemen opposite heartily subscribed, that every dollar a Finance Minister took out of the people more than he absolutely required was a dollar improvidently taken from them. What defence then has our present Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) for having taken during the past eleven years from the people of Canada over $93,000,000 more money than he required for the administration of the country ? What has become of all that money ? If an individual finds his revenue increasing every year, what does he do ? The first thing he does is to pay off his debts. If he has any improvements to make, he spends on these what money they require, and the balance he puts aside where it will be earning interest for him. Should not the same business methods apply to a government ? Here is a government which finds its revenue each year larger than it anticipated, and here is a Finance Minister who finds himself in the receipt of $93,000,000 more of the people's money than he expected to receive from the taxation he imposed, should he not have applied that surplus to paying off our country's debt ? That is what a wise and provident administrator would have done, but that is exactly what the present Finance Minister did not do. What became of that money ? He spent it. And as people become extravagant and profligate, the financial institutions of the world take a note of their extravagance and their credit goes down in proportion. Is it to be wondered at then that the credit of Canada does not stand as high to-day as it did in 1896, when these gentlemen took office, notwithstanding our increased earnings and wealth and industrial progress ?

A few years ago the Minister of Finance boasted that he had succeeded in getting Canadian government securities put on the English list for the investment of trust funds. He had succeeded in doing this because our securities were considered the very best of any colonial dependency, and he expected that we should be able to borrow, on that account, cheaper than we ever did before. Have we been able to do this ? Notwithstanding this fact, our credit stands lower to-day than it did then, judging by the fact that we have to pay more in order to borrow money. Is it not only fair to assume that this is due to the extravagance and improvidence of the present government ?

But not only did the Finance Minister receive $93,000,000 in surpluses but the Canadian Pacific Railway paid him back a loan of $15,000,000, which they had borrowed many years ago on the credit of Canada. Did he deposit this money as a sinking fund to pay off that loan ? No ; he spent this also. All this money is gone, and the public debt of Canada stands $5,000,000 higher than at the time when the present government came into power. Will he tell me that that is good financing? I leave it to the business men of Canada to judge for themselves. I venture to say that any shrewd financial critic will come to the conclusion that somewhere there have been extravagance and improvidence, that the government have not shown the best business management or they would not find themselves in the financial straits in which they are at the present time. Were the money that the poor people have been obliged to pay into the banks at three per cent in the hands of the Finance Minister it would be very useful. He could put it into the banks, or he could use it to handle the crops in the Northwest. It is clear that the banks have failed in their duty to the public, and I criticise them as I criticise the Minister of Finance. In that western country, a few years ago, the banks were offering loans in every direction for people to use in speculating in real estate and mining stock. But, suddenly, when the banks saw danger ahead, they not only cut off the credits for speculative purposes, but they denied the people money even to carry on legitimate operations. I say that the banks helped to educate the people in extravagance and speculation, and then denied them the facilities for regular business. I have been told that there were not less than 3,000 people in the real estate business in Winnipeg only a year ago. This gives us an idea of the magnitude of these speculative transactions. But all this is stopped, suddenly stopped, and the people who require circulating medium have a right to complain when the banks deny them the use of it for proper business operations. These banks were chartered by the public for the very purpose of providing the circulating medium when fair security is offered and that circulating medium should be available for the legitimate needs of the country.

There are other points in relation to this matter which I shall take another occasion to discuss. Meantime, I merely say that, when we are amending the banking laws, we should consider the desirability of making more radical amendments than we have done in past years, in order to bring the banks more into harmony with the real needs of the country and compel them to discharge the proper functions for which they are established, and for which important powers are given them by the people of Canada. When the people look over the situation, I think they will feel obliged to hold the Finance Minister responsible for much of the stringency which exists to-day, and that many of the people feel so keenly.

Now, I saw it stated in the newspapers yesterday that, in connection with the distribution of seed grain in the Northwest,

it was in contemplation by the government to carry on the works through the banks. And I think the Minister of Finance said that the government's plan would be to let the banks decide as to the necessary security.

Mr. FIELDING. I made no such statement with reference to the seed grain question, but only as to the aid given to the banks to move the grain. My statement did not relate to the seed grain question.

Mr. SPROULE. Evidently, I misunderstood the hon minister. But, for fear that something of this kind may be in contemplation, perhaps I may be permitted to make a few observations. I have information as to the situation from people in the west who tell me that there are certain things that should not be lost sight of. One thing these people tell me is that the supply of seed grain is absolutely necessary. Another is that this seed must be available on giving the security that the farmers have to offer, and at not too high a rate of interest. And a third point is that the seed must be provided early, so that it may be ready to put in the ground as soon as the spring opens. I am afraid that if these operations are carried out by the banks, these banks will follow their present course of demanding gilt-edged security. Many may be unable to satisfy the banks in this respect. Moreover, there will be many poor people, who, knowing how the banks have acted in the past, simply will never go to the banks for the necessary money to buy the seed grain. This assistance so necessary in the interest of the whole country, should be available to the poorest man as well as to the richest. The grain should be of the proper quality for seed. And also it should be furnished in time to enable the sowing to be done so as to give the crop the best chance of escaping the frost in the fall. It is represented to me also that payments should be spread over several years, because many of those who need this assistance will not be able to repay the money in one year. Another point is, that it is desirable to have this grain laid down in the elevators of the several places to be supplied. Where there are no elevators, then storehouses should be used. Above everything, the grain should not be put in the hands of one person in any locality, so that it can be made a monopoly or doled out in such a way as to exclude the poorer people from getting the benefit of it. And, finally, it is incumbent upon the government to have all the seed grain supplied thoroughly tested, with a certificate accompanying it, showing just what percentage will grow. If the farmer buys seed grain, seventy-five per cent of which will germinate, he need only sow twenty-five per cent more in order to get a full crop, should the conditions of growth be favourable. This is done quite frequently and with good results. The farmer who puts his labour to the sowing of this grain should be given every opportunity to secure a reasonable return. I offer these suggestions, as I have said, because they are given to me by people in the west who have the best means of understanding the conditions and judging what is required. I believe these suggestions are wise and timely, and I hope the government will act upon them.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL (Glengarry). I desire to say a few words in reference to the matter brought up by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Sproule). I put a question to him in order to get a direct statement, because I noticed that all through his speech he has laid down a hypothetical basis, he has argued upon a sort of negative basis nearly all through his speech. But while I take no objection to the statements he made about loans outside of Canada, I do take objection to the statement he made that the banks of Canada are loaning large amounts of the deposits of the Canadian people outside of the Dominion of Canada. For that reason I put that question to my hon. friend, with a desire to have a definite statement. Now let us go back to the time when the papers of this country were full of the idea that the Canadian banks were loaning Canadian deposits outside of Canada, I mean the month of October last. I will give you the position of the banks of Canada at that time. It is just as well to remember in this connection that our chartered banks have agencies in the old country, and they have agencies in the United States, where they take large amounts of deposits, they are carrying a foreign exchange, they are handling the business of the immense amount of traffic that the Dominion of Canada is doing, they require a large amount of money, and they have that money invested there. Now I will read the hon. gentleman a statement compiled from the Bankers' Association. I will only read the bulk sums, and it shows precisely the condition of affairs at that time. I take the bank statement of the month of October, and I am sure that these figures will be a surprise, not only to my hon. friend but to a lot of newspapers throughout the country who have been circulating rumours as gospel facts. The chartered banks of Canada, according to the October statement, had loaned to the Canadian public $630,261,000; the Canadian public had deposits in the chartered banks at that time of about $587,287,000, that sum is about $27,000,000 less to-day. I am not sure about the last bank statement. Consequently the loans to the Canadian public exceed deposits in the Canadian banks, all Canadian deposits, to the extent of $42,974,000. These are figures well worth remembering.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the hon. member is touching at all the question I raised.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. I am coming to it now. The amount of loans to people outside of Canada, as shown by the October statement of the chartered banks, is $73,301,000; so I am going him $10,000,000 better. The amount of deposits held by the chartered banks of Canada from foreign depositors, money deposited in their branches outside of Canada, and other foreign liabilities of those banks, according to the statement, is $69,727,000.

Mr. LALOR. Of this $73,000,000 that is loaned to foreign countries, is the hon. gentleman able to state whether that amount all went to the United States, or is some of it in Great Britain?

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. It is loaned to both, about $45,000,000 of it at that time was in the United States. The amount of deposits held by the chartered banks of Canada from foreign depositors, had in their branches outside of Canada, is $69,727,000. Now the total loans outside of Canada, or the total amounts due from banks outside of Canada, more than their deposits outside of Canada, are but the sum of $3,600,000, instead of $63,000,000 as my hon. friend stated.

Mr. SPROULE. This does not disprove the statement I made. I took the Canada 'Gazette,' the amount of money belonging to Canadian banks that was in the banks of New York on call, call loans.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. The Canada 'Gazette' does not state that the loans are all in New York, or any such place, the Canada 'Gazette' simply states the loans held outside of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. In that respect I am not going to contradict the hon. gentleman, because I may have confused what I took from the newspapers and what I took from the 'Gazette,' for I looked over both. The statement was made by one or the other, if not by both, that there was at that time over $64,000,000 of Canadian money invested in call loans in New York.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. That is just the reason I am making this statement. The papers all over the country, large and small, and people of all sorts, have imbibed that idea so completely that I desired to make this positive statement. I put the question to the hon. gentleman because he has dilated upon it time and again, talking about the savings of the poor farmers and the poor people of this country that the banks have loaned outside of Canada. The facts are that the banks are not loaning Canadian money outside of Canada, but they are loaning outside of Canada the deposits they have got in their banks outside of Canada.

Mr. LANCASTER. Would the hon. gentleman tell us what proportion of this is loaned in Great Britain and what proportion in New York?

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. I cannot tell that, and it does not make any difference. But the amount that is loaned in these places I have stated.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman know that from the returns of the bankers who are interested in it?

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. I took the precaution to get this information direct from the parties who know.

Mr. BARR. Would the hon. gentleman tell me who these parties were?

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. I got it from one of the representatives of the Bankers' Association of Canada, and I wished to correct the idea that this is Canadian money loaned outside of Canada. I am sure the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) could tell the equivalent of the sum. But without getting the exact information, I can only say that this country has a great deal to be thankful for that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is not Finance Minister.

Mr. LANCASTER. What does the hon. gentleman say is the exact information as to where the money is?

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. I have given it to you two or three times.

Mr. LANCASTER. I may be dense, but I have asked him to tell us how much of this money is loaned in England and how much is loaned in New York. Now if he knows that it is not loaned in New York, how much is loaned in England?

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. I said outside, loaned outside of Canada, including all over.

Mr. LANCASTER. Where is it loaned, what is the proportion?

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. The Canadian money is not loaned out of Canada.

Mr. LANCASTER. To what extent is my hon. friend from Grey Mr. Sproule), right, after all.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. He is entirely wrong.

Mr. SPROULE. My information is direct from a banker who has been in the business for nearly a quarter of a century, and he should know as well as the member who is speaking.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. He does not, he certainly does not.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Is it a fact that Canadian banks have advanced to the Canadian people more money than the Canadian people have put into the Canadian banks?

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. Yes.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. To what extent?

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. The chartered banks had loaned to the Canadian public $630,261,000; the Canadian public had deposited in the Canadian banks $570,000,000. The Canadian banks have loaned to the Canadian people $42,974,000 more than the Canadian people had deposited in the Canadian banks at that time.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the money they issued, that we gave them power to issue ?

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. That is their own capital.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is promissory notes.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). Mr. Speaker, it is certainly refreshing to see the government, after proclaiming for ten years from the housetops that the great progress and good times of the country were due entirely to the action of this government seek to evade responsibility for the present financial stringency. They gave Providence no credit whatever for the good times, Providence had nothing to do with them ; but now that bad times have struck us who is responsible for them ? Is it not the same government who claimed credit for the good times ? They had no right to claim credit for the good times, but surely they are responsible for the bad times that have struck us lately.

Mr. EMMERSON. Times are good now.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who says that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I say so.

Mr. TAYLOR. Gentlemen who are feeding at the public crib may say it but the people of the country do not say it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not feeding at the public crib.

Mr. TAYLOR. But you were until a short time ago and I think you have some pensions coming in. Those land deals down in New Brunswick may be bringing in returns.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would ask my hon. friend to take that back.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will take it back of course ; I was only in fun.

Mr. EMMERSON. Things said in fun and so lightly may be more offensive than if said otherwise. You promise not to do it again ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I knew that the business men of the country are feeling the pinch of hard times. There are good times with the farmers but they are not buying on account of the cry of hard times ; business men and working men know that there are hard times on us now, brought about by the action of this government.

We heard the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) on December 4, saying that this bugaboo of imports and exports was exploded. Year before last we imported about $53,000,000 more than we exported, including all our grain, butter, cheese, pork, bacon, lumber, all the produce of this country. We bought $53,000,000 more than that and had to send out $53,000,000 of money in addition to our exports of goods. This year we imported $12,000,000 more than all the produce that we sent out of this country. Yet the Minister of Agriculture says that the bugaboo is exploded. Let him go to a farmer and ask him what was the production of his farm for a year. The farmer may say : After paying all my wages, taxes and expenses, I have $1,000 of a surplus, but I shall ask my wife how much the household expenses were. The wife turns up the figures and says : The accounts are all here, they all have to be paid and come to $1,500. The farmer has a surplus of $1,000. Then is not the farmer $500 in debt ? So it is with the country. We brought in $120,000,000 more goods than we sent out and the country is $120,000,000 worse off to-day.

We have in this country the best banking system in the world, and the people of this country have faith in it. The banks under that system have done everything possible to carry on the business of the country and a great deal of credit, in my opinion, is due to the banking system. I do not think that the country is any better off for the announcement of the Minister of Finance that he was going to spoon-feed the banks, that he was going to give them money to move the crops. The banks have plenty of capital and money and do not want to be spoon-fed. There was a cry from the west that the banks would not give money and the minister said he would go to them and give them aid. I understand the banks did not ask for aid, but to gain a little political capital the minister said he would give help. What could the government do ? Have they any money ? Where is the $60,000,000 that the people deposited with the government ? Have they that to throw into the banks ? No, it is every bit of it spent in carrying on the affairs of the country, notwithstanding the great taxes they have collected. If the people called for that $63,000,000 to-morrow, if they asked for the return of their deposits, the government would have to say :

We are bankrupt, we have not the money to pay you. The American government has money in the treasury with which they can come to the aid of the banks, but this government has no money. They borrowed $63,000,000 of the people's money through the government savings bank and spent it—sepnt it on what ? Buying trash at double and treble the proper price like the soup tureen on the boat on the St. Lawrence. After having collected through the customs and inland revenue twice as much as was collected by the late government, it is all spent as well as the $63,000,000 of the people's money which was borrowed at 3 per cent. Why do they not have this money to lend to the banks to tide them over ?

Let me show the figures of what the banks have done. It is true that the banks have some money out on call loans outside of Canada. I have here the bank statement for the first of December in which it is stated that they have on call and short loans elsewhere than in Canada (no doubt a good portion of this is in United States) $43,509,000. Then they have current loans elsewhere than in Canada $22,928,000, a total of $66,437,000 of thet banks' capital that is loaned outside of Canada. Against that they have deposits elsewhere than in Canada (that is deposits brought in from people outside of Canada and deposited in the banks in Canada) $53,407,203, and they have balances due to agencies of the banks or to other banks or agencies in the United Kingdom $10,330,000. They have that due to other banks on hand and one of our largest banks has a loan in England of $9,757,000. Thus they have money from parties outside of Canada amounting to $73,523,000 as against tee $66,000,000 that they have out on short loans outside of Canada. Thus they have a balance of foreign money in their coffers of over $7,000,000, to put against the money they have on loan in New York.

Now we will take the other side of it. The banks have deposits by the public payable on demand in Canada of $157,-185,000, and they have deposits by the public payable after notice, or on a fixed date, amounting to $402,626,000, making a total of $560,000,000 that the banks owe the people of Canada on deposits. What have the banks done with this deposit ? They have on current loans in Canada, which is the money lent to the manufacturers and merchants of the country to carry on their business, $556,000,000, and they have on call and short loans on stocks and bonds in Canada $44,000,000, making a total of $601,-000,000, or about $41,000,000 more lent out in Canada than they have deposited of the money of the people. There is no trouble with the banks of this country in that respect. If the government had that $60,-000,000 they borrowed from the people of the country and were able to turn it over to the banks there would be no trouble at all, but the government squandered that money as they are sqnandering the taxes wrung from the people by the Minister of Customs, which are nearly three times more than when the Conservatives were in power. I have a good deal to do with the banks of Canada, and I know that if it were not for the help they are rendering the business of Canada, it would be in a mighty bad way. This government has no money to come to the rescue of the banks. The government can pledge the credit of the country as they are doing every day, but they have no money to help the banks should any stringency arise.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. You are destroying the argument of the member for East Grey.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not. Owing to the fact that this government sent out of the country last year $150,000,000 to buy imports, the banks were not able to lend to the farmers of the country, and so they had to curtail, and they informed the manufacturers of Canada that they must contract their business, that they must not allow it to expand this year because they could not give them as much credit as last year. That was due to the fact that the government sent out of the country $150,000,000 to buy goods in foreign countries.

Mr. MILLER. When the banks sent out this notice to manufacturers, did they indicate that as the reason why they were unable to supply the money?

Mr. TAYLOR. The banks don't give the public their reasons. They saw the way the government was trotting at a break-neck pace ; the banks are shrewd ; they knew there were bad times coming ; they saw the cloud, and they commenced to haul in sail. The banks saw that Canada was sending out $150,000,000 more for imports than it received for its exports, and they notified the manufacturers that they would have to curtail their business, and they asked the farmers to pay their indebtedness, because the farmers had good crops and they were living economically, and the banks thought they were able to pay. The farmers saw there was going to be a stringency and so they curtailed their purchases, and the manufacturers and the merchants felt it. When the Minister of Finance makes his next budget speech he will not have as rosy a statement as he had last year.

Mr. DYMENT. Would you like to see it that way?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, I would not. I am very sorry to see the bad times. But these bad times have been brought about by this government, which my hon. friend (Mr. Dyment) supports. If we had this $153,-000,000 that we had to pay for imports

more than we exported, we would be well off.

Mr. DYMENT. How do you account for the stringency in the money market in the United States, where the conditions in that respect are reversed ?

Mr. TAYLOR. They were gambling and trotting too fast in the United States. There is plenty of money in the United States, but the millionaires are jobbing in stocks, and they can cause a flurry any day they like. The United States banking institutions are not to be compared with our Canadian banking institutions. We have the best banking institutions in the world in Canada.

Mr. GORDON. How does the hon. gentleman account for the stringency in Germany, where they are manufacturing so much ?

Mr. FOSTER. That is too far off.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the speech of His Excellency at the opening of the session the government put into his mounth the statement that the financial stringency was world-wide, and therefore it included Germany, Now, there are some parts of the world that are experiencing good times, but the Governor General said that there were bad times all over the world.

Mr. EMMERSON. He must have been mistaken then.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was the advisers of His Excellency that made the mistake in putting these words into his mouth. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have convinced you and the House that the banks of Canada have done everything they could to carry on the affairs of the country, and that they are doing their best to-day. There is no censure to be cast upon the banks of Canada. The censure should be put upon the Minister of Finance, who attempted to spoon-feed them and told them he would give them some money when he didn't have a dollar in his pants to give to anybody. He has to pay 7 per cent in England to renew his temporary loans ; he is conducting his business the same as a merchant who has to renew his paper every thirty or sixty days and pay the regular bank rate. That is the way the affairs of this country are being carried on now. The figures I have quoted show that up to the first of December the banks of Canada have lent out every dollar they have received from the people of Canada and $41,000,000 to carry on the business of the country. There is no fault to be found with the banks. The fault is to be found with the Fininace Minister, who said the banks had no money to move out the grain. There is my friend from Kingston (Mr. Harty) who is looking at me, and he knows a grain buyer in Kingston who has one million dollars credit.

Mr. HARTY. Yes, three of them.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, three of them if he wants it, and he is moving all the grain he requires and the banks run no risk. He buys a carload of wheat in the Northwest, puts it in an elevator, gives a warehouse receipt, ships it, and when it is sold in England the bank gets the money. The government need not come to that man's rescue or any other good grain buyer's rescue because the bank holds the grain as security, and he pays interest on the 90 per cent or whatever they advance. That is the way the grain business of this country is done, and it needs no guarantee from the Finance Minister or the government to the banks of this country to enable them to lend Tom, Dick and Harry money to move the grain of the Northwest, because it will move itself through the grain buyers. As soon as they put it into a car they get a warehouse receipt for it, on which they can realize on delivery at the selling point, and that is put through the banks, so that a grain buyer need not have a very large amount of his own capital, the banks furnish it all, and are glad to do so. I do not think it is a good advertisement for the banking system of this country to say that the government had to come to their assistance and spoon-feed them to help them to move the crop of this year. If such a proposition was made, I do not think any of the banks accepted it. We have not yet heard from the Finance Minister what it was. The government said they were going to assist the banks to move the grain crop, although they had not a dollar in their treasury. They had spent all the money they had, as they are doing at the rate of $100,000,000 a year to run the country, whereas the Conservative government before 1896 did it better for $40,000,000. When the farmers of this country find this out I do not think that they will say to these fellows that they will be glad to keep them there longer ; but they will put them out and put in their places men who will manage the affairs of the country in a more satisfactory manner.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I do not wish to enter into the general discussion, but I would like to make our good-natured friend a little happier than he seems to be at present. I wish just to refer to one point in illustration to show that it is not wise to come to the conclusion that the country is so many millions better off if our exports exceed our imports, or so many millions poorer if our imports exceed our exports, as shown in the trade and navigation returns. My hon. friend said that in the year 1906 $53,000,000 more came into the country than was exported ;

but you must analyse the figures before you can come to any general conclusion. For instance, if a farmer earning $1,000 in a year had spent $1,500 in perishable products, it would be easy to see that he would be in a worse position at the end of the year than at the beginning; but suppose he had spent $900 and had bought another farm for $1,500 which was going to be productive, you would not say that he was worse off. In the $53,000,000 of excess of imports over exports there are to be included $9,000,000 worth of settlers' effects which came into this country free of duty. There is no doubt that there were other millions that came in with the 200,000 immigrants; but that $9,000,000 of settlers' effects goes to swell the adverse balance of trade which the hon. gentleman says is against us. Is the country poorer because that $9,000,000 appears against it on the face of the trade returns? Why, that was $9,000,000 worth of wealth, acquired by people in other countries and transplanted to this country, leaving those other countries $9,000,000 poorer and this country $9,000,000 richer. Suppose we had said to the men who brought in these settlers' effects, at the time the entry was made, take this back out of the country, and suppose we had said to another 200,000 of our people, go to the United States and take your household effects with you, and as you go out there will be an export entry made showing that you have increased our exports by $9,000,000. If you shut out the $9,000,000 which came in and took into account the $9,000,000 which went out, the adverse balance of trade would be reduced by $18,000,000. Would anybody say that the country was wealthier by that amount than before? No, you would say that it was that amount poorer than before. You have to analyse the trade returns, and see what the imports and exports consist of.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose that $9,000,000 comes in, and suppose it is invested, as my hon. friend says it is, does that help to wipe off the balance of trade for that year?

Mr. PATERSON. Not as far as the returns are concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. But the balance of the trade has to be made every year. It does not run on and wait until the investment pays the money back.

Mr. PATERSON. But the hon. gentleman will not say that there must be an export to equal that, because these people have brought in wealth acquired in other countries and have not sent produce back to pay for it. It is acquired wealth.

Mr. FOSTER. But if it has gone into an investment?

Mr. PATERSON. Then there will be a profitable return by and by; but in the meantime the returns show an adverse balance of trade. But in the case of the settlers' effects brought in there is $9,000,000 more wealth in the country.

Mr. TAYLOR. I suppose that $20 soup tureen for the 'Montcalm' was included in that.

Mr. PATERSON. I am discussing the large principle involved. If money is wasted by buying something that is not needed, that is another matter; but I am giving this case to illustrate the idea that if you merely take the trade returns and build an argument on them without analysing them, you will arrive at a fallacious conclusion.

Mr. TAYLOR. When the hon. gentleman sat on this side of the House and the Consevative government had a small adverse balance of trade, did he not 'whoop her up' and say that that was the reason the country was going to the dogs?

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot remember all that I did. On a great many occasions, I know, I said things that were necessary to be said, sometimes in subdued tones, sometimes in tones not so subdued, according to the enormity of the offence. I do not remember arguing that because there was a balance of trade against the country therefore it was going to ruin.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will try and refresh his memory some of these days by reading one of Sir Richard Cartwright's speeches and one of his own on this very subject.

Mr. J. BARR (Dufferin). No doubt the House has been very much enlightened by the lucid explanation given by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). He told us that there were $9,000 000 brought into the country by settlers—$9,000,000 more wealth. Well, if our duties were properly adjusted there is nothing in connection with the necessaries of life which could not be manufactured in this country. No doubt there are luxuries which we cannot manufacture and have to bring from abroad, but I submit that we ought to be in a position, and would be had a Conservative government continued in office, to furnish all the necessaries of life we require. My hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) has pinned his faith to the theory that when the balance of trade is against us, it shows that we are that much better off. I would like to know how that theory works out in connection with our immigrants who are coming into this country and bringing in supplies with them. It has ever been held by the Conservative party that the more we manufactured in this country and the less we imported, the better for this country, and it seems to me that that is a point on which

now all are agreed whether Reform or Conservative. For our part, we believe that the only reason why Canada to-day has to import $57,000,000 worth more than she exports, is because sufficient encouragement is not given to our manufacturers and they are not in the position in which they ought to be and in which they would be had the Conservative government remained in power. In that case we would have seen the balance of trade in our favour and our own manufacturers supplying the majority of goods we now import.

To-day we occupy a position unique in the history of the Dominion, a position we never occupied before and which I hope we shall never occupy again. As far as our banking system is concerned while the general principles of our banking law have worked fairly well, there have been occurrences in the past few months which show that the system has many defects. The developments in connection with the closing of the Sovereign bank prove beyond doubt that, so far as our banking arrangements are concerned, they occupy a most unsound position. And in connection with the Ontario bank it has been proved that, as in the case of all the banks that have gone down, the directors were mere figureheads. According to law, it is doubtful whether the directors of a bank have the right to go in at any time and examine its books and securities. True the law provides that no large loan shall be made without the consent of the directors, but very often that law is a dead letter, and we have had the admission from the largest bank that it is not unusual for the managers to invest the funds of the bank in large enterprises without calling together the board of directors. It is only after the investment has been made and everything is settled, that the consent of the directors is asked to what may be rather a wild scheme. Just look at the state of affairs to-day in connection with the Sovereign bank. That bank had over a million loaned to the Chicago and Milwaukee Electric railway, which is to-day in liquidation. Look at the financial speculations it went into in Alaska and elsewhere. If our banking system were all we desire it should be, if we had all the safeguards around it we ought to have, it would be utterly impossible for the president or manager to make large loans without consulting the board of directors. Under the circumstances, the time has come when the government should take up the question and bring in a Bill to remove these evils and renew public confidence. If we destroy public confidence in the banks their stock will become unsaleable, and we shall have a financial state of affairs worse if possible than the conditions now existing.

In connection with this motion, what are the circumstances? We have the government proposing to assist the banks to a large amount in removing grain from the great west. But if the banks were not in a most stringent position, they would not require that assistance. If the banks were not in a tighter position than they have ever been before, it would not be necessary for the government to come to their assistance, in this way.

We find it stated in the newspapers that the government is to advance $4,000,000 to distribute seed grain in Saskatchewan and Alberta. Having spent some time in that country, I believe that this is a wise step on the part of the government. It would be one of the greatest calamities that could befall this country, if, next spring, the farmers were without seed for their fields, or were compelled to use inferior seed which probably would not yield a good return. But, while this action is to be commended, the government should see to it that it is carried out in the most effective way. It will not do to have seed grain given only to the wealthy, to those who can give security; for it is only by a wide distribution of this seed grain among those who need it and can use it, that the benefits desired will accrue to the country at large.

But it is fair to ask: What has brought about this state of affairs? We know that in the west the crops were not altogether a failure. In Manitoba the yield has been almost, if not quite, up to the average, and the increased price of grain assure the farmers of Manitoba of a better return, probably, than in any former year. And, while mentioning that, I may point out that a great deal of this grain in Manitoba, both wheat and oats, is of excellent quality for seed. Why should it be sent here to the east, and then returned to Saskatchewan and Alberta for distribution to those requiring seed, with all the charges added, to be paid either by the settlers, or by the country as a whole? I say that it is the duty of the government to send experts to Manitoba to find out grain that can be used for seed, and have it shipped to the west for the purposes of this proposed distribution. But wherever this seed grain comes from, it must be provided in the meantime, at the expense of the country, and I hope the government will see to it that the fears expressed by some of the newspapers are not realized; I hope they will see to it that this seed grain does not get into the hands of tricksters or grafters who will make the distribution of it result to their own benefit, or to the benefit of a political party, instead of to the benefit of the farmers in whose interest this distribution is supposed to be undertaken. And I may go so far as to warn the government, that, while we are willing that they should carry on this work, we will hold them responsible for the manner in which the work is done.

I was about to deal with the real cause of the present state of affairs. It is true that, in many cases, the soil did not produce as in other years. But it must not be forgotten that, on the whole, the higher prices will go far towards making up that loss. I submit that one great cause of the difficulty is the class of immigrants brought into that country. It is a well known fact that hundreds of thousands of immigrants went into that country last year not only without means but utterly unacquainted with our methods of life and unfit to engage in farm work. It is not unnatural that the methods used to bring immigrants to the Northwest should result in the influx of many who should never be brought here. The immigration agents are paid $5 a head for these immigrants when they leave the country from which they come, and $5 when they arrive here. Of course, under these circumstances, the agents consider quantity rather than quality and send immigrants among whom are a very large proportion of an undesirable class. We need only look at our criminal records to see that an undesirable class of people has been brought among us. Many of the most flagitious crimes have been perpetrated by these new arrivals. The time has come, and more than come, when the government should exercise a more careful selection in our immigration. Better far that we have a much smaller number than that we have even a small percentage of this undesirable class. Who are the people who, in the Northwest to-day, are seeking the shelter and food as a matter of charity? They are largely the immigrants of whom I have spoken. Even orientals are being brought in and efforts are made to settle them in the west. I contend that not only should we have this as a white man's country, but we should have it peopled by immigrants who will help to build up Canada instead of proving an interference with the work of upbuilding that is now going on. If these unfit and criminal people are brought into Canada, what will be the result? They will lower the standard of moral life and be an injury to the country in every way.

Under these circumstances I submit that this government are not doing their duty in failing to take care of the immigrants that are brought to this country. Whilst that is the state of affairs in the west, I think a similar condition prevails in every province. From one end of the province of Ontario to the other we find soup kitchens are being opened everywhere. We find that charitable institutions are taxed to the utmost to look after the needy, and that is in the month of January when we have nearly four months more of cold weather to look forward to. The charitable institutions are utterly unable to care for these destitute people. What is the condition of our workingmen to-day in this country? Factories one after another are shutting down, or running on half time, many of them only run for a few hours a day. They are reducing wages, and the conditions of the labouring man is such as to demand our sincere sympathy. We know that there never was a time in this country when a dollar had as little purchasing power of the necessaries of life as it has now. Look at the price of bread to-day, at the price of eggs, at the price of meat. I say to-day that while the workingman is only getting from one-half to two-thirds of what he earned a year ago, his money will not buy nearly as much as it would a year ago. Under these circumstances we have the greatest sympathy for them, and we have the greatest sympathy for those charitable people who are endeavouring to carry them over this hard winter. In order to prove what I say, I will ask the House to hear what the Toronto 'Globe' of January 28 says. Of course, whatever hon. gentlemen opposite find in the 'Globe' they will accept without question, and when they find the 'Globe' telling about hard times they will accept it. But the Finance Minister and others have told us that we are flourishing to-day as we never did before. It may be that their friends and heelers are flourishing, and do not feel the hard times. But I want to tell him that throughout the length and breadth of this country the poor people feel the hard times as they never did before. Now here is what the 'Globe' of yesterday has to say. The heading is

Shacktown folk hard hit; St. George's Society will probably distribute food and fuel. Lack of work is now general. Special need for aid all over the city. The position of the Shacktown people is worse than that of the unemployed in the city, because they do not share in the city's official relief.

I suppose some hon. gentlemen do not know what Shacktown is. I was going to say that Toronto was a suburb of Shacktown. It is one of the most thriving places, and its population is daily increasing. Of course we know that there are a great many unemployed in the city. They are there by the hundreds and thousands, and while the charitable people are taxed to the utmost to keep the unemployed from the pangs of hunger in the city proper, the condition of the Shacktown unemployed is much worse.

The position of the Shacktown people is worse than that of the unemployed in the city, because they do not share in the city's official relief.

That is, they are a special people by themselves.

Two newly painted signs in Little Piccadilly—one of the shack communities where hard times are reigning—serve to indicate the nature of the people who are out of work in this city. One of them is hung from the

lowest limbs of an oak tree, whereunder is a shack as big as a back kitchen. It reads 'Ladies' and Gents.' pressing, cleaning, mending, sewing and darning done here, cheap.' The other depends from a twelve by fourteen dwelling: 'Bricklaying done by job or contract, cheap.' There is grim irony about those signs. Nobody in Little Piccadilly could pay to have his clothes mended; it would be ridiculous. Nobody could think of hiring a bricklayer; that would be madness. But the notices swing in the wind, marking a forlorn hope, pathetic in the hopelessness of their solicitation.

There is scarcely any money in these districts. Two men stood talking on a corner; one had an overcoat, the other was shivering. 'Sell ye my coat for half a dollar,' the former offered, spurred by an inspiration.

The other laughed, 'Half a dollar! Cheap enough, but I hv'nt seen twenty-five cents these six weeks.'

The woman's burden.—In a little two-roomed home under a thin cluster of pine trees, the reporter found a woman whose husband was sick, and who, by great good luck, was able to get a few days washing occasionally. There were two children, and by the woman's work food was supplied the little household. For fuel the children were sawing up an old pine tree with a borrowed saw. But the woman was wearing her husband's boots, with cardboard inserted to replace the soles.

Now that is the condition of affairs to be found in the suburbs of probably the wealthiest city in this fair Dominion. When these hon. gentlemen tell us about the flourishing times we are having, I ask you to think of the starving thousands upon thousands that are scattered all over this fair Dominion of ours. Now returning to the financial condition of this country, think of the amounts deposited in the savings banks. You are well aware that if we have $60,000,000 less in the savings banks to-day, it is not very creditable to this government, and will not raise them in the esteem of the people when they remember that only four years ago this government reduced the rate of interest from three and a half to three per cent, whilst at that very time they were paying larger interest than they were giving to these depositors.

They were making money out of them. What induced the Minister of Finance to take that extraordinary course? He tells us that it was done at the request of the bankers; the bankers wanted all the money. That is very true, the bankers wanted it at a very low rate and whilst they are lending it out at a large profit, from 6 per cent to 8 per cent, we find that they induced the Minister of Finance to grind down the poor people and to reduce the rate of interest paid on their savings one half per cent to 3 per cent. It does seem to me that that is another instance of the oppression of the weak to increase the wealth of the mighty, of adding to the burdens of the poor people for the purpose of increasing the wealth of those who are already very wealthy. Under these circumstances the government to-day should give a rate of interest on the savings of the people equal to what they would have to give if they were borrowing money in England or elsewhere, and in this way encourage the people of the country to accumulate savings. I believe that a rate of 3½ or 4 per cent would bring this about. There are other reasons why they should have a rate of interest such as would induce the people to deposit their money in the government savings banks. We know that the $60,000,000 of deposits in the government savings banks consist mostly of small amounts deposited by men and women, sometimes children, who are not accustomed to business; and the result is that when the interest gets down to 3 per cent instead of 4 per cent these people are often induced to put their money into stocks of wild cat schemes so that in many cases they lose their money. I submit that it is the duty of the government to give every encouragement to the people, particularly the poor, to become depositors in the government savings banks, and to do this they should grant as high a rate of interest as can be granted without loss to the government. In this way they would be doing a great service to the country and the result would be that whilst the government would not lose anything they would save money to the people and prevent them from putting their savings into schemes in which they would run the risk of losing not only the interest but the principal as well.

We are facing to-day a conditioin of hard times such as we never did before, and it is absolutely necessary for this government to devise ways and means to save the country from threatened ruin. We must look carefully to our immigrants and see that they are the class we desire to have in this country, and we should amend our banking laws in order that they may command the confidence of the people. Whilst our banking laws are good they are not perfect. As they stand now we know that the bankers are taking advantage of hard times and have raised the interests on loans from 6 per cent to 10 per cent, a rate which our manufacturers cannot pay and carry on their manufacturing, so that they may be obliged to close. We have a usury law preventing the ordinary man from charging more than a certain rate of interest, but the banks are exempt from the operation of that law and can charge what they wish. We should undoubtedly have a much better banking law than we have at the present time.

Mr. ROBERT PRINGLE (Stormont). This motion, Mr. Speaker, is a very important one. When it was stated in the press that the banks of our country had to ask the government for assistance in moving the crops in the west, it certainly was a shock to thousands of people throughout Canada who knew the situation in regard

to our banks. It was a shock to learn that the banks had to seek aid from the government for this purpose. If you spoke to a banker you would receive the reply that they had never asked the government for any assistance, that they had ample resources to take care of the crops in the west. I asked a question in this House as to the arrangements made at the early part of the session, as did other members, and we were told that at a later date we would get that information; but up to the present we have had no information as to the arrangement which this government had made with the banks to assist in the removal of the western crops. There are in the western country to-day very serious complaints as to the position in which the producers find themselves in handling their crops of last season. I was informed by the general manager of one of the banks who attended a meeting of the Canadian Bankers' Association, at which the question came up, that when he asked what the arrangements were for assisting the banks in the removal of the crop from the west, he was quietly told: You people have nothing whatever to do with it, this arrangement is only made with the large banks who are doing business in that western country. We are entitled to the fullest information in regard to the arrangement that has been made by the government with the banks to assist them in the removal of the western crops.

I would not like to say one word which might be construed as in any way disparaging our banks; we all know that we have in this country many banks which are strong and in which the people may have the most implicit confidence. In no year have the banks of this country made greater progress than in 1907. The statistics giving the returns earned by the banks on their paid-up capital show that these returns ran all the way from 7 per cent to 20 per cent. The Bank of Nova Scotia, probably the strongest financial institution in Canada, with a rest of 180 per cent of its capital, earned on its paid-up capital last year 20 per cent; the Bank of Montreal earned on its paid-up capital last year something over 13 per cent, almost 14 per cent. Some of the other banks earned 17, some 16, some 14; but all our stronger banks earned a very large percentage on their paid up capital and I believe that to-day the banks are in a stronger position and that the people of this country should have implicit confidence in them.

But, we are finding a tremendous shrinkage in deposits. One bank alone had a shrinkage of $10,000,000 in its deposits last year. Why is that ? It is not because the Canadian Bankers' Association absolutely control the rate of interest payable to the depositors ? And I make that statement for the reason that we have in our banking law a provision which gives to the bankers of Canada the right to pay such a rate of interest to depositors as they may deem advisable. Supply and demand will regulate the interest rate, but the government of this country can regulate the rate of interest payable on deposits in its own banking institutions, and when tight money period comes, when the government has to go to foreign markets, as this government has had to do, and pay four or five per cent for money brought into Canada, I say that the government of Canada should say to Canadian artisans and to Canadian farmers who have money to deposit : the time has come when we will allow you a reasonable rate of interest upon your deposits in the government savings banks. This government could have said during the last year that the time had come when they would allow 3½ or 4 per cent upon such deposits, and the Canadian Bankers' Association would have been compelled to get together and declare that they must raise their rate on deposits to meet the government rate. But what transpired a short time ago at a meeting of the Canadian Bankers' Association at Montreal? The question came up as to whether the government was going to raise the rate to 3½ per cent and the gentleman at the head of that association said : I have arranged that matter with the government, you need have no fear that the government dare raise the rate to the depositors in the government banks. There is only one way in which we can regulate the rate of interest to depositors and that way is by government action, and the government of Canada has got to act and not the Canadian Bankers' Association. Had the government of this country taken a proper and reasonable position and said : We have a period of tight money, we have a period of high interest, we will raise the rate of interest on money deposited with us, then the Canadian Bankers' Association would have to follow suit. And, Sir, I believe it is the very best thing that could happen to Canadian banks. They have been losing their deposits by millions. Take the Canadian Bank of Commerce which has a loss of deposits of $10,000,000 within the last few months. If the government had raised their rate the banks would have done likewise and the depositors would undoubtedly have left their money in the banks. This is not the time for me to discuss certain proposed amendments which I have given notice of in respect to the banking Act, but it is proper for me to say now that we have no limitation in regard to the contractual rate of interest that a bank can contract for in the Dominion of Canada. In connection with my professional duties this year, I became engaged in a case in which one of our leading banks had made a customer pay an exorbitant rate of interest for years. I was under the impression that

under the Bank Act the bankers of this country were limited to a rate of 7 per cent. I was under the impression that under this section of the Bank Act of 1906 which is practically the same as the section of the Act of 1900, the banks were limited to 7 per cent. The section reads :

> The bank may stipulate for, take, preserve, or exact any rate of interest or discount not exceeding seven per centum per annum and may receive and take in advance any such rate, but no higher rate of interest shall be recoverable by the bank.

But when I came to look into the authorities I found that if a man voluntarily pays a bank 10 per cent, or 12 per cent, or 18 per cent he cannot recover that money back. The money goes to the coffers of the bank and he has no redress. Some time ago I granted an interview to a certain paper in regard to the banking business and I want to now put myself right as to that interview. It was construed that I was condemning the banks for having call loans in foreign countries. I did no such thing. What I stated was this : That we have granted to the banks of this country a very large monopoly, that we have given them enormous powers, that we have given them the right to contract for any rate of interest they may see fit, and that these banks if they choose could create a stringency in this country by which they could compel the people to pay exorbitant rates. I pointed out that at that date the banks of this country had over $120,000,000 in foreign countries, that they had sent that money out of the country and that consequently there was to a certain extent a stringency in the Dominion which enabled the banks to charge a very high rate. My hon. friend from one of the Montreal constituencies replied in an interview in another newspaper and he stated that if I could show him that any bank in this country charged as high as 18 per cent he himself would be favourable to a law restricting the banks in that respect. Well, in order to show that the Canadian Bank of Commerce in western Canada has charged 18 per cent and 20 per cent to the borrowers of that country, all we have got to do is to look at the records of the courts. We need not look further than the case of the Bank of Commerce vs. Macdonald, or the Bank of British North America vs. Bosworth where 24 per cent was charged. It is unnecessary for me to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the banks in this country which are without any limitation as to the rate of interest they can contract for, have taken advantage of the condition of the people in western Canada and have charged as high as 24 per cent. Therefore I say that if banks are going to charge 18 per cent, and 24 per cent, and if banks are going to earn 17 per cent and 20 per cent upon their capital, the time has come for the government to say to the people : We will allow you a higher rate of interest for the money which you may deposit with us. If the government does that, then the Canadian Bankers' Association will very quickly raise the interest rate on bank deposits. I do not wish to say one word detrimental to the banks of this country. To my mind they are the greatest public utility we have. The people of this country have given them a great franchise and our banking laws are more generous to the banks than the laws of any other country under the sun. What other country in the world says to its banks : Pay up $1,000,000 capital and the moment you do you can have another million dollars upon which to do business, without any charge and without any security ; the only thing we require of you is a deposit of 5 per cent which remains with the government as security for note holders. I say that is a great privilege. It is a privilege which the banks have certainly made the best of and it is a privilege from which the banks have been able to reap large rewards. Therefore, when one proposes some amendments to the Bank Act, and some restrictions, and some regulations which he deems in the interests of the public, he is doing a public service.

What has occurred during the last three or four years justifies the position taken by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) in 1890 when introducing the Bank Act of that year, that there should be an independent audit of our banks, a position in which he was supported by some of the best minds in this country, but a position which the bankers fought until they got the provision eliminated from the Bill. If that had become law at that time and if, as was stated by Mr. McLeod, the general manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia the the other day at the annual meeting, there had been an independent audit of the banks during the past two or three years we would not have had the failures which have occurred in this country. If we had in this country, as they have in the United States, a controller who would have the right to step into the head office of any one of our banks, open the vault doors and look into the securities, do you mean to tell me that for sixty consecutive months the general manager of the Ontario bank would have been able to hoodwink and deceive the government and the people of this country ? The day has come when, in the interests of depositors—and they have large interests, having about $570,000,000 of their savings in the banks of this country—we must throw around those banks greater safeguards. We have seen only the other day what occurred in regard to the Sovereign bank. A few months ago an effort was made to bring that bank into a fairly strong position. My own personal belief is that if

the banks of this country had chosen to stand underneath the Sovereign bank, they could have brought it through and enabled it to pay its shareholders a reasonable amount on the money they invested in it; but it was not the policy of the Canadian Bankers' Association to assist the Sovereign bank to get on its feet and become a strong bank, but it was their policy to put that bank into liquidation and take from it the deposits which it had accumulated during the past few years. Go into the office in this city of the Canadian Bank of Commerce, which has appropriated to itself the business of the Sovereign bank. It has the deposits, and the customers can look after themselves, that is the position that is taken. I only mention this incidentally, because later on I am going to urge that the time has come—because Canada is getting to be a large country—when we have to stop the incorporation of small banks with small capital. I do not know whether I am stating what is absolutely correct or not when I state that one bank was incorporated, and its deposit of $250,000, was simply borrowed temporarily for a few days until it could get its certificate to do business; and once it got the certificate, the way in which it got its paid-up capital was by sending notes out to its branches, which were getting deposits, instructing the managers of those branches to put the notes to the credit of capital account and send the money to the head office; and in that way it got capital marked paid-up, so that it could issue for every dollar of paid-up capital a dollar of notes. We have to put some restrictions upon this business. How many of these banks have gone down in the last few years, and have been absorbed by the larger banks. The day has come when we should amend our banking law to make it more stringent in regard to the granting of charters. It may be said, you will create a monopoly. Suppose we do. Suppose we leave the business of banking largely in the hands of ten or twelve or fifteen of the large, strong banks of this country, are we not able as a parliament to regulate and control those banks in the interest of the public? In that way we will bring about confidence, and confidence is absolutely necessary in the business of banking; because, after all, our banks cannot do business on their own paid-up capital alone. They are only a medium for the investment of the savings of the small and large depositors; and unless the public have absolute confidence in them, they will not get the funds to assist in the development and the growing business of this country. I do not at this time desire to say anything in regard to some proposed amendments which I intend introducing later this session; but I consider it most important that these papers be brought down, that the people of this country may fully understand why it is that the banks have to come to the government to get money for the purpose of moving the crops from the west. Our banks have over $100,000,000 yet invested outside of Canada. They have curtailed their call loans, it is true, by $25,000,000 or $30,000,000; but they have got invested in American bonds, American stocks and other securities, millions and millions of dollars. If you find fault with that, they will tell you: 'You do not understand anything about banking; we have to have liquid assets.' What more liquid assets can they have than by lending money to the farmers on the products of this country? They are always talking about the importance of having these liquid assets. But we find one bank, the Bank of Commerce, to-day putting up a building which is estimated to cost a million and a half dollars. In the city of Toronto, on nearly every important corner, you will find large and expensive buildings in which the banks have tied up money for the purpose of getting liquid assets. For instance, the Sovereign bank has in Montreal one of the finest buildings in the city. In the report of the government, the banks state that the amount they have invested in bank premises and other real estate is $17,304,000, which does not begin to represent the money they have invested in buildings throughout the Dominion.

Take the Bank of Montreal. In its annual statement, the value of its bank's premises is given at $600,000. Why, that bank spent $1,500,000 a few yars ago on improvements in connection with its premises, and I am told that to-day the very ground upon which the bank building in Montreal stands is worth very much more than $600,000. I am not finding any fault with the banks for having good bank premises throughout the country; but when they come to the government and ask the government to furnish the money to assist them in moving the crops, let them not talk about liquid assets. They themselves are not investing their money where it will be used for the development of Canadian industries, but the moment they get their charters many of them put their money into railway bonds and stocks and other securities. Here are great public utilities to which we give charters for the purpose of enabling them to use the money of their depositors and stockholders in the development of this country, using it in other ways. I do not want to be understood as in any way attacking the credit and the standing of our banks. I believe that in Canada we have passed through this last financial crisis in an eminently satisfactory manner, and we have ben enabled to do that because we have had at the head of our financial institutions men of ability and prudence and foresight—men who saw a year ago that a storm was coming and began

to take in sail. I believe that financial conditions are going to improve in the very near future, but that has nothing whatever to do with the question as to the necessity of amending and improving our banking laws. We have now six applications for bank charters which will come up this session, and I take the stand that before we grant any of these charters, we should seriously consider, not in the interests of the bankers alone, but more particularly of the people, what amendments should be made to our banking laws.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. I did not care to interrupt the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, but he made a statement with regard to the interest charged by banks in the west, and I would like to ask him if there were any special circumstances surrounding the cases he mentioned, or are we fairly to infer that these are the rates charged by banks to their ordinary customers ?

Mr. PRINGLE. I cannot tell my hon. friend the special circumstances. In a new country I quite agree that the contractual rate of interest should be fairly high and that the banks should be given the privilege of charging a fairly high rate, but the point I desire to make is that there is no limitation what ever on the rate a bank may charge. Now there is no country under the sun which has not such a limitation. The state of New York has a limitation of 6 per cent and the other states 6 per cent to 7 per cent. In the newly established territories of the United States, the contractual limitation is 12 per cent, and in this country there should be some limitation. I am not advocating that our banks should be narrowed down to a hard and fast rate of 7 per cent or 8 per cent.

Mr. McINTYRE. I am not disputing my hon. friend's argument but simply asking for information.

Mr. PRINGLE. If the hon. gentleman will go to the library and take the Supreme Court reports, he will find there the cases fully reported. In the case of Bossuth the bank charged for some years 24 per cent, then reduced the rate to 18 per cent. Then Mr. Bossuth paid off the loan and came to the conclusion that the bank had exceeded its power under that section of the Act which limits the rate to 7 per cent and tried to recover the excess. All the courts however held that as he had voluntarily paid that excessive rate, he cannot recover any of it back. The same decision was given in the case of the Bank of Commerce vs. Macdonald and in a score of other cases, which is why I think there should be some limitation. But to the credit of some of the banks in the east, let me say that they do not charge these excessive rates. Take the Bank of Ottawa in this city, I do not believe that it ever charged a rate in excess of 8 per cent. The Bank of Nova Scotia, from what I have learned, never charged in excess of 8 per cent. Neither did the Royal Bank. I am not satisfied that the Bank of Montreal has ever charged an excessive rate, because I have my own personal knowledge to the contrary.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Very often in New York we see that what are termed call loans are charged from 15 per cent to 30 per cent. What is the meaning of that?

Mr. PRINGLE. On call money over $5,000, the banks are entitled to charge any rate they see fit. That is a question entirely of supply and demand. If the money market is tight, then the call money brings a larger rate. But people are not obliged to borrow call money. That is borrowed largely for the purpose of speculation. Take the Bank of England, they try to keep a reserve of 50 per cent. If the reserve drops under that, they raise the rate. When it gets above that, down goes the rate. In the last few months, for example, the reserve went down steadily, and the bank rate rose ; but now that the reserve is going up, the rate is lower. There is no state in the Union which has not a usury law. We had a usury law in this country in our Banking Act, but the Bankers' Association attacked that law until they got it eliminated. Mr. Falconbridge says, in that able work of his, in which he refers to the banking laws of this country, that the Bankers' Association directed and controlled the laws passed by this parliament, but the time has come when these laws should be framed in the interests of the people.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman has made a very extraordinary statement. He says that in one instance a bank of Canada, in order to obtain the capital, required to enable it to issue notes, sent promissory notes out to its branches to be discounted, and put the amount to the credit of the head office capital stock account, and on that amount the bank issued bills and went on doing business. Did I understand him rightly?

Mr. PRINGLE. If the hon. member will permit me, I will put it more clearly. Of course, I do not wish to give the name of my authority, nor do I wish to give the name of the bank. I am advocating amendments to the banking law. My correspondent tells me of a certain general manager who forwarded to him, who was a manager, notes to the amount of $111,000—notes of farmers and others who had subscribed to the stock of the bank. These notes he made him discount, and these were credited at the head office to capital account. Now, mark this : A bank is entitled to issue notes, dollar for dollar, to the amount of its paid up capital. The only thing necessary is that they shall deposit

five per cent as a security to note holders. Now, this kind of thing is going on in this country. But I say we can frame laws that will prevent this. We can frame a law under which it will be possible for an officer of the government to step into the head office of any bank and find out what these securities are that are returned in their annual or quarterly statements, and also where those securities are.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman's statement then is that, instead of cash, the stockholders put in promissory notes, which notes were discounted by the bank and that was counted as the capital of the bank. Is that the statement?

Mr. PRINGLE. I do not know that I can make it any clearer. I am speaking from information given me by one who knows, and I could give more information if I desired to do so. Of course, this is a very delicate subject, and one that we should discuss carefully. I do not wish to lessen confidence in any of our banking institutions. I can only state that what I have indicated has occurred, and the return, no doubt, has been made as paid up capital, and that is the way paid up capital has been provided in a certain bank. Of course I think that our banks, taken as a whole, are in a very strong position. I was only trying to show that the time has come when we should be more careful in regard to the banking charters. We have six applications for charters before this House this session. One of them, I believe, is backed by men who are actually ready to establish a bank, and do not care whether this government calls on them for a deposit of $500,000 or of $1,000,000. The rest of them, I understand, are not in that position. I say that the time has come when we should carefully consider our banking law, and we should do it before we grant further charters to banks.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. All I have to say is that I think the statement was made without due consideration. I think it was an unwise statement. I do not think it would be possible to establish a bank in that way.

Mr. PRINGLE. I did not say they established the bank in that way. If the hon. gentleman wants to know how they established it, I will tell him. They got $250,000 and they came here, and, as required by the Act, they deposited that money and got their certificate, and started operations. I do not say that that money was raised for the purpose of establishing a bank. After they once made a start, they got their $250,000 back. According to the by-laws of the Bankers' Association, they are required to show how much paid up capital they have in order to get circulation. If they could show $500,000 of paid up capital, they could circulate that amount of bills, and that is what they are after—to get circulation. Now, under the laxity of our laws, what actually occurred in one case? La Banque Ville Marie had $300,000 of excess circulation. I am told that it is impracticable for the government to control the circulation. Well every other country under the sun controls its circulation. But, we, in our generosity, leave it absolutely to the banker to say whether he should issue $300,000 excess circulation or not. You may tell me: Oh, but Mr. Wier went to the penitentiary for it. Well, what good did that do the hundred and odd depositors in my constituency, who waited two years, and, in the end, got 17½ cents on the dollar? But, if one seeks to discuss the banking question, he is told that he is socialistic and——

An hon. MEMBER. And that his credit will be stopped.

Mr. PRINGLE. Yes, that his credit will be stopped. It is good not to have any credit, and then it cannot be stopped.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The French treaty and then the resolution of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works about the sale to the Grand Trunk. Then we shall go into Supply, taking up the estimates of the Minister of Public Works.

At six o'clock, the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, January 30, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the Institute of Architects of Canada.—Mr. J. C. Walsh.

QUESTIONS.

POSTAL SERVICE AND COMPLAINTS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. Is the government aware of the report that large numbers of mutilated envelopes, containing important mail matter, have been received at different points in Canada? If so, what action has the government taken to remedy the grievance?

2. Has the government received complaints from business firms, calling attention to the carelessness of postmasters in forwarding mail matter? If so, what is the nature of these complaints, and has the government taken any action to remedy said grievances?

3. Has the government any agents or officials whose duty it is to cover all mail routes, investigate the receiving and transmission of mail matter at each post office, and the meth-

ods employed by postmasters in receiving and distributing mail? If so, how many officials are employed in this part of the service, what are their duties, and to whom do they report?

4. What is the total number of post offices in the Dominion?

5. Does the government make any examination into the means of carrying mail on mail routes throughout the country districts?

6. Has the government taken any action towards such a rearrangement of the postal service as would bring the correspondence of other districts into closer touch with the business requirements of the departmental, sessional and other correspondents at Ottawa?

7. Does the government compel postmasters to make a report of damaged letters received by them? If so, how many of such reports have been received during the past year?

8. Is there any reason why mail delivered at Kingston and Brockville, or nearby points, should not reach Ottawa earlier than letters posted at Toronto?

9. Has the government made any improvement during the past few months in the carrying to and from of mails touching the nearby towns? If so, what is the nature of the improvement?

10. Has the government ascertained that any person or persons have been guilty of mutilating His Majesty's mail during the past year? If so, what is the number of said persons, and are they still in the employ of the government?

11. How many complaints, if any, has the government received during the past six months referring to the needs of better mail service, mutilating mail, and carelessness in general, in the handling and delivery of mail?

12. What amount of money was paid during the past year by this government to satisfy claims for losses through the handling of mail matter?

13. What is the total amount of claims for losses through the handling of mail matter?

14. Is the government aware that mail formerly delivered to the city of Hull at 8.30 a.m. is now usually delivered after 9 a.m., and often 9.30 a.m.? If so, what is the cause of this delay, and has the government taken any action to remedy this delay?

15. Is the government aware that the mail arriving at the Union Station for delivery at Hull, Quebec, is needlessly held and should be sent direct to Hull?

16. Is the government aware that the mail bag made up in Ottawa for Hull is sent on the mail car to the Union Station, Ottawa, and is held there until the western train arrives in the morning?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. No.

2. Complaints of delay in the transmission of letters and other articles of mail matter are occasionally received. Careful investigation is always made into each complaint, and, when it is ascertained that the irregularities complained of could properly be charged against the postal service, steps are taken to prevent their recurrence.

3. Yes. Forty-six. Their duties are to report upon the establishment of new post offices, the inauguration of new mail routes, increased frequencies of service, upon the management of all post offices, to instruct postmasters in their duties generally, and to keep a careful supervision over the transmission of mail matter, so that its delivery may be effected with the least possible delay.

4. On 31st March last there were 11,377 post offices in the Dominion.

5. Yes.

6. As the department is at present using all possible facilities to give the very best and earliest service, it is not aware of any re-arrangement that could possibly be made that would improve the service now in existence. All trains and the earliest trains are used for the purpose of making connections between Ottawa and outside points.

7. Postmasters and other employees are required to note the condition of letters when in transit, and, in the event of the person to whom such mail matter is directed making complaint, such complaint is carefully investigated in order, if possible, to fix responsibility. A return to an order of the House is now in course of preparation by the department, dealing with the number of such cases.

8. Yes, because the train arriving at Ottawa via the Grand Trunk Railway from Kingston and Brockville is due at a later hour in the morning than the Toronto train.

9. Unless the names of the towns to which this question is supposed to refer is given, the department is not in a position to answer the inquiry.

10. No.

11. This information cannot at present be given, but a return is now in course of preparation in compliance with an order of the House, which when presented, will give the particulars asked for.

12 and 13. $830.14.

14. No change has been made by the department in the delivery of mail for the city of Hull, but since the 25th of November last, the Canadian Pacific Railway Toronto train, formerly due at the Union Station, Ottawa, at 6.25 a.m., does not now reach Ottawa until 7 a.m., in consequence of which mails must necessarily be delivered at the Hull post office at a later hour. Any delay in the arrival of the mails at Hull other than that occasioned by this change in the time of the arrival of the trains mentioned above must be caused by the trains not arriving on schedule time.

15. No.

16. A bag is despatched from the Ottawa post office, which is handed to the Hull contractor at the Union Station, Ottawa, to be delivered at Hull with the Toronto mails. When the Toronto train is on time, such mails should reach Hull considerably before 8 o'clock. When the train is late in reaching the Union Station, the contractor instead of awaiting the arrival of such train makes a special trip to Hull, return-

ing in time to connect with the Toronto train.

LIABILITY OF DOMINION TO PROVINCE OF NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

Why are there no liabilities shown on page 32 of the Public Accounts, 1907, as due from Canada to the province of New Brunswick for the following years: 1869, 1870, 1871, 1872, 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883 and 1884?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). No sums were due by the Dominion of Canada to the province of New Brunswick on what is known as 'Debt Account' for the years 1869, 1870, 1871, 1872, 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882 and 1883, the sums previously at the credit of the province having been withdrawn for railway and other public purposes. For the year 1884 (I think the hon. gentleman made a mistake in including this year in his question) the liability of the Dominion to the province of New Brunswick on 'Debt Account' was $563,449.29, as shown by the Public Accounts of 1907, Part I., page 32.

ST. PETER'S INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked :

1. Has the attention of the government been called to the fact that the Indians are disposing of their rights to lands under the settlement of the St. Peter's reserve effected last fall?

2. Has the government instructed the Indian agent at Selkirk regarding the rights of the purchasers of these lands? If so, what are the instructions?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.

2. Yes. The local Indian agent at Selkirk was instructed on the 21st instant, in connection with Indians disposing of, or pledging their holdings, that no transfer or pledge by any Indian would be in any way recognized by the department, and that when it had been determined what land each Indian was entitled to receive a patent for the same would be issued to such Indian without regard to any claims by white men or others. The agent was further instructed to make the position of the department clear and as widely known as possible, as any recognition of rights by transfer would cause endless complications, and in order to prevent same it was incumbent upon the department to issue grants only to the Indians found entitled to receive same.

TRESPASS ON BADGLEY ISLAND.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Has the Department of Justice a claim for collection against T. H. Jackman for $613.48, in respect of a claim made by the Department of Indian Affairs for trespass by said Jackson on Badgley island in the winter of 1905?

2. Has the claim been sued, or in what position does it stand?

3. If suit has been commenced, has said Jackman entered a defence thereto? If so, what are his grounds of defence?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. Yes.

2 and 3. Instructions have been given to a local solicitor, as agent of the Minister of Justice, to collect the amount, but the department is not aware whether any writ has yet been issued.

SIR MACKENZIE BOWELL'S MISSION TO AUSTRALIA.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked :

1. Who accompanied Sir Mackenzie Bowell upon his trip to Australia in the year 1893-4 in connection with the Pacific cable and the consideration of trade relations between Australia and Canada?

2. What was the amount paid in connection with travelling, living and other expenses in conection with his mission?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. J. L. Payne, secretary ; John Carleton, messenger.

2. $2,137.64.

MR. JUSTICE CIMON.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE asked :

1. Who is the Superior court judge for the district of Kamouraska?

2. Is he obliged by law to reside in his district?

3. If so, does he reside in his district?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. The Honourable M. H. E. Cimon.

2. Yes.

3. The government is not able to say.

THE DOUKHOBORS.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the attention of the Minister of the Interior to some news which has been current in the papers, and which appears in the Montreal 'Gazette' of January the 29th, with reference to the situation amongst the Doukhobors. It is rather a long article, and I do not wish to read it for 'Hansard,' but it goes to show, if it be true, that there is a very abnormal and very regrettable condition of things prevailing amongst the Doukhobors. I presume the Minister of the Interior has read it ; if he has not——

Mr. SPEAKER. Unless the hon. gentleman——

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I will read the article and ask a question upon it. The article reads :

Winnipeg, January 28.—(Special.)—Some extraordinary tyrannical decrees are being published by the Doukhobor leaders, that bid fair to drive the whole of the Northwest communities out on a vast pilgrimage next spring, as soon as the weather moderates. The situation in the Doukhobor villages here is unparalled in the world. They have been ordered to sell their cattle by their leaders. They have done so, and now their children die for want of sustenance. Last fall they were ordered to sell their sheep, to the number of 15,000, making a mockery of the benevolence of the quakers, who gave them to them. The Doukhobors gave the whole of the products to their leaders, and the people are now paupers. A special order was also sent out at the commencement of the winter to sell all chickens, and this was accordingly done, at a tremendous sacrifice. Recently agents have gone around to abolish 'time,' and as much as $6,600 worth of watches and clocks have been taken away from the people. Mirrors have been forbidden, and an agent of Peter Veregin has been around and collected all looking glasses. Tea, sugar, coffee, also pancakes, have been forbidden, and their food is now narrowed down to raw potatoes, onions, carrots, turnips, &c. The women have been noted for their skill in embroidery, but this the leaders have forbidden. All wheat is handled by a committee. Sometimes a thousand men go to work on a railway, but the money they earn is given to the committee, and no receipts are given them. Similarly, so with those young men who work in the community brickyard. All have to give receipts for what meagre portion of food allowance they get, but they get no receipts for what they hand in to the common fund. Five hundred people live in two houses. Every man and woman has a width of four feet, and they have to get into beds from the foot. All eat at big tables in the centre. The younger men of the party sleep like sardines in the garret. A new rule is that a Doukhobor must not own more than one shirt. On account of the indigestible food they eat many Doukhobors are suffering from diseases of the skin and stomach. They defy the registration laws, and births, marriages and deaths are not recorded, and instances of bigamy are not uncommon.

Next spring to the Doukhobors inured to the hardships of 'home' life, the fatigue of a pilgrimage will come as a luxury, and it is anticipated that 7,000 Doukhobors will make the long trek on the trail on the exasperated seventy that fled to Fort William last year, and who occasionally walk the streets of the twin cities naked to show that they are used to hardships and can bear still more. Their leaders are assured of the hardihood of the people of the communities, and a big pilgrimage is confidently expected this spring.

I give it for what it is worth; it appears in a reputable newspaper. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior if he has taken or proposes to take any action to inquire into the truth or otherwise of the statements therein made?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I have not read the article referred to, and I have no direct knowledge as to the allegations in it. I am not aware that it comes within the purview of my duties to acquaint myself with these matters as stated. As I understand it, the Doukhobor people came to Canada some seven or eight years ago and settled upon the land, and the administration of the land settled upon has been necessarily a matter for the consideration of the Interior Department. As long as these people could reasonably be considered immigrants I presume they were fairly to be considered to be under the supervision, to some extent, or the cognizance of, the Immigration Department. But I think it is fair to say that after they have been in the country some seven years they can scarcely be considered to be immigrants; they are under the same conditions as any other people who may have been residing in the country for that length of time.

THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved second reading of Bill (No. 57) respecting a certain convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not understand this was to be taken up before the information which has been asked for and promised was brought down. I have not received it yet.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is mistaken; the information in almost every respect has been on the table of the House for several days. I am sorry he has not seen it.

Mr. FOSTER. I have never seen it, and I have inquired for it.

Mr. FIELDING. It was sent to the distribution office, and I assumed the hon. gentleman would get it. I will be happy to send my hon. friend a copy at once, but I realize that will not suit his purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. I make the statement in good faith.

Mr. FIELDING. I know.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been looking for it every day, and I am certain it has not been distributed.

Mr. FIELDING. The practice is to send these papers to the distribution office, and I do not see what more I could do. The information brought down some days ago covers, I think, almost everything that was asked for. There was one point covered by the motion of my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) which we could not reach, but otherwise all the information is contained in the paper my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) now has in his hand. I am sorry it did not reach him earlier, but I am certainly not responsible for that.

Mr. MONK. Is this measure going through now ?

Mr. FIELDING. I should be very glad to have it through unless there be reason to the contrary.

Mr. MONK. I wish to make one or two observations before it goes through.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know if I would be going too far in asking the Finance Minister to leave this over to another day. I do not like to go into it without having the opportunity of making some little investigation.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no desire other than that the House should have the fullest opportunity to investigate and discuss the measure, and shall therefore assent to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman and withdraw the motion. I shall renew it again the first government day.

Mr. MONK. Does that mean to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, I shall renew the motion to-morrow.

Motion withdrawn.

GRAND TRUNK HOTEL SITE, OTTAWA.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to confirm the sale and transfer to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada of part of Major's Hill Park, in the city of Ottawa, for the sum of $100,000, and to authorize an agreement to be made with the said company in the terms of an order in council under date of September 26, 1907, and further to authorize payment of the proceeds of such sale, viz.:—the said sum of $100,000 to the Ottawa Improvement Commission, to be applied by them for the purposes of the commission under the instructions and directions of the Governor in Council.—Mr. Pugsley.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the hon. gentleman not going to make any statement before the House goes into Committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought perhaps I would make it in committee, but have no objection to making it now. Before I became Minister of Public Works certain negotiations were entered upon and were concluded, so far as they could be without governmental action, between my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, for the sale and transfer to the Grand Trunk Railway of a portion of Major's Hill Park, for the purpose of erecting thereon a large modern and thoroughly up to date hotel. My right hon. friend will no doubt inform the House of the negotiations, and all that I shall deem it necessary to do is to state the agreement arrived at. That agreement will be found embodied in an order in council which was passed the 26th September last. Under that agreement, there is to be conveyed to the Grand Trunk Railway a portion of Major's Hill Park, which is shown upon the plan attached to a copy of the order in council, already laid on the table, and that portion consists of an area of 25,328 square feet. That area faces, for a portion of the distance, upon the railway tracks near the Rideau canal.

Mr. FOSTER. Just what are the distances ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The distance upon the canal is 1,140 feet, facing upon the railway. Upon Rideau street the distance is 135 feet.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it go right out to the street ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be from the bank of the canal at the other side of the bridge. It is quite a little distance back from the street.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is the land fenced off now with a nice fence painted green ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it goes at right angles a distance of eighty feet.

Mr. FOSTER. Along Mackenzie avenue ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Parallel to Mackenzie avenue. Then it goes again at right angles to the last mentioned line a distance of 88 feet 6 inches and then a distance of 205 feet, 3 inches, parallel to the railway track, and thence a distance of 60 feet after connecting with the first line I have mentioned, containing an area altogether of 25,328 square feet.

The price at which this land is to be sold to the Grand Trunk Railway is the sum of $100,000, and the government has decided that that amount shall be handed over to the Ottawa Improvement Commission to be applied in improvements by the commission, subject to the direction and with the concurrence of the Governor in Council.

Mr. LANCASTER. How was the price arrived at ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By negotiations.

Mr. DANIEL. How many superficial feet altogether ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 25,328.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to go up there ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A large modern thoroughly up to date hotel.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be the height ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not gone into the plans in detail, but it is to be several storeys in height and is to cost about $1,500,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to have the number of storeys and the height from the ground.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will be able to give that information, if not, I can get it. There are some details in the agreement which perhaps it would be well to read. In the first place, it is provided that the department shall define by stakes the limit of ground to be used. Then that the company shall erect a fence around the area so defined. Also that no materials of any kind shall be piled on the ground on the park outside the inclosure fenced in. Also that the stone cutting and the preparation of all material shall be done altogether away from the grounds of the park. Also that great care shall be taken not to damage any of the walls or grass plots outside the inclosure, and that none of the trees outside are to be used by the company for any purpose. Should any trees be in the way of the construction of the building, they are not to be cut down, but are to be carefully uprooted and transplanted in another part of the park. Great care must be taken not to injure any portion of the park outside, any damage to the grass plots, trees or walks shall be made good by the contractors, and any portion of the park so injured shall be restored to the condition in which it was before the structure was begun. The company is to enter into an agreement before the land is conveyed, embodying the above conditions. And it is to be a condition of the grant that the railway company shall complete the hotel with in two years, according to plans to be approved of by the government, and that should the construction not be completed within two years, the grant to the company shall become void.

Mr. HAGGART. Two years from the date of agreement ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was understood that it should be two years from the date of the agreement, 20th December, 1907. But, as there has been some delay in obtaining the deed, by reason of it having been found necessary to come to parliament for authority to make the conveyance, it is possible that it would be reasonable to make the delay run to two years from the date of the deed.

Mr. FOSTER. They have not been delayed by that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Possibly not. But I merely suggest that possibly, a claim of that kind might be made, and it might not be unreasonable to allow two years from the time mentioned for the construction of the hotel.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the distance between the line of the hotel and Mackenzie avenue ; and what is the height of the proposed new building on Mackenzie avenue ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The distance is not given in feet, but judging from the plan, I should say it was about eighty feet.

Mr. FOSTER.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have had more to do with this transaction than my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley), and perhaps I should say a word. Members of the House are aware that, for a long time, the city of Ottawa has been in need of a modern hotel and that all classes of citizens of Ottawa have been giving their attention to this matter. They are aware, also, of course, that the city council of Ottawa has been in negotiation with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, since that company acquired its present interest in the Canada Atlantic Railway, for the construction of a station on the site of the present temporary Canada Atlantic station. The plan of the company at first, was to have a hotel and station on the same ground. But, after giving the matter the best consideration possible, they thought there was not more than enough room to afford proper accommodation for the station alone, and so they had to look elsewhere for a site for the hotel. They approached the government and asked for a site.

Mr. FOSTER. Who approached the government ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The authorities of the Grand Trunk. The government offered to give them a site on Nepean Point, and to give it gratuitously, the only condition being that they should erect a hotel. But the authorities of the Grand Trunk came to the conclusion that Nepean Point was too far from the business centre for a hotel in a city of the population of Ottawa, and so they asked the privilege of building in Major's Hill Park. After giving our best attention to the matter, we came to the conclusion that might be done. But, instead of giving a site free of charge, we exacted what we thought might be fair compensation, fixing the price at $100,000. It is proposed to build the hotel at the corner of the park, where one embankment faces the canal and the other Wellington street. Hon. gentlemen are aware that a roadway runs parallel with Wellington street from the higher ground down to the canal. The hotel will have a frontage of about 100 feet on Wellington street and about 1,000 feet along the canal. Between the hotel and the west side of Mackenzie avenue, there is a distance of 80 feet. Mackenzie avenue itself has a width of 40 feet. Thus, between the hotel and the eastern side of Mackenzie avenue where the proposed new government buildings are to stand, there will be a distance of 120 feet. Hon. members know that there is a monument in Major's Hill Park, to the memory of those who fell at Cut Knife in the rebellion of 1885. The ground upon which that monument stands is not to be included in the site of the hotel, but will remain part of the park. So, even after the hotel is

built, there will be ample entrance to the park 120 feet wide. It is proposed that the loss of the part of the park to be alienated shall be more than made up by taking in land on Nepean Point, extending the park to the waters' edge on the Ottawa river. That is, it is proposed that the $100,000 which the Grand Trunk Company is to pay the government for this land shall be handed over to the Ottawa Improvement Commission with a view to extending the park as proposed, thus making a very large park instead of the small one which we now have. The Ottawa Improvement Commission has in contemplation also the making of a driveway from Wellington street through the park and thence along the bank of the Ottawa river. Of course, I am sorry that we are to lose even an inch of the ground of the park, but on the other hand, we shall be more than compensated I think, by the extension of the park as proposed. On the whole, I think the proposition is a good one. A question was asked as to the height of the building. I am sorry, but the architect of the hotel has not yet completed a model which he has in preparation, and which when completed, will be placed in the lobby of the House to illustrate what is proposed. It is provided that the hotel is to be of the same style of architecture as these buildings on Parliament Hill. There will be some difference as to height. The plan, as first prepared, showed a building of seven storeys and roof. But we have required of the architect that he shall take off at least two storeys, making it not more than five storeys and roof. It may be thought that even five storeys will hardly be in harmony with the style of buildings that we have here, but I would remind hon. members that there is quite a difference in the levels, Parliament Hill being considerably higher than Major's Hill Park. For this reason, I think that the hotel will be in harmony with the style of buildings on Parliament Hill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is to be the length of the hotel building ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The width of the building facing Wellington street is a little more than 100 feet ; that is my recollection.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. To what extent will the hotel a thousand feet long overlap the new departmental buildings on Mackenzie avenue ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think it will overlap them at all. I think the buildings we contemplate will cover all the ground from the Lindsay building to St. Patrick street. The hotel building will not be of the same length at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will not the new departmental building go as far south as the northern most end of the hotel ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I was mistaken—I am told that the length of the building on the bank of the canal will be only 250 feet. Now with regard to another condition of the hotel, it has been suggested to us that a hotel on the park would necessarily encumber the park with material and various other accessories of a hotel. But I may explain to the House that the plan of the building which is proposed is to have an underground passage from the station to the hotel, and on the level of Wellington Street to the hotel it is proposed to put up a large station and platform which will give the public admission to the hill, while the accessories of a hotel and the working of the hotel, will be carried on on the lower level.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me it would have been far better if the government had adopted what I would regard as the constitutional course, that is, come to parliament and get authority at first, instead of acting first and coming to parliament afterwards. Every one who has sojourned in Ottawa realizes that it is very desirable, in the interests of the city and of the country, to have a good modern hotel, and I do not propose to say a word against that. But there are other sites in the city of Ottawa which could be obtained and which would be much more suitable, I think, than this ; and I am sorry indeed that the government have arrived at the conclusion that it is necessary to take a portion of this park for that purpose. So far as I am concerned—and I say it without a desire to be offensive in any way—in my estimation it is a piece of vandalism to take a portion of this park for that purpose. What will be the result ? You have buildings here in Ottawa at the present time, parliamentary buildings, departmental buildings, which are a credit to the country, which are the admiration of people who come to this city. They were constructed before confederation, but they were constructed upon a scale which made them worthy of the confederation which was afterwards formed, and I am sure we are all proud of them. In addition to that the Langevin Block has been built on Wellington Street. It is a matter of regret that in early days further sites on Wellington Street were not acquired, as it is commonly said that Sir John A. Macdonald desired they should be acquired. That perhaps cannot be remedied now, and you are proposing to erect the necessary departmental buildings on Mackenzie avenue. Then you propose to locate between these buildings and the parliament buildings this large modern hotel, which may be seven or eight storeys in height. It will be absolutely incongruous, it will be altogether out of place, and you might almost as well erect a large hotel alongside the Library here, or on this lawn in front of the parliament buildings. I regret that the government have thought

it necessary to do this; and I especially regret that they should have found themselves obliged to do it without consulting parliament in the first instance. Was this a matter of such extreme haste that the government could not have waited the then approaching session, and have listened to a discussion from the members of parliament, who surely on behalf of their constituents have some right to be consulted in respect to a matter of that kind; and after hearing the discussion and the deliberation from the representatives of the country, come to a conclusion as to whether this would be desirable in the public interest? A hotel of that kind towering among departmental buildings, a building with all the incidents of a large modern hotel, will do much to destroy the beauty and symmetry of the whole scheme of parliamentary buildings as they ought to be designed and erected. I am very sorry indeed that the government have seen fit to take this course. I do not think it is a course which they needed to take. If there was any pressing necessity about it, I would not blame them. But we have been getting on in the city of Ottawa without a large modern hotel for a good many years, ever since confederation; and to spring a scheme of this kind upon the country without taking from parliament the consent which was necessary, without giving to parliament an opportunity to put forward a suggestion or to give a word of advice, seems to be treating parliament with that contempt which is so characteristic of a great many of the administrative acts of this government. I am sorry for a great many reasons that they have done so in this case. I have no doubt the Grand Trunk Railway Company will build a hotel there which will be a fine modern building, and will supply what the city needs in that respect. I am not objecting to it on the ground that the hotel is not necessary, the hotel is necessary; I am not objecting to it because the Grand Trunk Railway proposes to build it, because I have no doubt they will put up a good hotel, and run it in a creditable manner. But I object to it because that hotel will be intruded into the ground of this park, and as I have said, you might as well place it on one of the lawns in front of this parliament building. There are other good sites not very far away from where that station will be located, as to which suggestions might have been made. I think the government in this case has acted with great unwisdom and unnecessary precipitancy, and I believe it will be a matter of regret to us and to those who come after us that the government have seen fit to adopt this course.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not want to see this pass without entering my protest against it. There are several things that I think the House might very well think of. In the first place two of these have been mentioned by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. R. L. Borden). The representatives of the people who are to a certain extent the custodians of the property of the people, left Ottawa last year after the session, feeling that their grounds in Ottawa, their public grounds on which they set great store, were intact and were the inheritance of the people. My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) smiles. Perhaps he does not adhere to the doctrine that these grounds are the property of the government, that they were last year in possession of the people of Canada. Well, being in the possession of the people of Canada, and particularly right here at the seat of government, a part of the great park site that we own, a portion of the property which we were fortunate enough to get at first and to have held for the country, now when we are obliged to add thereto, when therefore it would seem to be wisdom not to sell therefrom, we come to parliament on the last of November, and find that the government, a few days before we came here, have alienated from the country against law, a portion of one of its parks, the valuable property that Canada owns. I want to emphasize what my hon. friend said: it would have seemed to me to have been more fitting that the people's representatives, already on the point of assembling, should have had some opportunity to say whether or not they believed in alienating the property of the country for that purpose and more especially this very property. But, more than that the government have gone to work and bound themselves by making an appropriation of the money of this country when parliament was not in session, an appropriation of $100,000 to the Improvement Commission of the City of Ottawa. What is the use of parliament being called together if the appropriations are to be made while parliament is just on the eve of assembling? It would have been at least, graceful if the right hon. gentleman, when he did sell a portion of that property, had let the people's representatives say how that should be applied, whether it should be put into the treasury, or whether it should be given for this or that purpose. I know the reply of my right hon. friend. It will be that they take the responsibility and they lay themselves upon the grace and under the commands of parliament. We all know what that means.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company as to the disposal of the $100,000. That is entirely subject to the approval of parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. Entirely subject? So is this. I was just going to anticipate my hon. friend. I said I knew what the reply

would be, that the government would say: We have taken the responsibility and we will submit it to parliament. But, my hon. friend knows quite well, as every one sitting here does, that means that parliament has to accept the proposal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not as to the $100,000.

Mr. FOSTER. It means that parliament will have to accept it or this government will go out of power.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend misunderstood me. The agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway as to selling them land is one thing, the disposition of the $100,000 is quite another thing, and if my hon. friend will look at the terms he will see that there is no agreement whatever which is binding as to the $100,000 either as to the Improvement Commission or the railway company.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows that until parliament passes on this nothing has been absolutely decided, but his leader has said to the Improvement Commission, to the people of Ottawa, to the public and to us to-day, and it has been common property in this country, that the $100,000 goes to the Ottawa Improvement Commission. Is it in the resolution ?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it is in the resolution itself. I am protesting against both of these things; I am protesting against the government alienating the property of the people for a purpose that is not a public purpose at all. If they alienated it and devoted it to a public purpose in some way there might be a reason given which would partly sustain such a position, but it is not to be so used ; it is for a private company and for a private hotel. The right hon. First Minister stated the consideration; he wanted to see Ottawa have a hotel. So we all do, but is it the business of the government to provide hotels for the city of Ottawa? Is it the business of the government to provide hotels for the city of Ottawa any more than for the city of Montreal, or the city of Toronto, or for any other city? This government has alienated a part of a valuable property, of a park property of the people of this country in Ottawa. When we come back to another session we may find that during the interval they have alienated other parks in this country in other cities for the purpose of aiding private companies to build hotels.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We may find that they have sold all these parliament buildings.

Mr. FOSTER. They might do that, and if they go on doing these things they have a majority behind them that will sustain them in doing them. The principle of the appropriation of public money means the public appropriation of money by a free parliament. This is not put before a free parliament; it is put before a parliament which is bound hand and foot. It has been done by the government. The government do it on the ground that their followers will see them through, and their followers will see them through. The only alternative is for a man on that side to object to it. What answer would be given him ? Well, what are you going to do about it ? We are here ; do your worst ! What is the worst he can do? If he can get a sufficient number to join with him in a proper protest he can turn the government out. But the government is not afraid of any contingency of that kind. The exhibitions which have taken place repeatedly in this House have given them a well-grounded conviction that they need not fear contingencies of that kind. What reason in the world was there why this appropriation of public lands—for it is that and nothing more, given for a mere nominal sum and that sum given away before it reaches the hands of the government—what reason in the world was there that they should make that kind of a subvention to a private company? If we had land to provide for the building of a hotel what reason was there that it should not be open to fair competition between any parties or corporations who wished to build a hotel? Why was it done secretly on behalf of one single, private corporation, and if so, has the right hon. gentleman put himself in this position, that, if another great corporation comes and says it wants to build a hotel in the city of Montreal, or the city of Quebec or in any other city where there are government parks and asks you to treat it the same as you treated this favoured company, it means making another appropriation of land for hotel purposes? Has the government embarked on the plan of alienating public property for the sake of subsidizing a corporation that it is friendly to in carrying out their operations, building hotels and carrying them through? That is one phase of the question and the other phase of the question I want to emphasize again. What kind of commentary is it upon Liberal doctrines that the right hon. gentleman who leads this government and who administers it on the old policy and on Liberal principles, as he will declare, makes these appropriations and flaunts them before the public, before the members of parliament, who are coming from their homes, have a chance to say anything about the matter at all? Is that Liberalism? It is as far removed from it as can be. It is as far removed from constitutional government as properly understood as it can be. The only thing which the right hon. gentleman can say is that we have done it; we have taken the responsibility and we will see whether parliament will back us

up or not. In that state of things you can do anything you please. You can appropriate $10,000,000 if you please; you can bind the country hand and foot if you like, if you can get a majority behind you which will carry out your proposals for the sake of clinging to office, and they are pretty sure to do that for this parliament.

But, there is another feature which has its ridiculous side. The right hon. gentleman has told us of the Washington of the North. He has asked this parliament, forced this parliament—any way he has asked this parliament—to vote hundreds of thousands of dollars and credit towards beautifying the capital in which the parliament buildings and the government parks are a very outstanding feature, and while he is giving hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people's money to beautify this Ottawa—this Washington of the North—he goes to work, singles out one of its most prominent parks and puts a deformity there to last for all time or until it is pulled down. That is one way of beautifying the city of Ottawa, destroying with one stroke of the pen, what with the taxes of the people to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars he is trying to build up. I make this prophecy —I may not live to see its fulfilment but I believe that I will—that the time will come when the people of this country will vote to pull down that hotel, to restore that park to the public properties of this Dominion and to remove the deformity. What is the deformity ? Does my hon. friend conceive, can he conceive that the government at Berlin would take one of its splendid parks or avenues and deform it by permitting the building of a hotel there ? Does he think that Washington, governed as it is by the people of the nation, would commit the barbarous act of allowing a busy, bustling hotel to be put up in one of their great parks there ? Can he conceive of any country which is beautifying its capital deforming it by putting a private business in the shape of a hotel, with all its bustle and eternal hurry, into the very midst of what is its beautification and its pride ? We can not conceive of it in others. What madness was it that seized my right hon. friend when he made this contract and acceded to this idea? It is to be called the Laurier hotel, I am told. Is he so anxious for everlasting fame that he gives away the public property of the country in order to have his name put on a sign board in gilt letters on a deformity to our public park ? I do not care how beautiful a hotel you put up there, you cannot make any congenial union between a modern hotel and the rest and quiet and space and sky-line of these beautiful parks and gardens in Ottawa. To-day there is no more beautiful view in this country than the view from that street out towards the sky-line. If a hotel of five or seven stories is put there that view is absolutely blotted out from your sight and the whole natural beauty, which to my mind is not paralleled by any other spot in this country, is hidden and mangled and deformed by a bit of bustling, working hotel property in which coming and going is the feature from morn till night and night till morn. Here are the public grounds and public buildings well set up, beautiful in their proportions and kingly in the site they occupy. You are about to build a line of government buildings in proper style, not too high, an immense mass of government buildings and between the two parts of your property, between your two masses of buildings you will place a great hotel building which will absolutely hide them from view.

You say it is to be only five storeys high, but I see nothing in your agreement which gives you the power to stop them going into the air.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The plans are to be subject to the approval of the government.

Mr. FOSTER. They may be subject to the approval of the government——

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would include the number of storeys.

Mr. FOSTER. But if this government remains in power, this government which has alienated the property of this country to favour a company to which they are under very great obligations and to which they look for a great deal more in the near future, the hotel will be permitted to go up into the sky line just as far as they want it to go. We are absolutely at the mercy of the same government that alienates property in the teeth of parliament assembling, without asking the consent or the advice of parliament.

It does seem to me that the word 'vandalism' used by my hon. friend was a mild phrase with which to characterize this. I look at the faces of those who constitute the council and I fail to understand how these gentlemen came to be a unit on that question. I know that members of the cabinet have some ideas about such things and that they realize the incongruous thing which is being injected into the very midst of our park system. To-day every city is trying not to get rid of its parks, but to extend its park system. Here the government is trying to restrict and limit it.

Then comes the argument. It matters little for although we are cutting off this front door we are extending the back door. You are taking the money towards making the back a little more beautiful than it is to-day, but the fact remains that you have alienated the front part, the scenic part, and given it to a paltry hotel business. The government might have better asked us to vote $100,000 or $200,000 as a subvention to the hotel, than to have alien-

ated what was the patrimony of this country, which, once alienated, is very difficult to get back. It will be a repetition of what is taking place on the Plains of Abraham, but in a different way. At Quebec the government first forced a company to put a factory on these historic plains and now the people are compelled from sheer good humour and good taste and the wish to get rid of deformities, to buy the factory out. in this case you have given a site for this hotel and the time will come when the people assembled in this parliament, will say : Out upon that hideous deformity, we will buy it out, raze it to the ground, restore our park to its original position and save its beauty from being further marred.

I am sorry from the bottom of my heart that this thing was done, and although I would hate to subsidize railway companies or hotel companies, I would infinitely rather have voted for that than to have this thing put down there. You may make its face as beauteous as you like and have all possible adornments about it, but it is there, foreign and alien completely to the idea of a park and to the idea of a stately ground that a country like Canada would have been proud to have owned.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). This is not the most disgraceful act of this government but it is the maddest act that they have yet committed. The leader of the government can make his explanations as ample as he thinks fit as regards the opportunities of still obtaining an entry to the park, but he cannot do away with the fact that we will have a building standing there, cutting us off from the park, which will be a lasting disgrace to the administration which sanctioned it.

What is the position ? For years the policy of this government has been to place our new departmental buildings between Mackenzie avenue and Sussex street. What determined the government to place the departmental buildings to the east of Mackenzie avenue ? It was that we had Major's hill park there and that these buildings would look out upon the park. The government, knowing as it did, that it was going to build the new departmental buildings on Mackenzie avenue, the first great folly the government was guilty of was that it allowed a great commercial building, the Lindsay block, to be erected on the corner of that avenue.

Mr. FOSTER. They will buy that out.

Mr. LENNOX. If the Prime Minister had been prudent he would have taken measures to prevent the southern approach to the departmental buildings being blocked by the unsightly commercial structure which stands there now. The day is not far distant (and in view of what has been done rational men cannot oppose it) when the government will have to expropriate that property and cause another wasteful expenditure of public money. But it is not enough for the Prime Minister to have the Lindsay block there ; he must encourage another large commercial structure to be built across the narrow front of that beautiful little park. The entrance to the park is unfortunately very narrow. The right hon. gentleman tells us, with an excuse in his voice which may well be found there, that there will be 80 feet of space between the back door of this hotel and Mackenzie avenue, and that you can add to that the 40 feet width of the street. Well, you cannot add the width of Mackenzie avenue, because it is a public highway and a dirty highway at that, and so all you have is 80 feet of an entrance to that park, and in that 80 feet we have a monument erected to Canadian heroes, and which the First Minister is gracious enough to say shall not be removed. I have felt very keenly some of the ill-advised acts perpetrated by this government, but I never felt so strongly as I felt when I heard that a Liberal ministry could perpetrate such a thing as this. I echo the sentiment that it is a special disgrace to a ministry calling itself Liberal, that they should, after they have alienated the public property, come to this parliament for sanction to that alienation. Time and time again we have had this government commit the country and parliament to such schemes as this, and then we have them coming blandly to the House and asking their followers to vote in support of their action. Only two years ago, after the matter had dangled for months, just on the eve of the session they apointed a Railway Commission instead of waiting to lay the matter before parliament. A few years ago this same government pledged the country to build a railway to the Yukon on the eve of the assembling of parliament and so committed themselves to the scheme that the country had to pay for their blundering. But these are mere matters of money and not comparable in their unfortunate significance to this giving away of the property of the people of Canada. I am not prepared to say that the government did wisely in proposing to erect departmental buildings on Mackenzie avenue. I have always thought that the magnificent site on Wellington and Vittoria streets overlooking the Ottawa river, was the best place for these buildings. But the reason they gave for selecting Mackenzie avenue was that this beautiful little park in front, and now they propose to disfigure the park with an unsightly commercial building, unsightly in the sense that any commercial building is out of place in such a spot. I have no objection to the Grand Trunk Railway company; I have no objection to their obtaining a beautiful site for their hotel,

but I have great objection to this government sacrificing the public property to the interests of this railway company. The Prime Minister tells us that he will appropriate this $100,000 for the purpose of extending the park down to the Ottawa river. But there again we have the unsightly building of the Printing Bureau right in the middle of the proposed extension which he speaks of. I have no doubt the next proposal will be—and it was mooted before the new extension was put on the Printing Bureau—to call upon us to vote money to pull down the Printing Bureau and so extend the view from one end of the park to the other. But you can expend your $500,000 or more to extend that park, and you will still never get rid of this unsightly building at its entrance which will be there as a lasting monument to the folly of this government and the disgrace of the representatives of the people. I protest as strongly as it is in my power to protest against the action of the government and their system of entering into these bargains without the consent of parliament. This resolution says :

Resolved, that it is expedient to confirm the sale and transfer to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada of part of Major's Hill Park, in the city of Ottawa, for the sum of $100,000, and to authorize an agreement to be made with the said company in the terms of an order in council under date of September 26, 1907, and further to authorize payment of the proceeds of such sale, viz.:—the said sum of $100,000 to the Ottawa Improvement Commission, to be applied by them for the purposes of the commission under the instructions and directions of the Governor in Council.

It is a mere quibble to tell us that this is not forestalling the action of parliament, and that it is not appropriating the moneys of this country without the sanction of parliament. The policy as set out in this resolution is not only to sell the entrance to Major's Hill Park but it includes also the appropriation of moneys without the consent of parliament. The right hon. gentleman has not failed to let his subservient followers know that if they vote against that resolution they vote for the defeat of his administration, a thing they are not likely to do. This administration proclaims it from one end of the country to the other that it is a Liberal administration, and it is this Liberal administration which commits parliament to the appropriation of money before parliament has appropriated one dollar of it. And we are told that this parliament is free. Nothing of the kind. It has the kind of freedom the Minister of Finance spoke about the other night ; freedom which is granted to the minority by the grace of the majority. And we may say what we like and we can be as right as you please about every question and our views can be as broad and as patriotic as you can imagine and yet the subservient followers of Prime Minister will stand up behind him one after another and vote for anything he proposes because they know that a vote against it would be a vote of want of confidence in the government, and would turn them out of power.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Before this resolution is adopted, I desire to enter the very strongest protest against the action of the government in this matter. I have been coming to Ottawa yearly for the past twenty years. On many occasions I have gone through Major's Hill park. I have taken visitors there and pointed it out as the beauty spot of Ottawa, and I have always claimed that it was the property of the people of Canada. Never until I saw this resolution in print did I suppose for one moment that any government would be insane enough to attempt to appropriate that property for any other purpose than that of a pleasure ground for the people. Does the government really imagine that this park is their own property and not that of the people of Canada? Otherwise on what title do they claim the right to part with it for the purpose mentioned in this resolution? By what title do the people of Canada own that park? Is the government sure that they have the right to appropriate it for the purposes of a hotel? How did we get possession of it? Were there any conditions attached to its acquisition by us which practically would prohibit its being used for the purposes of a hotel or any other purpose than that of a public park or a beauty spot for the city of Ottawa?

Mr. FOSTER. For public purposes.

Mr. HENDERSON. For public purposes. I am under the impression that we are perhaps going a little too far. I doubt very much if even the parliament of Canada have the right to appropriate that property for the purposes of a hotel—not even if it is to bear and perpetuate the name of the Prime Minister. Even if parliament should sustain the government in this matter, I do not think that the people of this country will endorse our action. I believe that such action will be one of those that the people of this country, from one end to the other, will always condemn. Before we go further, I should like to have some member of the government enlighten the House as to what title we have to take the action we are now asked to approve. How did we acquire that property? Has it always been in the possession of the Crown? I am informed that it has not. I am informed that the Crown parted with that property, and that afterwards the property came back to the Crown subject to certain conditions. Are you sure that those conditions are such as would permit us to hand the

property over to the Grand Trunk Railway for $100,000? Are you sure that by so doing the government would not be liable for very large damages should it be found, after the hotel is erected, that the property cannot be used for hotel purposes? I shall expect some member of the government to make that point very clear before we part with this property. I am surprised beyond measure that the Major's Hill park should be broken into for any purpose whatever, much less for the purpose now contemplated. See what a terrible fight they are making in the city of Toronto to-day against the construction of a railway from Hamilton to that city—simply because it is to pass along one side of one of the city parks, The strongest possible objection is made against the construction of a railway along the south side of the park near the city of Toronto, even although it will adjoin another railway, and even although its construction will not destroy, to any great extent, the beauty of the park or take away any very large portion of the park. The people of Toronto are jealous of their park and desire that it should be maintained for the use of the public. But here, right in the heart of the city of Ottawa, we find the government disposing of what I have no hesitation in saying is the most beautiful spot in the city and which belongs, not only to the people of Ottawa alone, but to the people of this country. The people have the right to use it for recreation and for beautifying purposes, but any other purpose is contrary to the design and intention which led us to devote this ground for the people's use and comfort. Possibly we are too late in entering our protest, but I for one did not wish this resolution to pass——

Mr. FOSTER. Our opinion has not been asked.

Mr. HENDERSON. It has not. Had the government come to parliament in the first instance and asked our opinion before committing themselves to this policy, I do not believe that even the servile supporters behind this administration would have given their consent to our parting with this property in the manner indicated in this resolution. If the government had not committed itself to this proposition, and if its supporters were free to speak and vote as they thought fit on the question, I cannot for one moment believe that they would allow any part of Major's Hill park to be given for the purposes of a hotel.

Look at the thing from any other standpoint. Look at the miserable price obtained. One hundred dollars a foot for property right in the centre of Ottawa. Talk about competition ; do you suppose that that property would not realize more than $100,000 if opportunity were given for free competition? I am confident it would bring a great deal more. But I do not look at this matter from a money point of view. I would oppose the construction of this building there or our parting with that property for any purpose whatever, even if the Dominion obtained five times as much for it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How does the hon. gentleman make it $100 a foot?

Mr. TAYLOR. He is speaking of the frontage.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is 420 feet frontage. There is only 135 feet frontage on Rideau street. The other 285 feet is the frontage upon the canal.

Mr. BERGERON. How can you build a hotel with a thousand feet frontage on 420 feet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Prime Minister corrected that.

Mr. BERGERON. Then it is not 1,000 feet?

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that it is 1,000 feet along the canal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, that was a mistake. The figures are given here as 1,140 square feet at one particular part along the canal. But the number of lineal feet along the canal is 285.

Mr. HAGGART. How can it be square feet along the length of a canal ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is an area along the canal the number of square feet in which is figured out by the engineer.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the correct figure ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There have been four versions. Now, let us have the correct one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) will take the trouble to look at the plan—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I haven't it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But he has had access to it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Not yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was laid on the table several days ago.

Mr. HAGGART. But it is now in possession of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But the hon. gentleman can have it any time he desires.

Mr. BERGERON. Evidently, the departments are not all alike.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will give the figures, if hon. gentlemen will take them down : 285 feet on the canal and 135 on Rideau street.

Mr. FOSTER. And the total area ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total area is 25,329 square feet. But hon. gentlemen will remember that there is a jog in it, and——

Mr. FOSTER. What is the last letter of that word ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The one next to 'f.'

Mr. FOSTER. I thought it might be 'b.'

Mr. SPROULE. Is the property square ? Are the sides of the property of equal length ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. I certainly understood the minister to state that the property which the government was to sell to the Grand Trunk was 1,000 feet in length. I think there is no doubt the minister made that statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) is right. The figures given here by the surveyor is 1,140, and it is right on the line of the canal. It is a little blurred, and the hon. gentleman will admit that the mistake is a natural one. But, on looking at it more carefully I see that the frontage on the canal is 285 feet. The figure that I gave 1,140 is really square feet. But, if the hon. gentleman had figured even for a moment, he would have seen that there was an error on my part in the figure giving the lineal feet. I corrected this and gave the true distance on the canal frontage—285 feet.

Mr. HENDERSON. It only shows that it is necessary for us to get the original instead of a copy. I hope and trust that we now have the correct statement of the matter. I am glad at last that the government is giving away less property than I at first believed. Now, I have made my protest against the disposition of property for this or any other purpose outside of that for which it has been used. It seems to me that there are hon. gentlemen behind the government who will regret that they are obliged to support this proposition. I believe that when they try to explain to their constituents the transfer of public property in Ottawa for the purpose of erecting a hotel, they will find it difficult to satisfy the public. Important questions may arise in connection with this bargain. I do not know what guarantee the government is giving to the Grand Trunk Railway Company that it will be permitted to use this property for the purposes of a hotel. Suppose that local option is adopted in Ottawa, will the Grand Trunk have an action against the government or against the parliament of Canada for disposing of the property for a use for which it cannot be legally used ?

Mr. PATERSON. That is based on the assumption that a hotel must neecssarily sell liquor.

Mr. HENDERSON. That question may be raised. Again, so far as I know it may be possible for the Grand Trunk, having acquired this property for one purpose, to dispose of it to be used for some other purpose equally objectionable. I do not know but that, if they do not want to use it for a hotel, they might cut it up into smaller lots and sell it for other purposes. Before the resolution is voted on, I hope the government will make it clear to us that the tenure of the property is such that the government can deal with it in the manner proposed under the resolution.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). I desire to add a word or two in criticism of the proposition before the House. I think it is universally agreed that the situation of the parliament buildings is unequalled in Canada for such a purpose. It is a matter of pride and satisfaction to all that the fathers of confederation selected such a magnificent site for these federal public buildings. As you enter this building, you find the date 1867 recorded in the floor of the vestibule. This tells every one who enters here that it is more than forty years since this site was chosen. We cannot but agree that the fathers of confederation showed great foresight, not only in choosing the place for these buildings but the style of buildings which they left for posterity. And, now that we have come into this inheritance, and having control of these buildings for the brief course of our lives, it is our duty to remember that this is not a matter for our day alone; that these buildings are here for all time, so far as this country is concerned, and that we should not lightly alienate land which is part of a public property regarded with such pride and satisfaction by Canadians everywhere. I think this proposition is very much to be regretted, on the grounds urged by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and others who have spoken. The building of a hotel in Major's Hill park is certainly not a desirable thing. I understood the minister to say that the large and beautiful trees in the park are to be uprooted and planted somewhere else. The hon. gentleman may be an authority in arboriculture, but my confident belief is that, if he has the opportunity to see these trees a few years after their removal, he will find them nothing but withered stalks. Those trees cannot be transplanted now to any advantage. It seems to me the height of folly to attempt to transplant trees of that size, and remove them over to Nepean Point. I was wondering when I heard the hon. gentleman say these trees were to be removed, if history was going to repeat itself. Many of us who have read Shakespeare will remember how the witch told Macbeth that he should not die until Birnam Wood was removed to Dunsinane. I was thinking that if the witch at Ottawa had told this ministry ten or twelve years ago that they should not die until the trees on Major's Hill park were removed to Nepean Point, if that prophecy is about to be fulfilled, and their career may be near at an end. But whether that is true or not, the fact re-

mains that they are destroying this beauty spot in the city of Ottawa, a spot that belongs to the people of Canada, and doing it without having consulted this House or at least this side of it. It may be that hon. gentlemen opposite consider we are a small factor, but even if we are a small factor, we have some say about the property which belongs to the public. Any gentleman who has a wife and endeavours to hand his property over to anybody else, has got to get the consent of his wife, and I want to say that we have not yet barred our dower in that respect, and we propose now to enter our protest against the transferring of this public property, without the will of this parliament having been heard, or the members of this House having had an opportunity to present their views.

This park is one of the beauty spots of Ottawa, so much so that it has been well said that the public interest requires that it should be maintained as it is. Now there are many other sites that might have been obtained for that hotel, and that would have served the purpose equally well. I believe His Excellency the Governor General made the suggestion, or it was so reported, that the hotel should be built on Nepean Point, and not Major's Hill park. That seems to me to have been a very good idea ; place the hotel on Nepean Point or somewhere more remote. But why should this country subsidize any hotel at all ? That is a principle that ought to be looked into. Is it a fair proposition to the hotel interests of Ottawa who have some right to consideration, that this government should select one of the most beautiful sites in the city and hand it over to another hotel competing with these interests that have been established here and have had to fight their way ? Is that a business proposition ? I think not. Therefore I think the government have taken three or four steps in this matter that are not commendable. They have overridden, so to speak, the will of parliament ; they have taken the matter into their own hands and assigned this large part of the park to a hotel company for $100,000. All these matters are in direct conflict with the powers of parliament, and show the tendency of this government, manifested on many previous occasions, to usurp for the Privy Council powers that are supposed to be vested in parliament alone. I for one therefore, on these grounds, desire to enter my protest against what is being done by this government, and I think that when the country is fully seized of the facts, it will also be of the opinion that the move is not wise, that it is not proper, that it is not in the interest of the people of Canada as a whole who own and should control, this property.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). When I came to Ottawa 28 or 29 years ago, what is now the beautiful Major's Hill park was practically in its primeval state. A portion of it was used as a dumping ground for the refuse of Ottawa, it was very unsightly. As years went on and the parliament buildings became more attractive, many made suggestions that this unsightly spot should be taken up by the government and improved. In course of time the government decided to take it over from the city, under whose control it was at first, and asked parliament to vote a sum of money from year to year for the purpose of beautifying it. We built a stone wall around part of it, we levelled it up, planted trees upon it, set our flowers, and made of it the beautiful park that we find there at present. We did that at great expense to the country. We have continued from year to year to keep it up, with the idea of making it a perpetual beauty spot adjoining the parliamentary grounds, and an object of admiration for all who visit Ottawa from every quarter of the world. We were told that it was most desirable to do so because it was just opposite the parliamentary buildings, that it was the property of the people of Canada and parliament should take care of it. Now we have done that and kept it up during all these years at great expense. Later on, when we required more ground for new departmental buildings, the question was raised where we could get that ground. Some suggested that we should take a portion of Major's Hill park for that purpose, because it belonged to the government and would cost the country nothing. But a strong protest was entered by the people of Ottawa, and many members of parliament, against that project, they contended that it would destroy this beauty spot which ought to be kept for ever free. The result was that the government decided not to build upon it, and as they required more ground, they decided to buy all the land along Sussex street, which they did at great cost, rather than take any portion of Major's Hill park. We voted more money for the purpose of buying out large blocks that were erected for commercial and other purposes, paying a very extravagant price in many instances rather than take a foot of that park which we intended to keep for ever. Not only did we pay a large price for this property, but we paid very heavy commissions to the men who purchased it for the government. But after all we have done we find now that the government have presumed, by order in council, to sell a portion of it to the Grand Trunk company, and for what purpose ? For the purpose of erecting a hotel. Do you think the people of Canada will endorse that ? I do not think so. Do you think the people of Canada will consider that the government were doing their proper and legitimate duty ? I do not think so. I think the people will come to the conclusion that the government have

gone very far beyond their duty, and have assumed an authority that it was always supposed parliament alone could exercise. The government have a right to expend money on a Governor General's warrant when some great emergency arises which makes it absolutely necessary to spend the money not voted by parliament. But there is no such necessity in this case. There was no need of hurry in pushing through this undertaking, therefore I say there was no justification for the order in council that was passed selling this property.

Now there is another thing that attracts my attention. Why should we give a subsidy to a railway company to build a hotel? —because that is practically what we are doing. I am told—if my information be correct or approximately correct—that if this property were sold in open market it would realize four times the money that we receive for it. If that be so what is the situation ?—that we are giving $300,000 of a subsidy to the Grand Trunk Railway company to build an hotel. Well, the morale will not appeal with very great force to the temperance people of this country, I imagine. What have they done in addition to that ? For fear that there will be a protest from the city council or the citizens of Ottawa the government say : We will take the money which we receive for the sale of Canada's property and, because it is within the limits of your city and you might protest against it, we will buy you up by agreeing to spend that money in other directions for the beautification of Ottawa. Is that not absolutely and corruptly buying the silence of the people of Ottawa ? It seems to me that it is. I do not know any other explanation that can be given of it. By what parity of reasoning can you explain to the people of Canada that you have the right to take Canada's property and sell it for the purpose of raising money and then hand that money over to the people of Ottawa to expend for the beautification of the city or for the construction of roadways ? I do not think it is justifiable, I do not think that the people of Canada will justify it, nor do I think that the government have done right in doing it.

There is another feature I wish to draw attention to. A few years ago we were told that the people of Ottawa had applied to parliament to give them a larger subsidy to be expended in Ottawa because the Dominion government got water supply, fire protection, police protection and everything else for these grounds from the city of Ottawa, and it was contended that we should give something in lieu of these services to the city. We did agree from time to time to give an amount which was to be expended for the particular purpose of beautifying Ottawa. We agreed to pave the whole of Wellington street and we agreed to do more than that ; we agreed that if they would appoint a commission or allow us to join with them in the appointment of a commission we would give them a definite sum to be expended each year for the purpose of beautifying Ottawa and of making it the Washington of the North. The government take very great credit to themselves for what they have done in that regard. Parliament assented to it. I forget the exact amount that we agreed to give them, but I think it was $60,000 a year. The right hon. Prime Minister nods assent to that ; therefore, I am correct in that regard. In lieu of what we were getting from the people of Ottawa it was regarded as a proper thing to give them $60,000 a year to be expended by the Improvment Commission within the limits of the city of Ottawa or closely around the city on the Driveway. That was regarded as fair and ample compensation for what we received from the city. If that be so what justification can the government give for taking an additional $100,000 of the people's money and handing it over to the city of Ottawa to be spent by that commission ? Why this additional subsidy when we were told before that we were making them a fair compensation for what we receive ? What compensation are we getting for the additional subsidy of $100,000 which is to be expended within the limits of Ottawa ?—none whatever as far as I know. But, as I say the other feature of it is that it is taking money belonging to the people of Canada to bribe the people of Ottawa into acquiescence or into silence upon this question so that they will not raise any serious objection to it. I think that is radically wrong. Since we have gone so far, since we have subsidized the erection of hotels by railway companies are we sure that other railway corporations in Canada will not demand similar consideration at the hands of the government ? It is the Grand Trunk Railway company to-day. With equal propriety could not the Canadian Pacific Railway company come to the government to-morrow and demand the same consideration ? You have given to the Grand Trunk Railway company at least $300,000 by way of subsidy to build a large hotel in the city of Ottawa ; why should you not give us $300,000 more for which we will erect another hotel ? And following that, could not the Canadian Northern Railway company do the same thing ? They might with equal propriety make such a demand and they are as much entitled to consideration at the hands of the government as the Grand Trunk Railway is. For these reasons I think the government have done wrong. They have started on a career that, they know not where it will lead them, and they may find it difficult in future to restrain themselves when they are confronted with similar applications from other railway corporations ? In addition to that there seems

to be no guarantee that the Grand Trunk Railway company will for ever use the property for this purpose. I am not very much concerned about that because they might use it for some other purpose to-morrow or next year or twenty years hence, and if they did I do not think the people of Canada would object to it very much. But, it is objectionable for the reasons I have stated, and another objection I find to it is this: I do not understand, according to the usages of parliament, that the government are justified in selling the property of Canada by order in council to raise money and then spending that money before parliament has assented to it, or agreeing to spend it, because it is practically equivalent to spending it if they agree to spend it, and counting on the loyality of their following in this House to vote them through. They are taking the property of Canada, selling it to raise money and then devoting that money to a purpose which perhaps parliament would never devote it to, if it were asked to determine what should be done with the money. That I say is radically wrong. This is on a par with the scheme carried out by the government when, under the colour of a grazing lease to a corporation of men who are proposing to put cattle on the land in the Northwest, they sell 35,000 acres of land for one dollar an acre. They would not sell to the settler or homesteader going into that country land at $1, or $3 or $5 an acre, but they would sell to a corporation which goes in there to take up grazing lands on which to pasture cattle. This is on a par with that transaction. It is taking the eminent domain of the people of Canada and alienating it from the purpose for which it is held by the people of Canada selling it to some friends of their own at a mere fraction of its value and then using the money for any purpose they like. It is taking the property of Canada, not in this case to give it to a few friends, but for the purpose of giving a subsidy to a railway corporation for a purpose that the people will not justify, for the purpose of erecting a great hotel here in the city of Ottawa. Then as I said before, to square themselves, to corruptly buy the silence of the people of Ottawa, the money which is received in return for it they agree to hand over to the commission here to spend within the limits of the city so that the people may be estopped in their desire to object to such a transaction.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). I wish to ask the Prime Minister one question? This resolution says that it is expedient to confirm the sale and transfer of this property. I would like to inquire if the government have passed the title to the Grand Trunk?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that the title has not been transferred.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have the Grand Trunk been put in possession of the property?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think all they have done is to build a fence.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well they are in possession of the property, the actual title may not have passed into their hands but before you come to parliament you have practically given them a title to the property.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln, Niagara). I wish to enter my protest against the principle or want of principle involved in the proposed resolution. Not only is the matter unique in the merit or demerit of the particular case presented but also in the manner in which it has been dealt with by the government. The proposal of the government is:

House in Committee to consider the following proposed resolution:—Resolved, that it is expedient to confirm the sale and transfer to the Grand Trunk Railway, &c.

Upon the matter coming before the House and the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) speaking on it, he was told by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) that he had intended explaining it in committee but could explain now instead of in committee. I listened intently and all the information I could get from the minister was that they had gone into the contract, but there was not one word to show the wisdom or folly of the course or the reason that induced the government to go into this contract. The Prime Minister was obliged to supplement what he had said and he vouchsated an explanation of why it was done. The Minister of Public Works had said nothing except that the transaction had taken place, thereby implying what we are accustomed to see in this House that the supporters of the government are expected to vote for anything that a member of the cabinet says he is going to do. Not only does this show want of respect to the members of the opposition and to the people of this country but equally so to the hundred or more hon. gentlemen who support the government and who are apparently ready as he thinks to vote for the resolution. Nothing could better emphasize the evil mentioned by opposition speakers in the government entering into a contract before consulting parliament, than the fact that not a private member supporting the government undertakes to say one word as to whether he is in favour of or against the resolution. If the government had not made this practically a want of confidence vote, if they had pursued a constitutional course and consulted parliament, we would have had some advice, propositions and probably counter propositions and suggested amendments in this House from those supporting the government; we would have had the benefit of their knowledge and opinion, but they have

none of them discussed it from the standpoint of whether it is right or wrong. The Prime Minister gave us a reason and only one. If he was the mayor or city solicitor of Ottawa, I could understand him giving such a reason, but I cannot understand him giving it as the Prime Minister of Canada representing the whole people. His only reason was that the city of Ottawa needs a large new up-to-date hotel. Suppose it does ; suppose it needs a stove factory, a suite of law offices, an institution for the blind, or something else, are we to understand that because Ottawa needs it, this parliament is to alienate the public domain to serve the wants of Ottawa as a municipality ? The government owns property all over Canada and are we to understand that, if a deputation comes here from any city with a representation that the city will benefit by the sale of a part of the public domain within it, it shall be done ? We know that this is not done in other cities, why is it done in this case ? It is because the Grand Trunk wants the government to do it, or says they must do it, whichever way you want to put it.

The Prime Minister spoke about a monument erected to the memory of some of our volunteers. Was that built to be put into the back yard of a hotel ?

Mr. BERGERON. It may be near the bar room.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the Prime Minister believe that any one of those who had to do with the erection of that monument contemplated that a hotel would be put in front of it, so that from two sides it could not be seen, so that it would be practically at the back door of a commercial hotel, run by the railway ? The Prime Minister was unfortunate in his reference to that monument, for if there was ever a reason why the property should not be sold, even if as he says, the monument is to remain, it is the existence of that monument at that place.

The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) apparently did not understand the plan when he first spoke nor did he until he had received the assistance of hon. gentlemen who spoke on this side. When he did begin to understand the plan he practically proved to this House nothing more nor less than that what is left of the park is to be the garden of the hotel, simply a nice garden for the use of the guests, for which the hotel pays nothing. It is just as if a fine residence was to be built in a city in a public park, with a stipulation that nothing was to be built in front of it. Here we have a commercial hotel placed in the most desirable part of the whole park, and the whole benefit of the park accrues to that hotel. They do not own it but they get all the benefit from it that any one else does, with the special benefit that it surrounds their own property.

Mr. LANCASTER.

I shall not repeat the objections which have been urged to the details of the transaction, but I wish to point out to the Prime Minister that the principle involved is most dangerous and one which he would not contemplate in regard to any other institution than the Grand Trunk Pacific. We must assume that when the Grand Trunk Pacific want anything they can get it from the government, and get it by negotiation, without tenders, or competition ; they probably have only to ask in order to receive it.

Mr. BENNETT. The Grand Trunk can't wait.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Grand Trunk can't wait, and the government rushes the transaction through, and it asks parliament to sanction it afterwards.

Mr. BENNETT. What about that fence?

Mr. LANCASTER. I am told the Minister of Public Works is a lawyer, and he ought to know whether the Grand Trunk are in possession or not. But he did not give my hon. friend a direct answer when he asked if they could build a fence without being in possession.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) being a lawyer ought to know.

Mr. LANCASTER. It was my hon. friend from Leeds, who is not a lawyer, who asked the question, and it was a proper question to ask, and instead of the Minister of Public Works answering candidly, all he said was that he believed a fence had been built there. I can tell the Minister of Public Works that he will not facilitate business going through this House if he does not give more appropriate answers to the questions which are put him. The Grand Trunk are evidently in possession, and why were they put in possession before parliament gave its sanction? It is because the government take it for granted, and the Grand Trunk take it for granted, that it is only a farce to submit the matter to the consideration of parliament, because they know once the government does a thing it will be voted through any way. If it were not for my responsibility as a member of this House, I would say to the opposition : Leave the chamber and let the government and their followers put this resolution through. What is the use of insulting us by bringing before us for consideration a matter which has already been passed upon by the government, and which every one knows will be voted through by their supporters whether it is right or wrong and whether we consider it or not? My time is worth something both to my constituents and myself, and I could be doing work for my country in other places than in Ottawa, and if it is to be understood that resolutions are to be brought into this House cut and dried, knowing that

the majority in this House is going to vote for them, it would be courtesy and it would be charity even not to drag us to Ottawa to waste our time here. I appeal to the charity even of the Prime Minister that he should say so, and leave us to attend to our other business. It is a farce to submit for our consideration a thing that has already been done by the government, and that they know will go through irrespective of all other considerations when the party whip is cracked. I do not pretend to know one-quarter as much constitutional law as the Prime Minister, but what I do know I can apply better than he can. I respectfully submit that this manner of conducting public business is not constitutional. It is no more constitutional than the statement of the Finance Minister that I had no rights in this House except such as he and his supporters choose to give me. Is it common sense to submit this resolution for the consideration of the House, after we have drawn the reluctant statement from the Minister of Public Works that the other partners to the contract are now in possession of the property, that the contract is completed, and that parliament has to vote the resolution? I agree with the contention made on this side that we have no right to take $100,000 of the money of the people and give it to the city of Ottawa to improve its streets. And even if we had the right to do so, in an exceptional case we certainly should be consulted first to ascertain what parliament thinks about it. I assert unhesitatingly that this action of the government is unconstitutional from beginning to end, and if the people of Canada want the constitution of this country lived up to, it is their duty at the next opportunity to vote this government out of power.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) should not take it for granted that there is no use in his coming to parliament, because, devoted as the supporters of the government are to the general policy of the government, who knows but that his speech may have converted some of them to his views.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am afraid they will swallow anything.

Mr. PATERSON. Under the powerful argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) who knows but that the government may be defeated on this question, an occurrence which would bring about a condition of things that the hon. gentleman so earnestly desires.

Mr. LANCASTER. But you have already given away the property to the Grand Trunk.

Mr. PATERSON. Let us look at the matter a little dispassionately. No one expected that there would be unanimity on this question. In the city of Ottawa there was a divided opinion, and it did not run on political lines at all. It has been charged by the member for East Grey, who did not weigh his words, that this is nothing but a great bribe to the people of Ottawa, in giving $100,000 to the commission to expend for the benefit of the city. Well, that is a matter upon which every member of this House is free to speak and free to act as he chooses. It is quite within the power of this House to say whether that money will be given to the commission or not.

Mr. LANCASTER. We don't want the money, we want the land.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman has taken fresh ground now; he does not want to sell the land at all.

Mr. LANCASTER. That has been my contention all along.

Mr. PATERSON. The idea in the mind of the First Minister is that the erection of this building will not at all interfere with the beauty of the park. There is a large frontage left, and probably not anything like nineteen-twentieths of the park will be used. And still we find hon. gentlemen opposite declaring that we have given away the whole of that park to the Grand Trunk. Well, that is like other extravagant statements hon. gentlemen opposite are constantly making in the House and in the country. One would think they would have learned by this time that if ever they expect to be entrusted with the conduct of the affairs of this country, they must discuss questions upon their merits, and cease to indulge in extravagant expressions and foundationless statements. They have, not one or two, but more than two score examples of what the people of the country think about all these extravagant charges which the opposition make in this House and on the public platform and through their press. Time and again since the last general elections, three and a half years ago, the people of Canada have expressed confidence in the government. Surely if the people were to believe the tales the opposition have told they would not have supported the government as they have done; and yet after all the foundationless assertions made by the opposition, and their irrelevant arguments and their extravagant statements, the government is two votes stronger on a division than it was after the last general election. Here is a small portion of this park which is being alienated for a purpose which is recommended by the representatives of Ottawa and its citizens generally and which will supply a long felt want, without at all detracting from the utility and advantage of the park as a public pleasure ground. On the contrary, it will have the effect, in the opinion

of the vast majority of the people more particularly interested—the people of this city—of adding to its attractiveness from a public point of view. And we are getting in return from the Grand Trunk Railway for this small piece of ground the sum of $100,000, besides the erection of a magnificent building which will be a great additional attraction to the city. With that $100,000 from the sale of property belonging to the people of Ottawa——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. PATERSON. Practically.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, the people of Canada.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, put it that way if you like. All the public grounds in this city of Ottawa are the property of the people of Canada. Every patriotic citizen takes a pride in the capital of his country. He boasts of it. When he travels, he expresses to those he meets the desire that they should visit the capital of Canada and see what a young nation can do in making its capital city a place well worth a visit and which would do credit to a much older and more numerous people. The people of Ottawa, the members of this city who represent the people, know, that although there are very fair hotels here, still there is a great lack of such a hotel as would be an inducement to people to come here and pass some time in the city—people who have the means to pay for the very best accommodation that can be had and who will not be satisfied with anything less. Both from the point of view of the city itself and from a national standpoint, it is desirable that our capital should be made a centre of attraction for visitors from all parts of the world, and one of the essential requisites is the providing them with accommodation equal to the best they can obtain in the capitals of other countries. Then, as to the fairness of the proposition, if you want to apply that $100,000 to any other purpose than that indicated by the leader of the government, you are quite at liberty to do so. But let me point out that we are parting with only a very small portion of Major's Hill Park, that the park itself will not be injured in the slightest degree by the erection of this building, and that with that $100,000 we can secure for the people an extension of that park as large again as the park itself.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why not put another hotel there ?

Mr. PATERSON. I should think that the hon. gentleman ought to be satisfied with his own convincing eloquence and with the effect his eloquence has had on the House and not feel called upon to interrupt me. He should rest content in the victory he has had, and no doubt he can anticipate all the members of the opposition rising with him to vote against this proposition of the government. But we have had the constitutional question raised. Several hon. gentlemen have argued that what we have done is unconstitutional. If that be the case, I presume our title to the Grand Trunk Railway will not be valid and the property will not belong to them. But if that be the case, why the whole Canadian Pacific Railway system will have to be given up by that company for they have no better title. The grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway is not any more constitutional. My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was in the House and a supporter of the government which gave the Canadian Pacific Railway its franchise and its public grants. Does he not remember that contract which Sir Charles Tupper, a member of the government of Sir John Macdonald, made with Mr. George Stephen and certain other gentlemen, by which the government agreed to give these gentlemen $25,000,000 in cash and 25,000,000 acres of the domain of this country ? That was not a question of parting with a quarter of an acre but of 25,000,000 of acres of the people's domain, and that was done within a few weeks of the meeting of parliament, unknown to parliament and unknown to the people. The contract was made and signed by Sir Charles Tupper and brought down to this House, and I remember the blank amazement on the faces of many of the supporters of Sir John Macdonald when they first read that contract. And in addition to the 25,000,000 acres of land and the $25,000,000, there was given an exemption from taxation for twenty years, and a prohibition against the building of any other road which could in any way be a competitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway, besides the admission of materials free of duty and relief from taxation of all kinds. I need not enumerate all that was given, but that contract tied up Manitoba for years until that province was on the verge of rebellion. That was a contract made without the sanction of parliament, signed by Sir Charles Tupper representing the King, and when it was brought down to the House it cast dismay among many of the government supporters. As we talked to them and asked them : Are you prepared to support that ? No, they said. Oh, they said, this exemption from taxation can be altered. But when the contract was laid on the table they were told that that contract had to go through as it was, without the crossing of a 't' or the dotting of an 'i,' and when they were told this, there were serious faces among the supporters of the government.

Mr. LANCASTER. They were Tories and did not like to swallow everything without understanding it.

Mr. PATERSON. If the hon. gentleman chooses to insult the supporters of this government by saying they are forced to swallow this quarter of an acre of ground, was it not a pretty big gulp to ask the supporters of Sir John Macdonald to swallow 25,000,000 acres of land ? But they did swallow it. If the argument of the legal luminary from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) be well founded, if this be unconstitutional and therefore null and void, then the whole Canadian Pacific Railway contract, being unconstitutional, must be null and void, and we must get our $25,000,000 and our 25,000,000 acres of land back. Is the hon. gentleman not rather ashamed of his argument now ? Will he tell the House that what I am saying is not true ? If he does not believe it, let him read 'Hansard.'

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman think anybody could be ashamed of opposing anything this government does?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, why should they be ashamed of anything this government has done? But would the hon. gentleman think it necessary to put any such question as that concerning the acts of preceding governments?

Mr. LANCASTER. I am talking of this government.

Mr. PATERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) seems very uneasy. What surprises me is that he cannot rest upon his case but must get up so often to interrupt

Mr. LANCASTER. We got the hon. minister (Mr. Paterson) up anyway.

Mr. PATERSON. Surely, the hon. gentleman has confidence in his own powerful argument and need not constantly attempt to improve it. Now, whether wise or not, this is a bargain that has been made. Considered on its own merits, it seems to be a bargain in the public interest. Why did the Canadian Pacific Railway, with an enterprise which will admire, build a magnificent hotel in Quebec and another, lately finished, in Victoria? Because they desire traffic. And the result is that they are bringing people to the country. Now, we are interested in having people come here to the capital. And if a great railway corporation, having hundreds of miles of its system in the United States, sees fit to invest $1,000,000 in Ottawa to provide for the comfort and convenience of travellers and then use that as an advertisement to bring people to Ottawa, is that not a thing which will be of advantage to Canada as a whole? This great company will use every means to make it known that this capital of Canada is one of the beauty spots of the earth, a place that people who travel should visit, not merely as a beauty spot, but as the capital of a strong and growing nation. And these people coming here will learn what Canada has done and what a glorious future awaits her, and the knowledge of these things they will spread throughou the world. So, there is a national aspect to this question. And here is a clear cut proposition—that Canada shall receive $100,000 for what, after all, is a small piece of ground, and shall use that money to greatly enlarge the existing parks and add another beauty spot to this already beautiful city. Can any supporter of this government feel that he will have any trouble in explaining to his constituents his support of such a proposition?

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I assume that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) is making one of those exhibitions—I say it in no disrespectful way—that he seems to feel it incumbent upon him to make every session. He knows that, sitting behind him, are conspirators against his standing in the cabinet. He knows that the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant), for instance, only a short year ago, not in excitement, but in cold blood, went to a newspaper and told an interviewer there that the Minister of Customs was a marked man, that he must go, because of his increasing years and because his usefulness was gone. So, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) seems to feel it necessary to make one of these spasmodic appeals in order to convince hon. gentlemen on his own side that he is still in the fight. The Minister of Customs is very brave here. But he can be far from brave at other times. He is a minister from the province of Ontario and represents one of the strongest Liberal ridings in that province. He knows so well that popular feeling is strong against the government that in the last two elections he has not dared to run in the constituency which he represented in this House for so many years. And so he seeks a seat in the Liberal hive of North Brant.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does not seem to me that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) is dealing with the question before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. Certainly the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) is not in order.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, will you allow me to point out that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) spent some time in trying to make the point that the government had carried by-elections in this province or in that, and I was endeavouring to deal with the issue that he raised. If it is decided that the Minister of Customs was in order in speaking and that I am not in order in replying to him, I will bow to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Bennett) is not discussing the question before the House, but is making a personal attack on the Minister of Customs, and that is certainly irrelevant.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did the Minister of Customs stick to the point under discussion?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is hardly fair for the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) to make that criticism. If any hon. member had called attention to anything that the minister said that was not relevant, the minister would have been checked in the same way. The Speaker cannot attempt, on all occasions, to call members to order.

Mr. TAYLOR. We are very generous on this side and allowed him to go on.

Mr. PATERSON. I am not prepared to admit that anything I said was out of order. I made no attack on anybody. I used the results of the elections to show that followers of the government had confidence in the government.

Mr. BENNETT. If it is conceded that the minister was in order may I be permitted——

Mr. SPEAKER. The question whether the remarks of the Minister of Customs would have been held to be in order if attention had been called to them does not arise. If the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) has further remarks to make that are in order he has the floor.

Mr. BENNETT. If I was out of order, I certainly was not as much out of order as the supporters of the government in London when there was an election there. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) has referred to a contract made with the Canadian Pacific Railway. But that contract was made contingent on the will of parliament, while in the present case parliament is simply called upon to confirm a deal already made and not to deal with the whole question. More than that, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was not given its privileges until after the proposed arrangement had been sanctioned by parliament, but the government has actually put these men in possession of the property. There is one thing noteworthy in the address of the Minister of Customs, and that is that he stands up for more hotels for the city of Ottawa. I had always thought that the hon. gentleman was a strong temperance man, and on this point differed from some other hon. members on his own side of the House. But now he seems to be desirous, mainly, of having increased hotel accommodation in Ottawa. I suppose he will carry the same idea into his own city of Brantford. The reasons that the hon. minister assigns in support of this transaction are no reasons at all. They do not tell us why part of a national park belonging to this country should be alienated before consulting parliament. It is idle to say that a portion of the citizens of Ottawa desired the construction of this hotel. I think it very likely that many people in Ottawa were stampeded at the time by the Grand Trunk with the threat that they would in all probability not only not construct a hotel or the station either unless this land was granted, and probably the city council also was stampeded on that occasion. Well, that is all I have to say about it, and some time again when the Minister of Customs recurs to elections in the province of Ontario I promise him that if I am in the House I shall give him a rejoinder on that score, as well as in regard to Nova Scotia.

Mr. GEO. H. PERLEY (Argenteuil). As an old resident of the city of Ottawa I would like to say a few words on this subject. I have listened attentively to this debate to hear some good reason why this hotel should be put in this particular spot. When the Minister of Customs got on his feet I expected he would try and give us some reasons why they chose this place, and I want to congratulate the Minister of Customs on the reasons that he did not give. Instead of attempting to justify the choice of this spot, he started off on a stump speech, and told us about the great beauties of the city of Ottawa, which we all very much appreciate, and said that we wanted to get travellers to come here from all over the world. He told us about the Canadian Pacific Railway, and a lot of old time matters that we have heard in this House many times ; but he never attempted to give us a single reason why the hotel should be put in this particular place. There is no doubt that the people of Ottawa desire and need a first-class modern hotel, that is conceded on all hands ; and no doubt the city would be thankful to the government for arranging to get them a hotel if it was put in the proper place. However, I venture to assert here that if a vote of the people of Ottawa were taken to-morrow on this subject, there would be an immense majority that would prefer putting the hotel in some other place than where it is proposed to put it. Surely there are many other places in Ottawa offering quite as good a location as this. I believe firmly that the people of Ottawa would prefer to have the park left as it is, if they could get a hotel somewhere else. Why, Sir, a hotel built where it is proposed will split the land of this government in two. Instead of having an unbroken front to our land we are going to have this immense hotel right in the middle of it. A few years ago we heard about the new government buildings that are to be put up on Mackenzie Avenue. I am not going to discuss here the wisdom or unwisdom of choosing that site for public buildings ; but the site has been determined upon, the land has been purchased, and now they propose to put up a hotel in a place which will obstruct the view of the new buildings, so that a person walking on either Wellington Street or Sparks Street

down across the canal will have no view of the new buildings at all.

The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) said something that I wish to refer to, and that is that the result of this scheme will be that Major's Hill park will become a garden for this new hotel. Those of us who have seen hotels in Europe remember many places where the hotel has a garden of its own; but I know no place where the hotel has the use of a garden given to them by the government, which they pay nothing for. But to my mind the greatest pity of it all is that there was no need of choosing this particular site for the hotel. I think the government could have ararnged with the Grand Trunk Company to put the hotel in some other place, and I am very sorry that was not done. It has been said that the Grand Trunk wished to put it there because it was near the station. Now this hotel, I understand, is intended to be a first-class modern hotel for the purpose of attracting travellers and visitors from the United States and other parts of the world, that it is not intended to be a hotel for the use of transient visitors and commercial business men. Now I will ask the Minister of Customs, or any other gentleman who has travelled, if he ever chose a hotel in any city because it was near the station, unless he only wished to remain in it over night. A hotel will attract just as much custom, and just as good custom, if it is ten or fifteen minutes drive from the station, as if it were just across the street. Personally I would prefer to go to a hotel situated down below the Supreme Court on the bank of the river, rather than to a hotel where it is proposed to put this one. I do not believe any hon. gentlemen in this House can point to a case in any city where a first-class hotel has suffered at all from lack of custom because it was a few minutes drive away from the station. It looks to me as if the Grand Trunk wanted it put near the station for the purpose of catching commercial and transient trade, rather than to attract travellers and visitors from abroad.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman allow me a word ? He stated that the government could have induced the Grand Trunk Railway Company to put this hotel somewhere else. Will the hon. gentleman suggest how the government could have done it ?

Mr. PERLEY. I hardly think it necessary for me to give advice to the hon. gentleman who asked that question, that was the business of the government. The government have come down here, and have given us no reason why this hotel should be put in that particular place. The transactions of the government with the Grand Trunk Railway Company are something with which I have nothing to do. But I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works to give us one good reason why that hotel should be put in that particular place. Was there no other good land in the city of Ottawa ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will say to my hon. friend, what is already well known, because it became public in the proceedings of the city council, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company said: We believe this is an excellent site for a hotel, the best site, and unless we can get that site we won't build anywhere in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. PERLEY. Does the Minister of Public Works think there was no other site in the city of Ottawa good enough for this hotel ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say that, the government was not building the hotel, the Minister of Public Works was not building it. It was going to be built by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, they were proposing to expend a million or a million and a half, and they said—it was publicly reported—they said : Uuless we can get this site, which we think is by all means the best site for a hotel, we wont build a hotel in the city of Ottawa, at the present time at all events.

Mr. PERLEY. Well, I have only to repeat that I regret very much this hotel is going to be put in that particular place, I think it is a mistake from every point of view. I am very glad that we are going to have a new, modern hotel in the city of Ottawa, but I would like to have seen it put in some other place. I would again say that no reason has been given by the government for the location of this hotel in Major's Hill park in preference to another place. The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) has disappointed me exceedingly in getting up and talking about this question and every thing else without giving any reason why the government allowed it to be put there.

Motion agreed to and House went into committee on resolution.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not suppose we are going to carry this resolution before six o'clock. There were some questions put to the government when we were discussing the resolution which were not answered. The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) tried to compare the giving out of lands in the Northwest with the giving by the government of this property in the park, but I do not think he is quite right. The lands in the Northwest belonged to the government entirely. There was no doubt about that. I do not know whether Major's Hill park belongs to the government, or how it came into the possession of the government, or whether we can take it for hotel purposes or anything else.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Department of Justice has informed me that this land was

part of the ordinance lands of Canada. The title is vested in the Dominion government not subject to any trust. The land, under the law now on the statute-book, can be leased and if any improvement is made upon it they can be sold without putting it up to public competition.

Mr. BERGERON. Would it be asking too much to ask whether these papers could not be put on the table of the House ? If I am right in my recollection there was some condition in the granting of that land. I am not sure what it was as it is a long time since we came into possession of the property.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What papers does the hon. gentleman refer to ?

Mr. BERGERON. Papers showing how we came into possession of the park.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is ordinance land and under the Act relating to ordinance land, without coming to parliament, the government can put it up and sell it at public auction, or the government can lease it without putting it up to public competition, and, if any improvements are made by the lessee, the government has power to dispose of the land to the lessee. That is the law which has been upon the statute-book for many years, but we thought it better to come directly to parliament for the purpose of getting authority to make the sale.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like the hon. gentleman to furnish all the information in his possession with reference to these lands. They were originally got from Mr. Sparks by the Imperial government for the purpose of building the canal and they were transferred from the Imperial to the Dominion. The parties who originally gave the lands—that is the Sparks estate—contended that once the property was used for other than canal purposes it reverted to them. I understand that there was a suit in progress between the heirs and the Crown in reference to the ownership of the property. I want to know if that case has been decided or whether there has been an agreement come to or a settlement made in reference to the matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When was that suit instituted ? I never heard of it.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Justice will know, it has been before the courts a long time.

Mr. J. D. REID. If you do not intend to call it six o'clock, I want to enter my protest with reference to this matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have no objection, in so far as I am personally concerned, to allowing this resolution to go through with the understanding that we can have the matter debated again upon the second reading of the Bill and in Committee of the Whole House. It can be resumed then and perhaps it will save the duplicating of some portions of the debate at least. There is to be a Bill founded upon this resolution as I understand ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Which will afford ample opportunity for discussion. We will let the resolution go through pro forma without holding ourselves bound in any way by its passage so that we can keep the matter perfectly open until the Bill comes up for discussion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That will be understood.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no objection to that, I understand. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works would be good enough to send me a little memorandum in regard to the title in the meantime as I have no doubt that his doing so would save time when we come to discuss that particular feature in Committee of the Whole on the Bill. With that understanding I would be prepared to let the resolution go through pro forma.

Resolution reported, read a second time and agreed to.

Mr. PUGSLEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 89) to authorize the sale to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada of a portion of Major's Hill park in the city of Ottawa as a hotel site.

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

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY—DISPOSAL OF NORTHWEST TIMBER LIMITS.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, the lumber supply of the prairie provinces of the Northwest to which I wish to draw the attention of the House this evening, is a matter of vital importance to the people of those provinces. In the immense areas of treeless country constituting a large portion of those provinces, lumber may be said to be one of the necessities of existence. After his food, practically the first thing which faces a new settler in that country is the question of obtaining lumber wherewith to build his house and farm buildings. Its importance has been recognized by various long and animated discussions in this House, and even at the last session we had a long and searching inquiry into the question whether a combine existed in connection

with the lumber industry of the Northwest. Anything which tends to raise the price of lumber is a serious menace to the future settlement of the prairie provinces. For these reasons as well as others I propose to ask that an inquiry should be held into the whole question of the alienation of the timber areas of those provinces, such alienation being a matter that I believe will add most seriously to the price which the settlers of that country will have to pay for that commodity. It is popularly supposed that the Northwest provinces are composed mainly of open prairies. There is a mistaken idea of that kind among many of the settlers of those provinces themselves. As a matter of fact the whole of the northern portions of the prairie provinces from Lake Winnipeg to the Rockies, contain great stretches of timber capable of supplying the people of the prairies for very many years to come. This timber lies chiefly around the many lakes which we find distributed through the northern part of the country and also along the rivers. We find magnificent lumber especially near the sources of those rivers which take their origin on the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains. Mr. Stewart who was superintendent of forestry until quite recently, a gentleman who from his high position is competent to speak with authority upon the matter, at the forestry convention held in Ottawa in 1903, said :

It is generally thought that the Northwest is all prairie—not generally thought by those who know—but the general public has no idea of the enormous area of timber in the west, extending along the foothills of the Rocky Mountains, and away to the north and to the north of this province as well. Manitoba is considered a prairie country, but over half of it is wooded. I do not say that it is wooded the same as the Ottawa valley, but west of Lake Winnipegosis, between there and the boundary, there is larger spruce than I ever saw anywhere else except in British Columbia.

I myself have seen photographs showing a stretch one and a half miles in extent covered with close spruce averaging forty-five feet to the tree and fifteen inches on the stump, by actual measurement.

Perhaps the reason why the settlers in the prairie country have not up to the present time realized the immense extent of the timber resources which exist in their province has been the diffculty of communication between the northern and southern portions of those provinces. In the early years the railways ran almost entirely eastward and westward and it became necessary for the settlers to obtain their lumber supplies chiefly from Western Ontario or British Columbia. This had a most serious influence upon the price as the freight rates were extremely high ; I have known cases where the freight actually doubled the price of the lumber. The extension of railway facilities which has been taking place in the immediate past is now rendering intercommunication between the northern and southern portions of the provinces very much more easy, therefore the price to the southern settlers of lumber should be much lower in the near future than it has been in the past. The shorter haul and the greater competition, if there is competition among the northern lumbermen, should bring down the price to the prairie settlers.

The value of the timber areas is more or less a question of accessibility. When we have railway facilities and means of transportation there will be an unlimited market for the timber of the northern section and, given a short haul and effective competition, we should get low prices—and we should get them in the very near future. What will the settlers of those prairie provinces say when they learn that practically all the timber accessible for many years to come has passed from government control into the hands of private parties for a mere song. Yet, Sir, that is actually the case. I have always held that the public domain of any province, of right belongs to the people of that province. I will go further and say that in the case of lumber and coal, especially as regards the prairie provinces, it is of vital importance to keep the control and administration in the hands of the government so that those resources may be used in the interest of the settlers themselves.

I am not dealing with the question of coal at present. The government, in the case of the prairie provinces, should not look on the timber resources of these provinces as a source of revenue, but these timber resources should be so administered as to supply the people of that country with the cheapest possible lumber. This was the view taken by both the Mackenzie and the Macdonald governments. Their administration aimed at having the timber resources of the Northwest developed for the very purpose of furnishing the people of the prairie provinces with cheap lumber. In the carrying out of that policy they granted vast areas to parties applying for timber limits, but under such conditions regarding the operating of mills and producing lumber and paying rent, which practically made it necessary for any one taking up these limits to manufacture lumber on them without delay. These conditions, together with the transportation difficulties, choked off all but a very few of those who applied for those limits, so that out of 699 licenses granted between 1880 and 1896, 615 were allowed to lapse or were cancelled, owing to the failure of the lessees to conform to the obligations imposed on them. No doubt during the course of the debate likely to be had upon my amendment, we shall have

the usual list of licenses which were issued by the late government; but let me say that whether we consider the policy of the Mackenzie and the Macdonald administrations as likely or not likely to bring about a supply of cheap lumber to the settlers, if the Conservative party should be returned to power, such lands and timber limits as still remain in the possession of the Dominion government will be handed over into possession of the people of those provinces to use them for the benefit of the people of the provinces themselves. Let me point out to hon. gentlemen who may use the argument that we have been accustomed to, that five-sixths of the timber areas which are now alienated have been alienated since the present administration came into power in 1896. In recent years great changes have come over the situation owing to the railway development which has taken place, and great changes may be expected in the future owing to the additional railways for the building of which provision has been made, so that we may expect a great future for the lumber industries of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. With careful and provident administration the advantage of cheap lumber should have been very close to the people of those provinces, but what do we find? This government came into power with the definite promise that they would keep the land for the settler only and that nothing should be done for the speculator. But, as has been the case with our grazing areas, irrigable areas and mineral resources, so it has been with our timber areas. From the returns brought down we find that, not only timber areas which are at present capable of being worked, but those which are remote from settlement, and for which there has been no public demand whatever and which will have value only as settlement and transportation facilities extend, are in the hands of persons who are holding them for purely speculative purposes. Not only this, but these areas have been acquired for next to nothing, and are being hawked about for sale at very large prices by those into whose hands the government has allowed them to fall. Well, all the fortunes which will assuredly be made by these lucky holders must ultimately come out of the pockets of the people of those western provinces. Of that there can be no doubt whatever. Since the year 1898 the government has been making changes in the regulations which govern the timber areas of the Northwest, and those changes have been such as to result in an enormous demand for timber limits. This is due to the fact that the facilities for holding limits and making profit out of them have been greatly increased since the present government has come into office. Let me give you an idea of the procedure which is at the present time being carried out in the granting of timber limits, as given by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) himself on the 17th May, 1906. In answer to a question put to him from this side, he made use of the following language:

> The person who desires to acquire a timber berth notifies the department and describes it. The application is considered in the department, and, if it does not conflict with some other berth and some other interest, and is approved of, notice is given by advertisement in what is supposed to be the nearest newspaper, and printed slips containing the same information as in the advertisement are distributed as widely as may be to persons interested in tendering for timber limits. The advertisements run on an average, I think, about six weeks before the tenders are opened.

Is it not sixty days, asked Mr. Ingram. And the minister replied:

> It may run for sixty days and may be as long as six weeks, but I think it is never less than six weeks.

But in many of the advertisements the time given is considerably less than six weeks. At this point the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) was asked what procedure was adopted in the opening of tenders. He said that the Commissioner of Dominion Lands opened them. Mr. Ingram asked if he opened them alone, and the minister replied:

> He may be alone or he may be in company, but he is the official who opens the tenders, and the person offering the highest bonus is awarded the limit.

Naturally attention was called to the fact that there had been complaints of the abuse of this privilege given one man of opening alone such tenders, and the Minister of the Interior himself admitted that he had heard of such complaints, for, in answer to a suggestion along those lines, he said:

> I also have heard of complaints as to abuses of this privilege, but on inquiry I have found that those complaints were absolutely groundless and that the tenders were let to the highest bidder.

Let us for a moment examine this procedure as stated by the Minister of the Interior. Some prospector sets out to look for timber limits. After many difficulties and hardships, perhaps he finds some fine timber around some unexplored lake or little known river valley. Then he applies to the department; and if no one has entered a claim, an advertisement is issued offering forty or fifty miles to be chosen out of a very much larger area—three times the area or possibly even more than that—and six weeks after the issuing of the advertisement a tender, accompanied by a cheque for the whole amount, has to be in the office. The advertisement, so the Minister of the Interior said, is sent to the

nearest local paper, which may be published 150 or 200 miles away from the location of the timber limit. That advertisement takes some days to travel from Ottawa to where the local paper is published ; it has to wait until the issue of that paper appears, and then should any one chance to see the advertisement he may fit out and undertake a journey of 100 miles or more over a difficult and trackless country, hunt over the large area described in the advertisement, and possibly he may find the timber that has been advertised. He can then examine it ; and that done, he has to get back in time to make his tender and to send the deposit to Ottawa before the tenders are opened. In a very great number of cases it is absolutely a physical impossibility, to do that. Even were the tenders asked for during the summer (the very best time of the year), it, in many cases, would be a physical impossibility for any man to accomplish what it would be necessary for him to do. But when the tenders are called for, as they frequently are, in the early winter or early spring, it is practically impossible for any man to go over the limits. Under those circumstances, it is no wonder that very few venture to go to the trouble and expense of competing for these limits. I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that in putting up these timber areas for tender in this fashion, the Department of the Interior is acting absolutely in the dark ; they have absolutely no information themselves as to what is the value of the areas they are offering for sale, and they place no reserve price upon the limit to be sold.

Now, Sir, with regard to the practice of having the tenders opened by an official of the Dominion Lands Department sitting alone in his office, I submit that this is one of the very worst features of the whole system which has prevailed in the Department of the Interior. It is a practice which is utterly opposed to all proper ideas of good administration, and it is absolutely certain to lead to suspicion of collusion between the official and those persons who are tendering. No time should be lost in doing way with this most objectionable practice. It is in the interest of the officials themselves that this should be put a stop to so that they may be relieved of any suspicion on their conduct. It happens that I have some very slight knowledge of the procedure that takes place in the opening of tenders and awarding of contracts in some of the great spending departments of the mother country, and I know that the very greatest precautions are taken. Tenders are sealed and guarded with the most jealous care by the officials, and a certain number of officials are always present when the tenders are opened and the contracts awarded. In some cases the clerks are changed periodically so that they may not stay too long in the contract branch and be liable to the slightest breath of suspicion that they could be in any collusion with those who tender for government contracts. Such an example set to us by the great public departments in England is one which we would do well to imitate. Its adoption here would result in far greater competition and in better values being received for the property of the people.

Now, let us see what is the value of these timber limits which are being put up for public tender. I am informed that where spruce is found in merchantable quantities it is as a rule of a very even quality and it runs from 1,500,000 to 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 feet per square mile. I have estimates of the amount of timber to be found on several different limits, taken at random, and on one of these limits an estimate is given of 3,200,000 feet per square mile ; in fact 2½ miles have already been cut on this limit which has yielded this result. Another limit gives 2,400,000 feet per square mile, another 3,100,000 feet, another 3,300,000 feet per square mile, and so on. This timber has a value on the stump of probably $2 per thousand, and I am informed that the Hudson Bay Company have a fixed price of $2.50 per thousand feet from which they never deviate in the sales of the timber lands which they themselves own. Of course they do not charge any stumpage fee, while the government charges 50 cents. Accessible limits where the logs can be easily floated to the mill and the product shipped by rail or boat direct to the market, are worth at a fairly low estimate from $2,000 up to as high as $5,000 per mile. Let us say that $3,000 or $4,000 per mile represents a fair average price for such limits to-day in western Manitoba, Northern Saskatchewan, and Northern Alberta. I have seen a number of offers of sale of limits, and some of the prospectuses show the value which the lucky holders place upon these limits when they are offering them for sale. I may say, without going into detail, that the value placed on them is from $3,000 up to $7,000 per square mile. The Minister of Agriculture recently made a speech in the province of Quebec and he made boast that the present administration had sold their timber limits at a very much higher figure than did the Conservative administration, and he seemed to rejoice that the government had obtained for this 6,456 square miles which they had placed in the hands of private parties, a price of $81 per square mile, and this in face of the fact, that the private owners are offering these limits for from $3,000 to $7,500 per square mile.

Then I may say that this estimate includes those tracts which have been purchased by mill owners, who have purchased them for the supply of their own mills, and have paid in many cases prices which were fairly well up to their value.

But if you consider the average prices which have been given by those persons who have acquired the limits for purely speculative purposes, you will find the average sum per square mile falls very far below this figure. I have in mind a case where a man bought a berth just about eighteen months ago for the sum of $100, and who is now offering that berth for the sum of $72,500; he says he has already refused an offer of $52,000 for it. I think the offer which was made to him was made a considerable time ago. It must always be borne in mind that these enormous profits which are to accrue to speculative holders must come out of the pockets of the settlers in that country, who will in consequence have to pay higher prices for their lumber. I would estimate from what has taken place up to the present time that every man who has to purchase lumber in that country will have to pay $2 to $3 per thousand more for it than he would have to pay if this land were kept in the hands of the government and properly administered, to be leased only to those persons who intend to produce lumber. Let me lay it down as a matter of common sense that any limits not situated conveniently for shipment by railway or water, and whose development will have to wait for a railway, will only be purchased for speculative purposes. Consequently no person purchasing such a berth will pay more than a small proportion of the value which it will eventually be worth when that region has been developed by a railway system.

After a long fight in this House for the production of original documents in regard to certain of these timber limits, they were brought down a short time ago and laid upon the table of the House. There are many other original documents which have been repeatedly moved for from time to time, and have been refused us. But in three cases original documents were brought down, and it happens curiously enough that one of these documents presents some extraordinary features that call for general remark. There are certain remarkable circumstances in connection with these papers which must be apparent to anybody who makes even the most cursory examination of them. I do not myself intend to go into the details this evening. There are other hon. gentlemen to follow who will elaborate the various reasons for which I intend to ask that further inquiry be made into the matter of these timber areas. I will content myself for the present with presenting the reasons for which I intend to ask for this inquiry, before I move my resolution:

1. That the order in council of the 14th April, 1903, which provided for a renewal of all licenses from year to year while merchantable timber remains upon the area licensed enormously increased the values of timber limits and encouraged speculative applications for berths for the purpose of holding for future increase in values.

2. That nevertheless the Department of the Interior continued to put up for public tender large areas of the timber lands upon which the prairie provinces of the Northwest would naturally rely for their lumber supply in the future, and this was done without any inquiry as to the value of such areas and without any reserve bid or upset price—a policy which has largely resulted in timber limits falling into the hands of speculators to the detriment and loss of the consumer.

3. That such areas have in a large number of cases been situated far remote from settlement where the products could not for some time to come be made available for the public owing to lack of transportation facilities, a fact which gave them entirely a speculative value realizable only on the future development of the country through the extension of railways and settlement.

4. That the selection was permitted of small blocks out of much larger areas, rendering the unselected portions of the belt of little value to any but the original lessees to whom they would ultimately fall at their own price.

5. That the manner in which tenders were called for prevented any effective competition, in as much as the limits were not sufficiently advertised; that in some cases the time allowed between the publishing of the advertisement and the opening of the tenders was too short to allow of inspection by others than the original applicants; that in other instances tenders were called for at seasons of the year when examination of the properties by would-be purchasers was an impossibility—all of which combined to prevent any effective competition, so that as a result these valuable reserves were alienated for a tithe of their real value.

6. That in some instances tracts of timber situated at considerable distances from each other had to be included in a single tender, thus rendering still more difficult any real competition with those who possessed previously acquired information.

7. That the practice by which tenders when received by the department were opened and contracts awarded by a single official in his private office, has been highly detrimental to the public interest, has created distrust among intending bidders and has tended to discourage legitimate competition.

8. That in the case of the tenders for timber limit No. 1108 in which the original files have been recently laid by the government on the table of the House, the presence of two tenders in the same handwriting for widely different amounts, the figures in the higher of the two having apparently

been added after the remainder of the document had been drawn up, together with other features apparent in the documents themselves, render an investigation highly desirable in the public interest.

9. That the returns brought down by the department show so many remarkable coincidences in the matter of close bidding and other circumstances as to lead to the conclusion that the amount of the tenders must in some cases have leaked out, and thus led to the undue advantage of one or other of the persons competing and that a thorough investigation is necessary to set at rest any suspicion that may have arisen. For these reasons I beg to move in amendment:

That all the words after the word 'that' to the end of the proposed motion be omitted and the following substituted therefor:

In the opinion of this House a committee of nine members should be appointed to investigate, inquire into and consider all matters connected with or relating to the alienation, granting, rental, leasing or other disposal by lease, license or otherwise, since the first day of July, 1898, of any timber lands or timber berths forming part of the public lands of Canada, or of rights to the same or to the timber thereon, and to report upon the matters aforesaid to this House; with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses on oath or affirmation.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the House ready for the question? All those in favour of the amendment will please say——

Mr. H. B. AMES (St. Antoine, Montreal). Mr. Speaker, I thought it was the intention of members of the government to reply to the statements that have just been made by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake). But, inasmuch as they appear to have nothing to say on this subject, either concluding that the matter is not of sufficient importance to deserve their attention or else reserving what they have to say until some future time—I find it necessary, if this debate is to be continued, that it should be continued by some hon. member on our side of the House. So, I propose to say a few words in support of the motion so ably presented by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle.

A great deal has been said, not only in the press but on the public platform, with reference to the manner in which this government has disposed of timber areas in the Northwest. Whenever members of the government or their supporters are criticised on account of these transactions, they invariably seek refuge in one declaration. They always say: These timber limits were put up at public competition; and, since that was the case, what possible objection or criticism can there be? I think the hon. member for Qu'Appelle has pretty well exploded that defence; for any one who has followed his remarks can see that, so far as the shibboleth of public competition is concerned, it is a mere play upon words, and that the public competition, so called, under which thousands of acres of our timber lands in the west have passed from the hands of the people has been but a deception and a travesty. Thousands of square miles of our timber lands have been prematurely offered, long before there was any demand for them, long before there was any necessity for their being offered, timber lands in outlying sections which no one but the speculator had explored, and put up under conditions under which bona fide competition was absolutely impossible. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle has shown how utterly impossible it was to have competition under the circumstances under which these outlying limits have been offered, and I do not intend to further amplify that phase of the situation.

The results of this system of tendering, however, I wish to bring to the attention of this House. In the first place, I wish to point out that the conditions, under which this government has permitted those who acquired these limits to hold them, have in every way tended to make the life of the speculator as easy as possible. In the advertisements, as a rule, there is no mention of any date for selection and survey. The result has been that the government have been exceedingly lenient to most of those acquiring outlying limits. Year after year has been allowed to go by and the limits have not been selected. The government have complaisantly, in many cases, notified the happy holders that they should make their selections—three, four, five, even six times; and yet the holders have not completed their selections, and whole areas have been locked up for a term of years until it should be deemed fitting by the happy possessor to make his selection of blocks. In the meantime, values have increased, and the lucky holders have been able to keep others out of the region, sometimes for years. Nor has the so much vaunted saw mill clause been of any real effect. It is not a deterrent to speculative holding to any great extent. It can be put in force only if the minister demands; and it is interpreted to mean that, unless the timber is needed for the settlers in that neighbourhood, there will be no insistence upon the erection of a saw mill. And as these are outlying limits, far from civilization and in sections where there are no settlers, the holders of them are never troubled with the saw mill clause. And these limits, held under practically perpetual lease, renewable from year to year so long as merchantable timber stands upon them, have acquired a very great value, and this value has been given them largely by the very fact that the leases are perpetual. See what it means, and how easy it is to hold one of these timber limits. Take, for example, a limit of fifty square miles.

The ground rent is $5 a year, or $250 a year for the limit. The lucky lessee can hold it for ten years for $2,500, and, during that time the limit may have come to have an actual value of half a million dollars or more. Everything about the methods, at present prevailing in the department, goes to encourage the speculator not only in the acquisition but also in the holding of his limits. By putting up these inaccessible limits prematurely, by permitting them to fall into the hands of people who wish to speculate in them, the great unearned increment passes from our hands and is enjoyed by others. These limits should have been retained until the timber was needed; then they should have been put up under conditions which would have ensured genuine competition among men who wish to cut, not to hold. Then the country would get an adequate return. The limits would then cost the man who acquired them so much that it would be necessary to cut the timber thereon, and so we should have genuine competition.

Now, I propose to spend a few minutes in dealing with the very interesting question: Who has profited by this system? It has not been the consumer. Oh, no. It has not been the settler. Oh, no. It has been the man who has secured limits in the outlying districts, holds them and sell them at an enormous profit. Out of 365 licenses which are in force at the present time, covering an area of 6,402 square miles, five-sixths were given out under the present government. If there is any blame to be attached the present government must bear five-sixths of it. Practically every license, or nineteenth-twentieths of the licenses given out prior to 1896 have lapsed owing to the onerous conditions which could not be fulfilled by the persons holding the licenses. Out of all the timber to-day under lease in the Northwest five-sixths has passed into the hands of the present holders under this administration. These limits are held by three classes of people. They are held, in the first place by the genuine operator and for the genuine timber operator we have every respect. We welcome him to the country and we should make our regulations so that we may give him an opportunity to acquire the timber and to make it available for the benefit of the settler and of the consumer. We welcome him and every man who comes into this country to manufacture and to sell lumber should be given every opportunity to do so. There is a second class which we are also not here to criticise; and that is represented by those genuine manufacturers of lumber, who, looking far into the future and realizing they are making a capital outlay, are desirous that they should have reserve supplies upon which they may draw in the time to come. We have no quarrel with the Red Deer Lumber Company, the Prince Albert Lumber Company, the Edmonton Lumber Company and others where large capital is invested and where great interests are involved, who, looking five, ten, or twenty years ahead, acquire a supply of timber that they may keep their mills running. We are not criticising aimlessly. We are criticising a certain portion of these timber leases that have been given and that is the section that I propose to speak about. There is a third class and that third-class is represented by the speculator, the man who has no mill, the man who has no intention of putting up a mill, the man who has no intention of supplying lumber in the west, but the man who is on the look out for a bargain, the man who having captured a limit for next to nothing, is prepared to hold it until the unearned increment makes it worth hundreds of thousands of dollars, when he is prepared to sell and to squeeze the last cent out of the person who operates the limit. Where does the speculator reside, and who is he? We do not have to go very far even from parliament hill to find him. We have him in Ottawa, we have him in Montreal, we have him in Toronto, we have him in Winnipeg—lawyers, real estate owners, second hand machinery dealers, hide dealers, members of the Senate and members of this House. They are all among the speculation in timber. Headless, unknown companies that serve as cloaks for people who do not dare tell where their interests lie are speculating in timber as well. These people acquire these limits, they hold them and then they sell them. They levy a tax not only on ourselves but on those who come afterwards—on posterity. We have squandered our patrimony and those who come after us will execrate our memory in so far as we have done so. The system which has promoted, which promotes and which is so well adapted to serve the ends of the speculator is certainly deserving of the condemnation of this House. Let us make an estimate if we can as to the extent of the area of these timber limits which is in the hands of speculators. I have endeavoured to do that with great care. I have endeavoured to ascertain who might be classified as speculators, and I find that at least forty per cent and probably fifty per cent of the timber under lease is in the hands of speculators. I find that on three-quarters of the area under lease there has never been a stick of timber cut, that it is not held by operators and that all the timber which is now going into the west to supply the needs of the people goes from about one-quarter of the holdings which are in the hands of real timber operators, and that fully half of the areas that are at present under lease in the Canadian Northwest were put up before there had been a legitimate demand for the timber, were put up while the regions were absolutely inaccessible, were put up before there had been any exploration or any valuation of

them, before there had been any attempt made to find out on the part of this government what these great uninventoried assets were worth. There was no real competition on the part of timber interests. When you find that a limit was located near the timber operators and they looked after it you got a good price for it, but if you had a limit in a remote district, which only had a speculative value, you got a mere bagatelle. That is the history of limit after limit; they fell into the hands of favoured individuals who will hold them until they acquire immense value and who will thus levy tribute on the consumer. By way of illustration I could perhaps offer to this House no better example than that which is presented by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows). The hon. member for Dauphin in this respect occupies a threefold capacity. In the first place, he is a sawmill owner. As a legitimate sawmill owner established at Grand View, Manitoba, he has an area of 94 square miles, located available to his mill which he operates, and I would have it understood that I have not one word of criticism to offer regarding the hon. member for Dauphin with respect to his operations as a genuine sawmill owner and a general supplier of timber for the west. The hon. member for Dauphin, with an eye on the future and realizing that the time may come when he will require to establish other mills, while he was a commissioner of the Canadian Northern Railway, enjoying excellent opportunities of advance knowledge of the Porcupine Hills country, acquired in that region 141 square miles. hat hon. gentleman has reserve miles. That hon. gentleman has reserve him as inheritors, will some day cut into lumber, and yet I think the hon. member for Dauphin would not be unwilling to sell those limits and if rumour is correct he would not take half a million dollars for the timber lands that he holds on the slopes of the Porcupine Hills. If he is holding those with the intention of cutting and selling the timber then I have no word of criticism to offer again on his behalf. But, the hon. member for Dauphin appears in a third capacity. In this case he appears, as near as I can judge, in the capacity of the speculator profiting by this iniquitous system. He has acquired, on the Pembina and MacLeod rivers, lying north and west of Edmonton, 228 square miles of timber limits. I understand that these limits are even now—he may correct me if I am making a misstatement—under option for sale at a large amount.

Mr. BURROWS. That is entirely incorrect.

Mr. AMES. That is entirely incorrect? I am very glad that the hon. gentleman has called my attention to it. I then make the statement that I understand that the limits have a very great value and that when the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is built to the Yellow Head Pass and the Canadian Northern Railway reaches Athabaska Landing those 228 square miles, owned by the hon. member for Dauphin, west and northwest of Edmonton, will have a very much greater value than they have to-day. He will not deny that. He will not deny also that this government put up these limits long in advance of the demand, that they put up these limits before they had been surveyed or valued, that they put up these limits when there was no competition, that they put up these limits when the region was inaccessible and that the time between the date on which the advertisement left Ottawa and the time when the bid required to be back in Ottawa was not sufficient to allow any competition or examination to be made of these limits.

Mr. BURROWS. Does the hon. gentleman assert that I got those limits put up to public competition?

Mr. AMES. I say that the hon. member secured those limits under a form known as public competition which in reality was no real public competition at all.

Mr. BURROWS. I asked him if he tried to assume that I applied to have those limits put up to pubilc competition?

Mr. AMES. I cannot see that that has anything to do with the case. My proposition—and the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) will pardon me if I press it, I have no grudge against the hon member in any way—but I am asserting that a pernicious system exists in this department and that the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) is one of those who have immensely profited by that system.

It is not difficult to distinguish between the operator and the speculator; the operators are well known, the speculators are less well known. A careful analysis of those 6,400 square miles of which I spoke leads me to conclude that at least 2,400 miles, and most of this in outlying districts, are in the hands of recognized speculators, and that these 2,400 miles to-day are worth about $5,000,000. How this will affect the future timber supply of the west I propose to study for a moment by taking up consecutively the several districts and pointing out to this House what this ruinous policy has meant and will mean to the people of the Northwest. Take for example the Winnipeg situation. The city of Winnipeg is largely dependent for its timber supply largely upon limits situated on Lake Winnipeg and the Winnipeg river. Nearly all of these limits have been taken up for some time, and most of them have been cut over so that the people at Winnipeg are beginning to realize that the quantity of timber in their reserve supply is very

limited. We are spending a large sum of money to make the river at St. Andrews rapids navigable and to make it possible for boats to come up from Lake Winnipeg right to the very quays at the city of Winnipeg. When the people of Winnipeg wake up to the situation that practically all the timber on Lake Winnipeg and the Winnipeg river has been cut over, and when they go further afield to see where they can secure a reserve supply, what will they find? Their natural reserve supply will be up the Saskatchewan river which flows into Lake Winnipeg from the west. They will find that all the timber between Lake Winnipeg and the Pas Mission, all the timber on Moose lake, Cedar lake, and Cormorant lake, all the timber which should really be the reserve supply of Winnipeg, is in the hands of A. W. Fraser, of Ottawa, of W. H. Nolan (or the people for whom he stands), of Montreal, and the Macdonalds of this city. All these limits are for sale, and it will be necessary for the genuine timber dealers of Winnipeg to buy from these speculators before they can have a reserve supply.

Take the situation on the Saskatchewan river, from Fort à la Corne to the Pas Mission. The Canadian Northern Railway, on the way to Hudson bay, has constructed a line as far as the Pas Mission. The line is not in very good order yet, but still, in the winter at any rate, some freight can be carried over it; it will, however, soon be graded and ballasted and will be able to handle freight to better advantage. That line, it is expected, will bring timber from the north down into the farming section of Saskatchewan. If a sawmill was established at the Pas Mission, all the timber of the Carrot river and the Saskatchewan between the Pas Mission and Fort à la Corne could be floated down to the Mission, milled there and be shipped down 100 miles south and come into the Saskatchewan market; so that the moment the railway is hauling freight from the Pas Mission these limits become of value. If you examine the limits you will find that all the timber in that section, 200 miles long, has been appropriated by the Prince Rupert Lumber Company, the Macdonalds, of Ottawa, C. R. Smith, of Wisconsin, and H. Finger, of Port Arthur; they have all that timber. Not one of them has a mill, not one of them has cut a stick on any of these limits and many of these limits are to-day in the market for sale. The people who have obtained them in many instances secured them for no other purpose but to sell them. They were put up when absolutely inaccessible, they were put up in advance of the demand, they were put up before the Department of the Interior had any knowledge of their value, and they were given away for a bagatelle. They are in the hands of people who intend to sell and not to cut, and the people of the west will pay in additional prices for sawn lumber, every cent the speculator makes out of them.

Take the Prince Albert situation and what do we find? Lumbering has been carried on in Prince Albert for 20 years. It is the main supply for sawn timber in the middle west. The timber does not lie so much along the main river as on the tributaries to the north, the Little Red river, the Sturgeon river and the Big river. All the limits for about 50 miles north and west and northwest, of Prince Albert are in the hands of operating companies and you will find four large mills there all doing good business. We have not the slightest objection to that timber being in the hands of these people and to their cutting it and sending it to the market. But what has been done? Beyond that 50 miles radius there is an immense reserve area. This government put up that whole immense area at one time; this government put up 50 blocks of 10 miles each to be selected within an area of 6,000 square miles at one time. Anybody can see that it was absolutely impossible to have any competition in that respect. In the three or four weeks allowed it was absolutely impossible for a man to cruise over a section as large as the whole of the eastern townships and pick out in 50 blocks timber equal in combined area to the county of Stanstead. How could that be done within three or four weeks? What is the result? That this whole timber supply has fallen into the hands of the Big River Lumber Company and of a Winnipeg lawyer. I may be misinformed, but I understand it is on sale in whole or in part at the present time, or has been until very recently.

Take the situation at Fort à la Corne east of Prince Albert, which up to the present time has not been available. There you will find the hon. member for Humbolt and Mr. A. E. Hitchcock, of Hitchcock & McGregor fame. There you will find 100 square miles which have been put up before they were accessible and which I understand are at present on sale.

Take the Edmonton situation, and what do we find?

Mr. ADAMSON. Does the hon. member state that that limit is in my hands, and that I am not operating a sawmill. I am in the sawmill business.

Mr. AMES. I have a return showing that the limit was acquired by a Mr. A. J. Adamson and made over to the Sturgeon River Lumber Company. Possibly the hon. member will say if there is any difference between Mr. A. J. Adamson and the Sturgeon River Lumber Company.

Mr. ADAMSON. There is a very decided difference. I did not get one dollar advance on my timber when turning it over to the Sturgeon River Company; there was

no profit made and the timber limit is being operated as the gentleman says it should be done, it is being sawn now.

Mr. AMES. If I were selling from myself, H. B. Ames, to myself, the H. B. Ames Company, Limited, of which I held most of the stock, I would not expect to get much profit. Well, to come back to the Edmonton situation, what do we find there ? The city of Edmonton and the city of Strathcona depend for their timber supply upon that which comes down the North Saskatchewan river. Edmonton is a large town, it is growing very rapidly, large quantities of timber are required——

Mr. FOSTER. It is a big city.

Mr. AMES. It is a big city ; it will be larger. For 100 miles up from Edmonton you will find the timber berths mainly in the hands of operating companies who have their saw mills in Edmonton. That is as it should be. They compete, and together they keep the price of lumber fairly well down. But when you get beyond the 100 mile zone what do you find ? You find that the Imperial Pulp Company, which our friend Nolan and our friend Fraser of original document fame, have very much to do with ; the Imperial Pulp Company, which has no office as far as can be found, no saw mill, has a post office box in Winnipeg as its only known asset, the Imperial Pulp Company owns 300 square miles, which is practically all the reserve supply at the head of the North Saskatchewan, and the Brazeau river and the other tributaries of the North Saskatchewan; practically all the timber from where you get beyond the 100 mile limit above Edmonton. And when it is necessary for the present saw mill owners to negotiate for fresh timber limits they will have to go to the Imperial Pulp company, or shut down. Now let us consider for a moment what will be the eventuality when the Canadian Northern reaches Athabaska Landing. The railway is now being constructed in that direction and probably in a few years the Athabaska river will be tapped, and from that point all the products from up stream can be readily brought down to Edmonton. At present the road to Athabaska Landing is a long and difficult journey ; at present to explore the head waters of the Athabaska river is a very difficult undertaking, but when that river is reached by the railways and when it becomes possible to establish a saw mill proposition at Athabaska Landing and there cut the timber from the head waters of that river and its tributaries, and ship it out by railway and find a market in Edmonton and elsewhere, then it will be found that the speculator has got in ahead. In this hitherto inaccessible region the speculator has gone in in advance of the railroads, and the government have already granted limits exceeding 400 square miles in that comparatively inaccessible area. Before there was any knowledge of the value, before there was any survey, before there was any attempt made to find what the timber was worth, it was given to those who asked for it through this form of pseudo competition. And the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) again was one of the lucky ones. And the hon. senator from Prince Albert was a lucky one. And the Imperial Pulp Company again figures, and fifty per cent of the timber that has been alienated in these regions will be found with these gentlemen. They have anticipated the railway by about four years. I presume they will be prepared to sell. They have again profited by this pernicious system in as much as they have acquired these limits, through the grace of the government, long before the time had arrived when they should have been put up to public auction. By the premature disposal of these limits they have gone for a bagatelle, and their present owners will some day reap an immense benefit.

Now, take the case on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. It was supposed in the first place in 1903, that the Grand Trunk Pacific would pass by way of Dunvegan and you will find a clause in the Bill to that effect. And while we were here legislating—or while some of us were here for I had not then a seat in the House—while we were here legislating and while most people were asking where Dunvegan was, the speculator was up in that country getting busy. And all the best timber on the Peace river and on the Wapiti and the Smoky rivers which flow into the Peace river, the timber that the future settler in the Peace river valley will require to depend upon, all that timber 330 miles in extent passed into the hands of J. W. Stewart, of Larsen Brothers, the contractors, for a mere pittance, a mere bagatelle.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any left ?

Mr. AMES. Precious little. Now it is perfectly plain that there could be no competition when these limits were put up. They lie 200 miles out from Edmonton in a region practically untraversed and unsettled. How was it possible for any competitive bid to come in ? The only man that could bid was some one who would take a chance shot at it, with the idea that he would risk a few hundred dollars and could not go very far wrong. But the Grand Trunk Pacific is not going by way of Dunvegan now. It is going by the Yellow Head Pass, and to reach the Yellow Head Pass it will go along the McLeod and Athabaska rivers, and here again a little advance knowledge was very valuable. The hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) took a long shot in advance and acquired two-thirds of the timber on the McLeod river. And the Imperial Pulp Company, which bobs

up on every occasion, the Imperial Pulp Company acquired all the timber on the Pembina river south of the railroad, so that they have practically a cinch on everything there is in that section of the country. And to these the bona fide operator has to go and with these people the bona fide operator must make terms, and when the people of Edmonton need the reserve supply from Athabaska Landing or from the west or from the head waters of their own river, —the three sections which should naturally supply them—they will find the reserve limits in every one of these sections held by people whom I would term speculators.

Let me recapitulate—you will find that the Winnipeg reserve supply of about 200 square miles ; the Carrot river country supply of 500 square miles ; northwest of Prince Albert comprising 500 square miles ; the head waters of the North Saskatchewan 300 square miles ; the Athabaska river above the landing 400 square miles ; the Peace river country where J. W. Stewart and others are interested 350 square miles ; and lying along the line of the Canadian Northern 150 square miles, or all told 2,400 square miles out of the 6,400 square miles, is practically in the hands of speculators. This whole area, or rather this series of areas, comprising 40 per cent of all the timber at present under lease in the Northwest was put up while it was absolutely inaccessible, was put up prematurely, was put up in advance of any actual demand. The competition for it was a perfect farce, the bonus was wholly inadequate, and it has fallen into the hands of speculators who will levy their tax upon the consumer in the days to come. Had these limits been retained until the railroad reached these sections, until there was a competitive demand by operators, until there was a real necessity for putting them in the market, the unearned increment which now goes into the hands of the speculator would have gone into the coffers of this country and into the pockets of the people of this country where it rightly belongs. The government have unnecessarily thrown away for the benefit of others the unearned increment which accessibility would give in value to these limits.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to give by way of illustration three instances, and those who will follow me will give other instances—we will give this House a great many instances which will bear out exactly what I have been saying. I propose only to deal with the reserve supply of Winnipeg, viz., limits 1107, 1108 and 1171, just one section, just 200 square miles of the 2,400 square miles of which I have been speaking. Just north of Lake Winnipegosis there lies a lake called Cedar lake. Through this lake runs the Saskatchewan river, and where the Saskatchewan connects with Lake Winnipeg, there is a magnificent water-power which can be used for milling purposes. This lake is about the size of Lake Simcoe, and the location for a sawmill is at the outlet. On the 30th September, 1903, Messrs. Perkins, Fraser & Gibson, a firm which includes our friend A. W. Fraser, 'on behalf of a client,' name undisclosed, applied for 60 square miles, to be selected on Cedar lake, around the lake and on the islands in the lake. The department responded to the demand with the usual alacrity with which it answers to demands from its friends. The application was made on the 30th September, 1903, and within twelve days—and I ask you to mark this because there will be instances shown where the department did not move with anything like the same speed—it got out the advertisements and issued the notices that bids would be received on the 2nd December. These notices had to be sent to Winnipeg. They were notices three inches long by two inches wide. They were inserted just once in the 'Manitoba Free Press' and just once in the 'Dauphin Press.' Notices were sent to the Superintendent of Forestry and to the Crown Timber agents at Winnipeg and Prince Albert and to three postmasters—a poster three inches long by two inches wide. The advertising was not extensive.

Mr. FOSTER. That was an instance of the government's economy.

Mr. AMES. Yes, but it can hardly be said to have encouraged competition. Just see what happened. Those advertisements left Ottawa about the 12th October. It was at least a week later before they could appear in the Winnipeg and Dauphin papers, so that nobody in the region affected would be likely to see these advertisements much before the 20th October. Supposing a man in Winnipeg saw the advertisement on the 20th October, saying that a timber berth would be put up to auction on Cedar lake, which is about 60 miles north from the railway. Of course it takes some time to fit out a cruising expedition. You have to find the men, you have to get canoes and supplies, and it would be ten days at least before the party could leave Winnipeg to go out and explore those limits. There would be no use applying at the Winnipeg office because the Crown timber agent could give no information. The only thing he could say would be : There is the advertisement, go and look at the limit yourself. But by the time the cruising party reached Lake Winnipegosis — about the 1st November — the steamer would have been taken off the lake, so that the usual method of getting to Cedar lake would have been taken away. About the 8th or 10th November, the lake begins to freeze over and the ice is not strong enough to drive across and yet too sharp for a canoe

expedition, so that there was no possibility of any competitor from Winnipeg going to Cedar lake and seeing the limits. Even under the best of circumstances it would have required a fortnight or more to get to the lake and go around it, as it has a shore line of 150 miles, and that is where the timber is located. Yet it was expected that in four weeks a man could go to Lake Winnipeg, cross to Cedar lake and then get back to Winnipeg, and have time to finance a big bonus proposition and be prepared to put in his bid to the department by the 2nd December. What happened ? Exactly what was expected and what was intended. When the 2nd December arrived, there was only one tender, that of the original applicant, A. W. Fraser, and for a 60 mile limit, friend Fraser ventured the enormous bid of $500 and got the limit. That was the original bid, and there was no necessity to fill in the figures $500 with other pen and ink. For that paltry sum, that magnificent timber limit passed from the hands of the government into the hands of Mr. A. W. Fraser, or of the undisclosed client whom he represented. Friend Fraser has always been a job lot buyer. When you look through the bids, you will find that his bid is usually about one-tenth of what others think the berth is worth. If anything is going on the bargain counter, you will find friend Fraser on hand to buy it. At all events, this bid of $500 at the usual ratio of what the government might be expected to get from Fraser, meant at least $5,000 as an average bid of another. After friend Fraser got the limit he began negotiations with the Land Commissioner at that time, the present hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), and he had no difficulty in persuading the Land Commissioner to enlarge the area of the limit from 60 to 90 miles. No new tenders were called for, additional bouns was asked, but friend Fraser got the chance of selecting 90 square miles on Cedar lake, the limits he required for the sum of $500, or $5.56 per square mile, or a little less than one cent an acre. You might have thought a land commissioner, who was really anxious to see that value was obtained for the limits of the country, would have said that this bid was insufficient and have called for tenders again. Not so. That one tender was accepted, and the limit went at that price. And since then, although the government then found it necesary to act with such alacrity that they could not allow any reasonable time to other parties desirous of tendering to visit the country, the Department of the Interior found no difficulty in permitting friend Fraser to take more than three years in finding out where the timber lay around Cedar lake which he had obtained. It was four years after he got his limit before he filed his plan of survey. In the meantime all others were excluded and verybody was told that until friend Fraser selected his limit, no one else could locate. Well, it took friend Fraser four years to go over the district and select his scattered lots around that lake, 90 square miles in all, where spruce timber could be found.

Mr. FOSTER. Out of what area ?

Mr. AMES. The entire coast line of the lake is about 150 miles and the islands have about forty miles area. If any hon. gentleman is under the impression that the timber is not of much use, I should be glad to show photographs taken this summer by a friend of mine who visited the limit. That limit was acquired by Mr. Fraser, not with the intention of putting up a sawmill because he is not in that business. He can make more money in Ottawa from his office. He has a partner, so I am told, Mr. D. B. Macdonald, of Winnipeg. Mr. Macdonald looks after the selling end and the limit has been already offered by him for sale. I have here the prospectus issued by J. Heffner & Son, real estate agents, 367 Main street, Winnipeg, giving a description and stating a price. And you might allow me to read that, Mr. Speaker :

Cedar lake, which is situated on Saskatchewan waters is comprised of something over 100 square miles and is estimated at 250,000,000 feet. The timber on this berth would work to advantage in connection with the former berth. As you will notice by the accompanying plan there is one short portage to land the logs from Cedar lake to Lake Winnipeg, a distance of from two and half to three miles. The waters in both lakes are of the same level and the country lying in between the two lakes is of a low flat nature. The timber is immediately surrounding the shores of the lake stated, for sixty square miles, together with the islands or portions of the islands that have been selected. The survey has been made, but up to the present I am not in possession of the plans. The timber is of good quality and fairly clean, more so than the timber in the Erwood and Red Deer districts, but not quite so large. The price for this block is $500,000.

Pretty good as a speculation, is it not? The government parted with it for $500. It has cost Mr. Fraser $450 a year ground rent, a small sum for fire-guarding and a couple of thousand dollars for surveys—and it is on the market for $500,000. It was also offered in the market by the Knoblunch Land Company of Minneapolis, who quoted the same price. It is not a bad speculation when a man can sell for about a thousand times what he has paid. Or, even if he had to pay ground rent for five years and then can sell for a hundred times what he paid, it would seem to be a fairly good transaction.

Now, I say that the department played right into the hands of Mr. Fraser in giv-

ing out that limit. I say that the evidence shows that apparently, there was collusion between the department and Fraser in obtaining that limit, or it would never have been put up under such conditions. Mr. Fraser says he acquired it for an undisclosed client. Who is this undisclosed client ? Is the House entitled to know that? Is Fraser to be used as a cover for some one to acquire this limit for $500——

Mr. FOSTER. Who was minister at that time?

Mr. AMES. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) was Minister of the Interior at that time, and the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) was land commissioner.

Mr. FOSTER. Worth while to go to Stanstead to defend land deals, eh?

Mr. AMES. On January 23, 1908—not very long ago, you see—this limit was assigned to the Spruce Lumber Company.

Mr. J. D. REID. This month?

Mr. AMES. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Who are they?

Mr. AMES. The same people under another name apparently. The president of the Spruce Lumber Company is W. C. Perkins and the secretary H. H. Williams. The probability is that the limit has not changed ownership to any great extent.

Now, let us take up another limit that, on the application of this same Fraser, was put up at the same time. This is north of Cedar lake, and is known as the Moose lake limit. Moose lake also is drained by a side river from the Saskatchewan, and all the product of timber on Moose lake is easily floated into Cedar lake and so to the sawmill. Moose lake is about as large as Lake Nipissing; so you can see that to have all the timber on Moose lake is no small privilege. The timber can be easily milled at Grand Rapids and floated down to Lake Winnipeg in barges, and when the channel is improved it can be laid on the wharf at Winnipeg at a very low figure. Fraser applied for this limit, and again he asked for it 'for a client.' He asked for sixty miles and the conditions were the same as in the matter of Cedar lake. There was the same insufficiency of notice, the same impossibility of examination, and the result was very much the same, except that Cedar lake is a little further and more difficult to get at than Moose lake. There was no question of competition. What little competition there was for this limit came from Ottawa here. Mr. Fraser put in a nominal bid of $1,000. It is evident that he expected no competition. But there was a surprise in store for him, for one named James Currie, who, I understand, is connected with the McDonalds, who are thoroughly responsible people, put in a tender of $6,420. Then a tender was put in signed W. H. Nolan for $7,000. And the $7,000 tender captured the limit.

Now, we had the opportunity a day or two ago of seeing the originals in connection with that deal. The government spent two weeks in trying to persuade us that we did not want the originals, and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) is credited with not being over-anxious that we should see them. However, these originals have been in possession of the House. And on examining them what have we found? We have found that Fraser's tender and Nolan's tender are in exactly the same handwriting. Copies gave us to understand that they were put in by two different men. Typewritten copies would lead us to believe that there was genuine competition in that case. But the originals have shown us that from the same lawyer's office came both tenders, and, while one was signed by the applicant in his own name, to the other he affixed a name that was not his—we do not know whether with or without the consent of the party whose name was used.

Now, I want to ask one pertinent question. How did Fraser know that it was necessary to put in a second bid just seven times the amount of his first bid? All three tenders are dated the same day—December 2. Suddenly Fraser found himself called upon to offer $7,000 for the limit, and he offered it in the name of another man. How did he know that it was necessary to go up to $7,000 in order to secure this limit? There is another thing that the original proves, and that is that the Nolan tender, written by Fraser, was originally written without any price at all; the price was filled in with another pen and was blotted immediately after it was filled in. Who filled it in? Was it filled in after or before it reached the department. If it was filled in before it reached the department, how did Fraser know that it was necessary to put in $7,000? If it was filled in after it reached the department, who was Fraser's good friend on the inside to put it in ? Another consideration. The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) was at that time land commissioner. The hon. member is a very astute gentleman ; I do not think he could be readily imposed upon. I cannot imagine how he could be unaware of the fact that the two tenders were in exactly the same handwriting; I cannot imagine how he could fail to see that the tendering in this case had something about it which needed to be looked into. Did he protect the department over which he presided? Did he make any investigation ? Did he accept the two tenders coming from the same party, the man who had signed two names to two different tenders? There is something to be explained there.

Mr. MACDONALD. What should he have done ?

Mr. AMES. Call for new tenders.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was it right to accept a blank tender ?

Mr. MACDONALD. Accept the highest tender, as every man should.

Mr. AMES. Does not the Prime Minister think that the matter should be investigated ? Does he not think an opportunity should be given for an explanation on the part of Mr. Fraser and Mr. Nolan ? We are quite willing to do our share if he will allow us an investigation. We will endeavour to bring out the actual facts of the case if an opportunity is afforded. Will the right hon. gentleman give us that opportunity ?

Well, let us continue the history of that letter. The return shows that Mr. Nolan was only a prête nom for Mr. Fraser, because Nolan was apparently unaware of the fact that the limit had come his way until he was notified of it. Well, what was the next step in the game ? Five days after Mr. Nolan got the limit he transferred it to the Imperial Pulp Company. Who are the Imperial Pulp Company ? We would like to know who are the shareholders of the Imperial Pulp Company, what interests the Imperial Pulp Company have, where is their place of business, and who are profiting by all the transactions that the Imperial Pulp Company have ? That assignment was made, I say, five days after Mr. Nolan got the limit. Who asked Mr. Nolan to make the assignment, at whose instance was the assignment made ? Can the then land commissioner tell us under what circumstances Mr. Nolan made that assignment, and why he made it ? There is something to be explained there. We know that Mr. Nolan and the then land commissioner are very closely connected, we know that they have common financial interests. There is a good deal to explain between the then land commissioner of that department and Mr. Nolan. May we have an opportunity in a committee to investigate and find out what that relationship is ?

Well, now we will continue the story of the limit. Although the limit was transferred, as I say, to the Imperial Pulp Company in five days, the transfer was not registered for three years. Meantime the department had notified Nolan and Fraser, and Fraser paid the dues generally in the name of Nolan. I have grave doubts whether Nolan ever paid a dollar of his own money on that limit. We would like to find out, and I think a court of inquiry would enable us to find out, if Nolan did not keep up the limit, who did ? Who do Fraser and Nolan stand for, anyway ? Who are Fraser and Nolan and the Imperial Pulp Company standing for ? We are dealing with large values, we want to know who are profiting by these transactions. Well, there was no difficulty in that case in enlarging the area from 60 to 70 miles, there was no difficulty in giving these successful tenderers opportunities for selection. Only on the 31st of December last was the final selection made, or at least that was the last extension granted, and the Minister of the Interior will tell us if a still further extension has been given. Here they have had four years to select their limit, during which time no one else could enter into that area, during which time no one else had a right to make application to cut a stick of timber in that whole area. For four years Fraser, Nolan and the Imperial Pulp Company have been sitting on everything of value in sight all about Moose lake.

Now, what is the value of that limit? That limit has been visited, and an expert report has been prepared. We find that this limit contains a large quantity of white spruce, that this white spruce is larger in size than it is at Moose lake. I shall be able to show the Prime Minister, or the Minister of the Interior, or anybody else in this House, a series of photographs of the timber on that limit.

An hon. MEMBER. You ought to have lantern slides.

Mr. AMES. I have lantern slides of this, and I shall use them, too. It is timber where a grown man standing against a spruce tree will have wood on both sides of his shoulders, timber which, on an average, for over a mile, will cut sticks over forty-five feet long. That limit is also on sale, or was a short time ago. Regarding that limit I have also a prospectus from the same firm of gentlemen, J. Haffner & Sons, 367 Main street, Winnipeg; and this is how they describe it :

> The party purchasing this has the right to select sixty square miles on the shores of the said lake, together with the islands or portions of the islands that they may deem advisable. The survey of this berth has not yet been made, so that the exact area cannot be definitely stated. Like Cedar lake, the timber is conveniently situated to water and can be floated in booms directly to Cedar lake and can be towed to the point of manufacture on Lake Winnipegosis. The estimate of this limit is between 250 and 300 million feet, and the price asked for same is $2 per thousand. To be determined in bulk or established by arbitration. Terms, 50 cents cash, and the balance to be arranged.

If there are 250,000,000 feet, that means $500,000 ; if there are 300,000,000 feet, that means $600,000. Does it not seem that if this limit, worth $500,000 or $600,000, has been obtained under the suspicious circumstances which the original documents show, that the government ought to permit an investigation, and if the government admits

an investigation of this, should they not allow an investigation of every transaction which Fraser, or Nolan, or the Imperial Pulp Company, has had anything to do with? On the 18th of December, 1906, this limit also went the way of the rest, and was assigned to the Imperial Pulp Company, and a new lease dated January 20, 1908, was made with them. Who compose the Imperial Pulp Company? We do not know. We only know that D. H. McMillan is president, and R. R. Pattinson is the secretary; and this Mr. McMillan, I belive, is the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba. But what we would like to know is how much stock Mr. McMillan owns, and who owns the rest of the stock; who has owned stock from the beginning, and who really stands to profit by it, because the Imperial Pulp Company owns 475 miles of the best selected timber that can be found in the whole west, and every portion of timber that the Imperial Pulp Company acquired they acquired in outlying sections before there was any demand for the timber, before the regions were explored or accessible; the limits went for a bagatelle; they were knocked down for a mere pittance, and they fell into the hands of this company and those who act on their behalf.

I have just a word to say in reference to the third of these limits and with this I will be very brief. The third was on Cormorant lake, No. 1171, and the report and photos in my possession shows that superior timber grows upon this lake and that the quality is excellent. It will cut in some places by actual measurement from six to seven million feet to the mile. The Hudson Bay Railway is already planned to go right through that property, and when extended northward will give a great value. Mr. A. W. Fraser was the applicant for that limit also. He asked for it; he asked for fifty square miles to be selected out of 200 square miles. It was also insufficiently advertised; only 47 days were allowed in winter from the time the advertisement left Ottawa until the bids should be back in Ottawa. So, you will see that to advertise this in the west and to permit of a journey of 100 miles up through that north country in the dead of winter was absolutely impossible. Although Mr. A. W. Fraser asked for the limit he did not bid for it. Who did bid for it and who got the limit? The limit was knocked down to the only bidders, the McDonalds for $1,845. The McDonalds were interested with Curry in the limit on the lake just below.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Are these the same McDonalds who put in a second bid in connection with that timber limit?

Mr. AMES. Yes, I am going to show that if you will allow me.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a good question.

Mr. AMES. The correspondence seems to show that Mr. Fraser was very anxious to get limit 1171, but Mr. Fraser's ardour for the limit seems to have cooled and he did not bid for it, and the limit fell to the only bidders, the Macdonalds, here in Ottawa.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. If these are the same McDonalds how can the hon. gentleman suggest that it was necessary for Mr. Fraser to put in a second bid as against these McDonalds?

Mr. AMES. I see that it will be necessary for me to explain that Mr. Fraser and the McDonalds have no connection whatsoever and are usually active competitors. In the case of 1108 there was the James Currie and the Fraser-Nolan second bid. It is reasonable to suppose that the McDonalds were displeased at losing the 1108 limit and it is reasonable to assume that Mr. Fraser withdrew from 1171 in order to satisfy the McDonalds when they bid for the limit. At all events if an investigation were allowed we might be prepared to ask a few pertinent questions which might illumine the matter: No. 1171 is estimated as containing about 75,000,000 feet. I should be very glad to show photographs of that as well if any one wishes to see them. That limit, therefore, at $2 a thousand feet would be worth $150,000. That enables us to make some comparisons to see what the government gets as its percentage out of these outlying limits. Cedar lake, 90 square miles containing, it is claimed, 250,000,000 feet went for $500 bonus; Moose lake, 70 square miles, said to contain 250,000,000 feet went for $7,000; Cormorant lake, 50 square miles, said to contain 75,000,000 feet went for $1,845. These three limits went for the gigantic sum of $9,345, for 210 square miles, or for all the reserve supply of the great city of Winnipeg about $45 per square mile. These limits are considered to be worth $1,150,000. They are considered to be worth $5,500 per square mile, and there are said to be on them 575,000,000 feet of standing spruce timber. All that the government have got for that timber is $9,345.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How much per square mile?

Mr. AMES. Forty-five dollars is what the government get by way of bonus, and $5,500 per square mile is what the people hold them at.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman suggest that $5,500 per square mile is the value of ordinary timber limits in this country?

Mr. AMES. Five thousand dollars per square mile is not unreasonable at all at least where there is plenty of timber.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is at least 500 per cent more than the very best crown timber

lands are worth in the province I come from at all events.

Mr. AMES. I may say that is what the prospectus calls for and that is the price that the people themselves place upon these lands. The Hudson's Bay Company have a fixed price at $2.50 per thousand feet for all the timber standing on their limits. It is not an unusual thing for a timber limit in the west to have two, three or four million feet per square mile.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Is the hon. gentleman aware of the fact that that same Hudson's Bay Company got its timber from a Conservative government without paying anything ?

Mr. AMES. Mr. Speaker, I have but a few words to say before taking my seat. These illustrations that I have given, I think, strengthen the contention with which I prefaced my remarks at the outset. I claim that this government put up these limits in advance of the demand, that they put them up before they had any idea of the value of them, that they disposed of them under circumstances, at least in the case of one limit, that may be characterized as suspicious, that they were put up under circumstances which made competition impossible, that property worth over a million of dollars has gone with a return to this country of less than $10,000 and that the series of transactions with A. W. Fraser, Nolan and the Imperial Pulp Company should be carefully investigated by a committee of this House. Throughout the whole Canadian west there is a feeling of deep distrust that has grown from year to year with respect to the administration of the Department of the Interior. If you hear it once you hear it over and over again ; responsible men will tell you that there has been no use in tendering for timber limits except through some one who is a favourite of the government. If you want those limits to bring a right price you must restore confidence ; you cannot allow the people of the west, the legitimate operators of the west, to feel that they cannot get justice or that there is any thing about this tendering which will not bear investigation ; and that is why I am claiming that this investigation should take place.

I sometimes think that this House and this country do not realize the dual position in which parliament stands. We are here not only to spend the revenues; we are here as custodians of the great uninventoried assets of this Dominion. We do not realize the great value of the land, of the coal, of the grazing areas and of the timber which is under the control of this parliament. In most of the provinces that sort of wealth is under the immediate control of the province, but the wealth of the great Northwest is under the control of this Ottawa government. It is a long cry from here to the timber limits which have been spoken of to-night, and it is hardly to be expected that there will be that close supervision which is desirable, but I claim that in the administration of our great national assets this government has acted in a manner that can only be characterized as improvident. I admit that the alienation of these limits is necessary for their development, but I claim that the government should retain possession of them until such time as they are actually needed to be converted into products which the country demands. The unearned increment, the increment that comes from settlement, the increment that comes from improved transportation facilities, the increment that comes from the hundreds of thousands of dollars that we are expending in opening up these areas, should belong to us as representatives of the people of Canada. And when the government deliberately allows these immense areas to be put up to pseudo public competition, under circumstances which can only attract a few speculators hanging about the corridors at Ottawa, I say they are recreant to their trust. I cannot but feel this when I realize that from Lake Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains every timbered area has been picked over and every good belt taken up so that there is hardly a good timber limit left for the man who wants it. This government has lost a great opportunity in being negligent in their custodianship of the assets of the people.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia). As my name has been mentioned by the two gentlemen who have spoken before me, I shall take up the attention of the House in dealing with this matter. Mr. Ames asked for certain returns; he got the returns and then he asked for the original papers; he has got the original papers; having these original papers before him he is making reflections on the department in connection with them and I stand here representing the department at that time. If there was anything wrong in the action of the department I am the man who was responsible, and if he thinks there has been anything wrong on my part or on the part of the department in connection with these tenders, I declare in the most emphatic and flat-footed manner possible that it is absolutely false, and I now challenge the hon. gentleman or any other hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House to take the manly course for once, to stop insinuating and to rise in his place and to make a charge. If he does that——

Mr. AVERY. Will you vote for an investigation?

Mr. TURRIFF. I will be the first man to ask the Prime Minister to grant him his committee and give him an opportunity of making good his charges; then perhaps

either he or I will take a back seat, and we will see who it will be.

I now wish for a few moments to discuss as my hon. friends before me have discussed, the policy and the administration of the timber lands of the west, and when we have discussed that for a little while and thrown a little more light perhaps on the subject than has been thrown on it so far, possibly this House and this country may be in a better position to judge as to which government has maladministered the timber lands of this country. Every word that has been said by the two hon. gentlemen who have spoken before me in condemnation of this administration is ten times as great a condemnation of the party now in opposition when they were in power.

Mr. FOSTER. That settles it all.

Mr. TURRIFF. It does not settle it all. For some time back my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who now says 'that settles it all' made such just statements throughout the country as Mr. Ames has made to-night and he thought it was going to settle it all, but it did not. He and his friends went down to Stanstead and made the same broad, sweeping statements and it did not settle it there. I stood on the same platform with some speakers who sit on the other side of the House and although they had been very free and ready with their denunciations of the timber administration in the Northwest the night before and at every other meeting in Stanstead, when I was on the same platform and issued a challenge to any one of them to discuss the matter with me——

Mr. FOSTER. Who's afraid!

Mr. TURRIFF—not one of them had a word to say. The photographs, the magic lantern and all had been taken through that constituency, but some way or other they had not the faculty of making the people believe that the present government was not administering the lands and timber limits of the west properly; nor were they able to convince any one down there that if they had another opportunity to try to administer the affairs of the west or any other affairs they would be able to do it as well as the present government. Mr. Ames to-night has said a good deal about the government not ascertaining anything about the values of limits before they were put up for competition. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) could throw some light on that subject, because, when he was a minister of the Crown, they undertook on one or two occasions to state when advertising limits that there was so much timber on them; they sold them on these conditions, and what was the result? They were forced afterwards to refund the money. Because between the time that they made the report as to what was on the limits and the time the limits were sold, either the inspectors they had sent out did not know their business or they gave false reports or the timber was destroyed by fire, as very often happens. And when the government sold limits and the timber which they said was on the limits did not exist, they were forced to refund the money in several cases. In all those cases, where they had sold limits, claiming there was timber on them, and no timber was found there, they had to refund the money.

The hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) also reported that on these limits there were from 2,000,000 to 7,000,000 feet of lumber to the mile. No doubt you can go into certain parts of the Northwest and find patches of spruce that will run at the rate of 5,000,000 feet per square mile; but I venture the assertion, and leave it to any man who knows anything at all about spruce timber in the west, that you cannot get a timber limit in that country that runs 5,000,000 or 6,000,0000 or 7,000,000 feet to the square mile. I say further that, in most cases, when you secure a limit of 50 square miles of timber, you will not have 10 miles or more than one-half of 10 miles of actual timber.

As to the question whether the policy was a good one or not, that is a matter for this House to decide and which I have not to answer in any shape or form. The hon. member for Qu'appelle (Mr. Lake) comes forward now with a resolution asking to change these regulations and the system of disposing of timber. He is just a little bit slow because, as I understand, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) changed these regulations over a month ago, and the timber limits are being administered under new regulations altogether at present.

Mr. LAKE. Is the hon. gentleman referring to the resolutions before the House If he has read it, he has not understood it.

Mr. TURRIFF. I am referring to the resolution before the House and also to the speeches made by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) and the hon. member for St. Antoine Division (Mr. Ames). The latter hon. gentleman spoke about speculative limits. He said that the price received for those limits was less than the price received for limits that are now being operated. Well, I do not think he understands very much about the timber business out in the west. The sawmill men are the men who know more about the timber in that country than anybody else. As a matter of fact, any sawmill owner out there or in any part of the country makes it his duty to ascertain where the stretches of timber are in all parts of the country, so that when timber is put up for competition, he has an idea what to bid, if he

wants to buy. If these large limits, which the hon. gentleman calls speculative, have gone at a small price, do not imagine that the sawmill men of that country did not know all about it. And if they did not bid high, it was because the limits were not worth much money and because the cost of handling them and the risk from fire are such that it did not pay to bid a high price.

Mr. PERLEY. Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question ? Was the time between the publishing of the advertisement and the time for putting in tenders sufficient to allow parties interested to examine these limits ?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes.

Mr. PERLEY. In six weeks ?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, I would consider so.

Mr. PERLEY. Abundance of time ?

Mr. TURRIFF. There are some men over there who would be too slow to do it in that time. The hon. member is perhaps one of them.

An hon. MEMBER. The hon. gentleman is evidently not one.

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. member for St. Antoine Division (Mr. Ames) had a good deal to say about the values of these limits. Well, the value that men, making a prospectus, put on an article is one thing and the actual value another. It would be much more to the point if the hon. gentleman had given an instance, and I venture the assertion that there is not one man in the lumber business—or if there is one it will be an exception—there is not one man who has been in the lumber business for the last ten years who could sell out and square off his bank account. I question if there is one man. I have heard a good many say they wished they could hand over their whole business and wipe out their liabilities. There has not been any profit made, so far as I have heard, in the sawing of timber in any part of the Northwest, up to the present at all events.

A good deal has been said also about the conditions and about the easy terms given to the holders of limits. But I want to point out that in every one of these licenses, the government has the right to insist on a mill being erected and on the lumber cut, and the assertions that have been made to-night, and all over the country for months past that the government, in disposing of these timber limits, had disposed of the land irrevocably, is absolutely incorrect. There is not one acre of timber which has been disposed of that carries the land with it. It is only the timber that is sold, and the land reverts to the government. And in every license there is a clause providing that whenever the timber is cut on any portion of a limit, that portion of the limit may be withdrawn, and also providing that the government may say to the limit holder : We will give you so long to take off the timber or whatever timber remains on your limit, and we intend to withdraw your limit and have it available for homestead entry or for disposal in any other manner.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there not a provision that the limit holders shall hold them as long as there is merchantable timber ?

Mr. TURRIFF. There is a provision that they may renew their lease from year to year, but there is a clause in the license which provides that whenever a portion of the limit is exhausted, or a portion of the timber taken off any limit, the government may at any time say to the limit holder : You must cut the balance of the timber ; and they can withdraw the land, according as the timber is cut. A good deal has been said by the hon. member for St. Antoine Division (Mr. Ames) about the amount of timber which this government has alienated. Let me just show how much was alienated when my hon. friends opposite were in power.

Mr. AMES. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he will also kindly state how much of the timber that was alienated by the Conservative government was retained and held by them ?

Mr. TURRIFF. I will be most happy to tell my hon. friend why his friends did not retain it ; that is what I will tell him.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. They all went broke under the Conservative administration.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not a fault that can be urged against your people.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Every one is more prosperous now.

Mr. TURRIFF. It may possibly be urged that when the gentlemen on the other side of the House were in power, timber was not worth so much. If there is any argument in that, then to carry it to its logical conclusion it would follow that when the Mackenzie administration was in power the timber would be of still less value than it was after Sir John Macdonald came to power in 1878, because there were fewer people in the country at that time. But what do we find ? During the Mackenzie administration there were some people in that part of the country, and the Mackenzie government disposed of a small amount of timber between the years 1873 and 1878. They disposed of 310 square miles and they disposed of it practically under the same conditions that timber has been dealt with

ever since. The Mackenzie government received a bonus of $7,150 for the timber they sold, or an average of a little over $23 per square mile. Now that is a long time ago, but in those days of the Mackenzie government when the timber of the west was properly administered, was put up for competition, was sold to the people who wanted it, was sold to the highest bidder, was handled in a proper manner and not given away for nothing, as it was to the pets and favourites of the late Conservative government, it shows that the Mackenzie government got a reasonably fair price for the timber. But what happened as soon as there was a change of government and the hon. gentlemen opposite came into power.

Mr. BRODER. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question. Who changed the law? The law was changed under the Mackenzie government so that it should not be put up to public auction. If you look at the statute you will see they changed the law.

Mr. TURRIFF. If it was, as soon as your friends came into power they rechanged it, because it was not put up for competition under the Conservative government.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I ask the hon gentleman in what condition it would be when it was 'unchanged.'

Mr. TURRIFF. I cannot tell my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Foster) much about it, because he knows probably as much about the timber regulations in the Northwest as I do.

An hon. MEMBER. He applied for a limit.

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, he applied for a limit, and talking about original papers, if any one wants to see the original papers in that case they can see the hon. gentleman's application in his own handwriting.

Mr. AMES. May I ask if it was necessary for my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) to secure the permission of the House to see the original documents.

Mr. TURRIFF. When my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) applied for a timber limit it happened there were two or three other applications for it, but he did not want to pay anything for the timber limit; he wanted to get it for nothing. And later on my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) put in an application for somebody else and the order in council went through and that party got the limit.

Mr. FOSTER. I must look these up.

An hon. MEMBER. Was he a member of parliament then?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, he was a member of parliament then. During the Mackenzie administration, from 1873 to 1878, they disposed of 310 square miles, but let us see what our Conservative friends disposed of between 1878 and 1896. If there is any point to the remark made by the hon. member (Mr. Ames) that during late years the timber of the western country has been put up before it was required, before there were people in the country needing it, before there was proper competition, surely that would apply with greater force to the years the Conservative government was in power. But the present Liberal government have disposed of 6,000 square miles in eleven years, and what are you to think of the Conservative administration which, when there were not nearly so many people in the western country as there are at the present time, disposed of not 6,000 square miles, but 29,322 square miles. Was that keeping the timber until there was competition; was that keeping the timber till it was needed by the settlers? Was that disposing of it before it was needed? My hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) had something to say about members of this House and senators getting timber under this government. I want to make the statement here and now, that from the time this government came into power until the present moment, not one single acre, not one single stick of timber has been disposed of to anybody, friend or opponent, member or senator, or anybody else in any shape or form except by public competition after properly advertising it, and to the highest bidder.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. That's a good joke.

Mr. PATERSON. No 'easiest terms' about that.

Mr. TURRIFF. As I have said, the Conservative administration disposed of 29,322 square miles of timber and that amounts in acres to a good deal more land than the hon. member (Mr. Ames) stated in this House a year or two ago remained of land fit for settlement in that whole western country. It amounted to 18,666,196 acres, and out of that amount 23,987 square miles or 15,351,744 acres were given away absolutely for nothing. And, in practically every case it was given to members and senators and politicians and friends of the Tory administration of the day. That is the record of our friends opposite. And that is the reason they are not able to make the people of any part of this country believe their statements about the present administration of the timber and the lands in the west. That is the reason they are not trusted, because the people know what took place when these same gentlemen had the power of administering the lands and the timber of the west. The people of this

country know that after the elections of 1882 or 1883, hundreds of limits of fifty miles each were given to every Tory politician almost in Canada. I do not know why it was given away so freely then, but possibly it was in view of the elections that were about to take place, and after they had taken place, in order, I suppose to enable the friends of the government to recoup themselves somewhat.

An hon. MEMBER. What was paid for these limits?

Mr. TURRIFF. For this whole 29,322 square miles, or 18,766,196 acres, the Conservative government received a bouns at the rate of $4.13 per square mile on the average, or less than one-fifth what had been received by the Mackenzie administration for timber limits many years before. And during the time the present government has been in power they have disposed of 6,456 square miles for a total bouns of $528,878.80, or an average of $81.92 per square mile. In addition to that, there is the ground rent; and on this account the government is receiving $30,000 a year besides the bonus. And then, of course, as the timber is cut, stumpage at the rate of 50 cents per thousand feet must be paid. Should the hon. member for St. Antoine be right, and should there be 5,000,000 feet to the square mile, the government will receive $2,500 a square mile. If the hon. gentleman is not right, if, for instance, there should be only half that, the government will still take in a large revenue for the country. But there is this to be borne in mind—that the man who puts his money into timber in that country, or any other country (and lumbermen on the other side of the House understand this perfectly well), takes a certain amount of risk. He is liable to have the whole value of his property destroyed by a single fire.

Now, I want to give you the names of some of the men who got timber berths for nothing under the Conservative government. I will not take time to go through all the years, but I would like to show those who got these prize packages in one year. Timber limits were given to Conservative members of parliament, senators and politicians and their friends. You go through the list and you will scarcely find the name of a single Liberal. And where such a name appears, it is probable that of a clerk working for a prominent Conservative. I confine myself to the year 1883, during which year there was given away, without competition, by hon. gentlemen opposite, timber limits covering an area of 10,326 square miles, or almost double what has been disposed of by this Liberal administration during its whole stay in office, since June, 1896. I say that this immense area was given away for absolutely nothing—the whole area did not bring in enough to buy a postage stamp. It was given away to the friends of the government of that day in a single year.

The first name is that of T. O. Allan, who got 32 miles.

James Apted got 50 miles.

Frank Arnoldi—I think he is a well-known Conservative here—got 50 miles.

J. S. Atkins, Conservative politician in Winnipeg, got 50 miles.

Stewart Atchison got 50 miles.

H. H. Bailey must have done a good deal for the government of that day. He got 50 miles on January 5. Then by August 11 he had got hungry again, and on that day he was given another 50 miles. On November 6 he got an additional 50 miles; and on November 29 he got a fourth limit of 50 miles—a total of 200 miles, or 128,000 acres, given away in one year to one man for nothing.

John Bain—not our John—got 50 miles. Apparently this John wanted more, so Bain & Patterson got another 50 miles.

The hon. member for St. Antoine talks about there not being time enough for competition or inspection. In those days they did not even publish an advertisement. Anybody could go in and make application for a timber limit. But, of course, not everybody could get a limit—only those who were regarded as 'right' were considered as having any claim. Many a man applied for a timber limit and did not get it.

The next fortunate man whose name I find on this list is Mr. W. J. Baskerville, 50 miles.

E. A. Bates 50 miles.

Walter Beatty—he was at one time member of provincial parliament for Toronto got 50 miles.

J. H. Beaty got 48 miles in June; then John H. Beaty got 50 miles in December. He was a Toronto man.

Alexander Begg got 50 miles.

Robert Bell got 50 miles.

Bellemare and Lefebre got 50 miles.

J. G. H. Bergeron got 50 miles.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, Horace!

Mr. TURRIFF. E. B. Black got 50 miles and E. F. B. Black got 50 miles.

T. G. Blackstock, a Toronto politician, got 50 miles.

David Blain got 50 miles.

Mr. BLAIN. He is a Liberal.

Mr. HARTY. He went over to you afterwards.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Why does not the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) read out the name of the hon member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows).

Mr. TURRIFF. The name of the hon. member for Dauphin will be read out in

its proper year and place. He got three limits of fifty miles each, he and his partner—because his partner was a very prominent Tory worker.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) makes a mistake. The hon. member for Dauphin also was, at that time, a Tory.

Mr. T. A. BURROWS (Dauphin). On the occasion, two years ago, when I had the privilege of addressing the House on this question, I stated that during the Conservative administration I had received a timber limit and had received it for nothing: I was in the lumber business—I was not taking the limit merely for speculation like the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). I cut the timber off the limits trying to make some money—and I did not make very much at that time. I was not like Mr. Bergeron, buying for speculation.

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) says that at that time the hon. member for Dauphin was a Conservative also. Well, contrary to the hon. member for Marquette, he has seen light since and has amended his ways. Yes, 15,351,000 acres were given away by my hon. friend from North Toronto to his friends. The hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) tried to explain why these timber limits were not now held by these parties, and he stated that it was because of the onerous conditions and regulations of the late government which compelled them to give up the timber limits. I venture the statement, Mr. Speaker, that you may go through the limits that were given in those days, and of all the hundreds that were given away for nothing you cannot find three that were cancelled for that reason. I will tell you why they were cancelled, not because there was not good timber on the limits, but because, under the administration of my hon. friends opposite, the timber was not worth anything they scarcely got any people into the country, and the people they did get in there did not stay, with the result that they could not afford to go on paying $5 per square mile ground rent, and they did not pay the ground rent, and after a good many years many of the timber limits that had been given away and that were valuable, were cancelled for non-payment of the ground rent. That is the same timber that in many cases, has been disposed of by this government at good prices, for which we got in over half a million dollars in bonuses, in addition to the ground rent and dues. Now then let me go on with the names.

Name.	Area, Square miles.
Black, H.	50
Boyd, J. C.	50
Brennan, J. C.	50
Brennan, H. H.	50
Brouse & Company, Geo. J.	25
Bremner, Jacob.	50
Bulmer, F. T.	50
Bulmer, H., junior.	50
Bulmer, Henry, junior.	50
Burke & Company, E. G.	50
Cameron, H. D.	50
Campbell, C. J.	50
Campbell, F. C.	50
Charette, Salem.	50
Church, C. R.	50
Clarke, Thomas.	50
Colby, C. C.	50
Cooke, J. M.	50
Cope, Fred.	50
Courtman, John.	50
Cummings, D. W.	50
Cummings, D. W.	48
Cunningham, James.	50
Daly, J. B.	50
Dawes, Jos. G.	50
Devlin, R. J.	50

The fur business and the timber business are somewhat connected in the Northwest.

Dickey, James A.	50
Dickinson, W. B.	50
Dickinson, G. L.	50
Doty, Edwin.	50
Doran, P. D.	50
Doty, Edwin.	50
Duguay, J. H.	50
Duhamel & Daveluy.	50
Dwyer, L. J.	50
Elliott, Wm.	50
Evans, Robert.	50
Fair, Wood & Company.	50

Remember that all this is given away for nothing, no competition, no bonus.

Farrow, John M.	50
Farrow, Asher.	50
Fellows, C. L.	50
Fotheringham, John T.	50
Fraser, Alex.	50
Fuller, T. R.	48
Geary, John.	50
George, R. and P.	18
Ginty, John.	50
Goodwin, George.	50
Grandin, His Grace Bishop.	10
Hamilton, G. W.	50
Hanson, Geo. C.	50
Hart, Geo. F.	50
Heney, John Jos.	50
Henry, John.	50
Hill, S. W.	50
Holmes, S. H.	50

Many of these gentlemen are prominent Ottawa Conservative.

Howlan, Geo. W.	50
Howard, G. R.	50
Jackson, John.	50
James, T. F.	50
Jamison, J. C.	50
Jones, T. R.	50
Kavanagh, Jos.	50

A prominent Conservative of New Brunswick.

Kayll, A. J.	16.75
Kennedy, C. E.	50

Name.	Area, Square miles.
Kennedy, T. L.	50
Kenny, Thomas.	50

Ex-Tory member of parliament for Halifax.

Knight, S.	50
Knight, James.	50
Law, Kyle Samuel.	50
Le Baron, E. H.	50
Lecourt, Eugene.	30
Leduc, Charles.	50
Leeson, George.	48

A prominent Conservative of Calgary.

Lefevre, Alfred.	50
Longtine, R.	30
Lottridge, J. M.	50
MacArthur, J. B.	50
Macdonald, John.	50
Macdonald, Hugh.	50
Macdonald, John R.	50
Macdonald, John J.	50

These are prominent Tories of Toronto.

Macdowall, D. H.	50

Ex-member of parliament for Saskatchewan.

Macfee, K. N.	50
Mackenzie, Wm.	50
Mackay, Alex.	50
Mackay, Percey.	50
Mackay, Wm.	50
Mackay, Walter.	50
MacMahon, E.	50
Martin, John.	50
Massue, L. H.	50
Michaud, A.	50
Mihinnick, J. R.	50
Moffatt, A.	50
Montplaisir, H.	50
Moore, H. S.	3.75
Morton, William.	50
Murphy, James.	50
McCaffrey, William.	50
McColl, Alex.	48
McCall, A.	48

I am still giving the names of those who got their limits for nothing, without any competition, all in the one year. I am not half through the year yet.

McCarthy, Wm.	50
McGillivray, E.	50
McKnight, James.	50
McKnight, James.	50
McLaren, P.	50
McLean, A. D.	50
McLean, T. A.	50
McLean, Neil.	50

The McLeans were still to the fore in those days, as they are in the House to-day.

Rochester, John.	48
Rutherford, A. C.	50
Sandford, W. E.	50
Scarth, W. B.	50
Shneider, T. H.	65
Sharples, Wm.	50
Shell River Colonization Company.	48
Shields, Wm.	50
Shields, John.	50
Shortiss, Thomas.	50
Skead, Robert.	50
Skead, E. S.	50
Skead, George.	50
Small, C. C.	50
Smiley, H.	50
Smith, J. G.	50
Smith, J. S.	50
Smith, W. B.	50
Smith & Muir.	50
Spinks, M.	50
Sproule, John C.	50
Squiers, A.	50
Starrs, Michael.	50
Stewart, John.	50
Stewart Ranch Company.	50
St. Catherine Milling and Lumber Company.	50
St. Catherine Milling and Lumber Company.	50
St. George, H. Q.	50
Street, W. P. R.	50
Stubbs, Wm.	50
Stubbs, Wm. H.	20
Sutton, R. T.	50
Sutton, R. T.	50
Sutton, R. T.	50
Taillefer, L.	50
Teeter, W. H.	50
Tellier, L.	50
Thorne, W. H.	50
Throop, R. C.	50
Tilt, James.	50
Tisdale, D.	50
Torence, H. A.	50
Tromanhauser & Wells.	50
Ward, H. A.	50
Welsh, T. P.	50
White, John.	50
Wiley, Thomas.	40
Wilson, Wm.	50
Wilson, Wm.	50
Wilson, John.	50
Wilson, R. A.	50
Wood, James.	50
Wood & Dawson.	50
Woods, James P.	50

Mr. Rochester is an ex-Tory member of this House.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And uncle of W. T. R. Preston, too.

Mr. TURRIFF. I think that possibly if the hon. member for St. Antoine would look back in his history he might possibly be able to throw some light on this Rochester limit. Mr. Scarth was at one time a member of parliament. Mr. Robert Skead was an Ottawa politician at one time. Mr. Tisdale is at present a member of the House.

Mr. BRODER. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that the licenses were issued for these limits?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, the licenses were issued in each case by order in council under the late administration.

Mr. BRODER. That is not so; it is absolutely not the fact; I can vouch for that.

Mr. TURRIFF. I want to state that what I am saying is absolutely the fact and if hon. gentlemen wish I will go over the list from beginning to end and give the date at which each order in council was issued, because I have it here.

Mr. WARD. I want to say that it is absolutely not the fact, and that I never received a license from the government in any shape or form.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. One of your friends swiped it, I guess.

Mr. WARD. No, I will explain more fully afterwards.

Mr. TURRIFF. An order in council was passed in each and every case. In order to save time I did not give the date of the order in council, but I have the date of the order in council in the middle column and I can give it if hon. gentlemen want it. There is the list of timber limits that were given away by hon. gentlemen opposite in one year without any competition, without any bonus, without any price whatever in any shape or form, and the men who supported them at that time are the men who come forward and state that the administration of the timber resources by this government has not been in the interest of the country and who are endeavouring, by a resolution, to condemn that administration. The total number of acres given away during one year was 6,608,960.

Mr. LAKE. How many licenses does the hon. gentleman say were issued and how many orders in council passed?

Mr. TURRIFF. There were 212 in that year.

Mr. LAKE. 212 licenses?

Mr. TURRIFF. Orders in council passed.

Mr. LAKE. Does the hon. gentleman say that 212 orders in council were passed granting that number of licenses?

Mr. TURRIFF. The number of berths granted that year was 212, that is 10,326 square miles, and order in council was passed for each of them and the license was issued in every case, as soon as the applicant paid his year's ground rent.

Mr. WARD. That does not answer the question, how many licenses were issued.

Mr. PERLEY. Why do you not answer that ?

Mr. TURRIFF. To every man who paid his ground rent the license was given and in every case an order in council was passed preparatory to giving that.

Mr. WARD. Then you refuse to answer that question ?

Mr. TURRIFF. I have not the information here.

Mr. BRODER.

Mr. WARD. I guess you have not.

Mr. LAKE. You do not want to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the hon. member, talking about orders in council or licenses ?

Mr. TURRIFF. I have stated two or three times already that in every case where an application was made an order in council was passed giving the 50 miles.

Mr. LAKE. Without competition ?

Mr. TURRIFF. I sat still when you were making all sorts of misstatements and now the least you can do is to allow me to speak. That is what existed under the old administration and these men come forward to-day and try to censure the government on the way they have administered the affairs of the west in connection with timber. I wish to repeat what I have said that the hon. gentlemen opposite having the papers before them, if any gentleman opposite has a charge to make against me as a member of parliament or as an officer of the government in this or any other matter let him make this charge and get his committee and he will get it right away and then we will find out whether the insinuations made are correct or not.

Mr. LAKE. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question now, when I will not be interrupting him ? I would have answered questions when I was speaking, if he had chosen to ask them. Does he state that all these orders in council were issued granting licenses without competition ?

Mr. TURRIFF. I said that in the case of every name that I read out to-night, embracing that 6,000,000 acres of land, in every case these orders in council were passed giving those to the applicants without competition in any shape, form or manner.

On motion of Mr. Perley, the debate was adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT — INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYEES AND MUNICIPAL POLITICS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Railways. I hold in my hand a circular which was distributed, I understand, last fall, reading :

Intercolonial Railway.
Office of the General Manager,
Moncton, New Brunswick, December 23, 1907.
Circular No. 381.

To employees.

The Minister of Railways, having been requested to allow employees of the railway to

offer themselves as candidates for and to accept municipal offices, has carefully considered the matter, and his conclusion is, that, generally, it is not in the interest of the railway that this should be allowed and that only in such very exceptional cases as the minister may determine, the public interest can be served without the interest of the railway being prejudicially affected, shall employees be permitted to offer and accept such offices. This decision is based upon the usual policy of railways in such matters, such policy being considered on the whole as best adapted to serve the respective interests most concerned.

D. POTTINGER,
General Manager.

Is the minister aware that two Intercolonial employees, Mr. Blain and Mr. Munro are candidates for the position of town councillor in Stellarton and are those cases exceptional and for what reason does the minister so consider them ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to inform my hon. friend that the hon. the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) is confined to his room by a serious indisposition. I shall take pains that this matter is brought to his attention as soon as he can attend to business.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This debate will go on to-morrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, January 31, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRODUCTION OF ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS.

On the orders of the day being called :

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask a question of the ministry. It was stated that all original documents might be left with the clerk of the Public Accounts Committee. A most important file was there this morning. I went up just now to inspect the file and I find it is not there. The clerk says he does not know who has it or where it has gone. I am sorry the Minister of Public Works is not present because the matter is in his department.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will see that that is not a question.

Mr. BENNETT. And I will now ask the question whether any minister of the Crown knows where the files are.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must call the attention of thet House to a habit that is growing up of introducing subjects for discussion and then asking questions, which would obviously annul the rule we introduced in this respect.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this not a question of privilege ? Has not a member the right to rise at any time.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is another matter. If it is put on that score it is entirely different. A question of privilege may be raised at any time ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I shall bring the matter to the attention of the Minister of Public Works the moment he comes in.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—NEWSPAPER REPORTS.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE (Stormont). I wish to bring up a question of privilege. In the press comments on some statements which I made in the House on Wednesday in connection with a certain resolution to bring down papers in regard to the arrangement that had been made to assist the banks in financing the crops of the western country, some of the papers have seen fit to say :

Then came Mr. Pringle with a denunciation of the banks and the banking system of the country.

Others have seen fit to say that—

Mr. Pringle made a sensational attack upon the banks.

While I am a believer in the press and have found the press usually very fair with members of this House, I do find fault with the press on this occasion accusing me of making an attack upon the banks of this country. It is only necessary for me to say, Sir, that in my remarks I thought I handled the banks with kid gloves and treated them absolutely fairly. I said :

I would not like to say one word which might be construed as in any way disparaging our banks; we all know that we have in this country many banks which are strong and in which the people may have the most implicit confidence.

Surely these remarks of mine were not an attack upon the banks of this country. I said again :

I believe that to-day the banks are in a strong position, and that the people of this country should have implicit confidence in them.

Again I said :

I do not want to be understood as in any way attacking the credit and the standing of our banks. I believe that in Canada we have passed through this last financial crisis in an eminently satisfactory manner, and we have

been enabled to do that because we have had at the head of our financial institutions men of ability and prudence and foresight—men who saw a year ago that a storm was coming and began to take in sail.

I repeat that I have not in any way attacked the banks of this country; but because a humble member of this House rises to advocate certain amendments that he thinks would be in the interest of the people of this country, the papers turn around and say he is attacking the banks. I was prepared for this because I was advised some time ago: There is not a particle of use in your bringing up proposed amendments to the Bank Act, you will have the large majority of the House against you, you will have the press of the country against you, you will have the Canadian Bankers' Association against you, and it will be impossible for you; it has been tried before and it cannot be accomplished. Mr. Speaker, just a moment, I am not going to discuss the banking system but I have a right to discuss what I did say. I said that the day had come in Canada when we should have legislation restricting the contractual rate of interest to borrowers. I said that in practically every other country under the sun, there was such a law, that we in Canada had no such law, and consequently our banks which are becoming a great monopoly were in a position to contract for any rate of interest they might see fit. I pointed out on that afternoon that in the different States of the United States——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that is a discussion on the general question. The hon. gentleman is quite within his right on a question of privilege to point out wherein he was misrepresented by the press in order to rectify that; but to enter upon a general discussion of the topic now would not be a question of privilege but would be bringing up the whole discussion again.

Mr. PRINGLE. I have no desire at the present time to enter upon a general discussion, but I have a desire to place myself absolutely right in so far as I am concerned, and to say that I was not attacking the banks and I was not attacking the financial institutions of this country. I was simply suggesting some proposed amendments, and stating that at a later date when the resolution which stands in my name comes up I would bring the matter fully before the House. I did say, in order to back up my assertion, that H. C. McLeod, the general manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia had only a few days ago put on record his most emphatic approval of government inspection. I am not now going to quote Mr. McLeod's statement at the annual meeting of the Bank of Nova Scotia but I do say that he took very strong ground on that point. That is all I have to say at the present time. I have not attacked the banks in any way, but surely a member of this House has a perfect right to get up in this House, if he thinks it wise to do so, and advocate any amendment to the law which he considers necessary in the interest of the people of Canada.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I just wish to say as a question of privilege also, that since my observations in this House on this question have been criticised by several of the newspapers of the country as an improper attack upon the banks of Canada, I had not that object in view nor did I in my judgment make any attack on our banks. In addition to that I want to say that I will always avail myself of what I conceive to be the proper rights and privileges of a member of parliament to criticise banks or any thing else in this House in a legitimate and fair way. That is what I did the other day and it is what I shall do in the future whether it meets with the approval of the press or the banks or not.

PRODUCTION OF ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS IN COMMONS.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). As the Minister of Public Works is now in his place I call his attention to the fact that the original papers which this morning were produced in the Public Accounts Committee, namely the dredging tenders, are not now there. As I and others wish to see them between now and the next meeting of the committee I would ask the minister if he knows of their whereabouts and if he does will he order their return to the committee at once.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I do not know where the tenders are. I may say that right after it was understood that the documents in my department should be left with the clerk of the committee I gave instructions to the official who had them in charge to return such papers and leave them with the clerk of the committee. If my hon. friend will give me a memorandum of what particular documents there are, I shall have inquiries made and if they are on file in my department I shall have them sent to the clerk of the committee without delay.

Mr. BENNETT. I may tell the minister that the clerk of the committee informs me that he has not handed the papers over to any official of the Public Works Department. What I want is the whole file of the tenders that were before the committee this morning. The clerk of the committee has not handed them to any official of the Public Works Department, and, who has taken them is entirely unknown to him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As to that I have no knowledge at all. This is the first time I have heard the papers are not there.

DISPOSAL OF NORTHWEST TIMBER LIMITS—QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. H. B. AMES (St. Antoine, Montreal). I rise to a question of privilege with regard to a matter which came up in yesterday's debate. While I was absent from the Chamber I understand that the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) said :

I think that possibly if the hon. member for Montreal (St. Antoine) would look back in his history he must possibly be able to throw some light on this Rochester limit.

I would like to ask if the hon. member (Mr. Turriff) may be permitted to say what that allusion refers to. I have spoken already and cannot speak again in the debate, but I may say from my seat in the House that this is an absolute mystery as I have absolutely no knowledge of anything in connection with the Rochester limit.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the government orders are called I want to direct attention again to some returns which I think should have been down. On December the 11th I called for returns with reference to the cold storage in the city of St. John, N. B. These have not been brought down and they are not voluminous. It seems to me they might be here before this time. On the same date I called for returns in connection with the 'All-Red Route,' so called. On January the 13th I called for a number of returns with reference to the Yukon election conspiracy case : The so called Wiley papers, the Pringle, and the Beddoe report. I would like very much to know when they will be brought down ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The papers in the Interior Department are in preparation, but at present there is such a mass of orders for papers in the department that we are not able to get them out faster than we do.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice the Minister of Railways and Canals in his place and I would like to know if he can give any information in reference to the matter I mentioned on the adjournment last night.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Minister of Railways and Canals is not in his place.

Mr. SPROULE. I see the hon. Mr. Pugsley there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the question ?

Mr. SPROULE. I refer to notices which were sent out with reference to employees of the Intercolonial running for positions in municipal councils and referred to the fact that two of the employees are candidates now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not undertake to answer a question for the Department of Railways.

Mr. SPROULE. I had forgotten that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) was not the head of the Department of Railways Department ?

SUPPLY—DISPOSAL OF NORTHWEST TIMBER LIMITS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Fielding that the House go into Committee of Supply and the motion of Mr. Lake in amendment thereto.

Mr. GEORGE H. PERLEY (Argenteuil). Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) and the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) brought to the attention of this House a question which it seems to me is as important in the public interest as any that has been brought to the attention of the House since I have been a member. Let me at the outset express my surprise that neither the Prime Minister nor the Minister of the Interior have seen fit to rise in this House and to make any explanation in regard to the matter. I always understood it was the duty of the ministers of the Crown to give an explanation when any question was raised by an hon. member on a matter affecting the administration of the government, and I have been wondering what the cause of this unusual reticence is. As to the Minister of the Interior it is of course possible that on account of the extraordinary way in which he handled the case of the original papers, it is thought best that he should not come to the assistance of the government in this particular matter. On the other hand it may be that the hon. Minister (Mr. Oliver) knows that this is an exceedingly bad case for him and he wishes to wait and find out whether we know all about it before he makes his reply. As for the Prime Minister, when it seemed to us there was occasion for a committee of inquiry to look into matters that were suspicious the Prime Minister has always asked his supporters to vote it down. I fancy it is possible that he may have had so many of these cases brought to his attention that he begins to think they are of no importance whatever.

Now with reference to timber limits in the Northwest, I wish to say that I congratulate the Minister of the Interior on having followed the advice given him from this side from time to time regarding this matter. I think if he keeps on following our advice a while longer, he will begin to think that he ought to be on the Conservative side of the House. The limit regulations were discussed in this House on the

17th May, 1906. At that time it was stated that an order in council passed on the 1st of July, 1898, was in practically the same terms as those that were in force previous to that time. But on the 14th of April, 1903, this government passed an extraordinary order in council purporting to give to the limit owners the right of renewal as long as any timber was on the land, without the government having any right to increase the dues or to change the regulations. This was the subject matter of a discussion on the 17th of May, 1906. We took exception to that order in council as being wrong and improvident, and I am proud to say that the government saw the matter in the light that we did, and took our advice on that subject, as they have on many other occasions. The result was that on the 23rd of July, 1906, the government passed another order in council changing the regulations in this regard. I quote from this order in council of July 23, 1906 :

And whereas there is some uncertainty as to the effect of this section.

That is referring to the section which we claimed was wrong, and the uncertainty existed because the Conservatives pointed it out to the administration.

Therefore, the Governor General in Council, in order to make the intention clear, is pleased to order that the said section 3 shall be and the same is hereby amended, by adding to the first sentence thereof, immediately after the words 'area licensed' the following:

Provided, however, that such renewal shall be granted subject to any changes which may have been made in the regulations, increasing or altering the rental or dues to be paid, or otherwise varying the terms and conditions under which the licenses are granted.

This last order in council was in force until this month, and I find in the licenses of the current year there is a clause to a similar effect as follows:

So long as the licensee complies with the conditions of this license, and of the regulations, he shall be entitled to a renewal of his license from year to year while merchantable timber remains upon the area licensed, provided, however, that such renewal shall be granted subject to any change which may have been made in the regulations, increasing or altering the rental or dues to be paid, or otherwise varying the terms or conditions under which the licenses are granted.

That was a distinct victory for the party on this side of the House, and I infer that the Minister of the Interior would never have seen fit to alter this obnoxious regulation if the Conservatives had not called his attention to it in the forcible manner they did. On the 14th of March last, further comments were made from this side of the House on the regulations in force at that time, and we urged on the government that they should make further changes in these regulations which would inure to the public benefit. We claimed, amongst other things, that more notice should be given for the sale of any timber limits, as it seemed manifest to us that six weeks notice was really ridiculous. We also claimed that the government should know something about the value of the timber limits they were selling. That seemed to be an ordinary common sense thing for the governent to do. What was the result of this protest of ours last year ? The government, during the last Christmas holidays, put forth new regulations altogether which were contained in the Canada 'Gazette' of January 11, 1908. These new regulations I may say are a great improvement on the old ones. The latter have been changed in several ways that will be for the benefit of the public, and I am glad to see that the government have at last seen reason to consider the public interest in the matter of these timber limits.

In passing I wish to say that even these new regulations do not seem to be perfect, and I wish to call the attention of the minister to one or two items in them which I think might be improved. Paragraph 3 is as follows :

No license shall be disposed of until notice of the sale has been given for a period of not less than sixty days in a newspaper published in the district in which the berth is located, and also in a newspaper having a general circulation in the province.

Now I say advisedly that sixty days notice is not sufficient for a sale of this kind. When the government are selling timber limits, it is necessary to give sufficient notice to enable prospective buyers to go and examine the limits and make up their minds as to their value. Those things are not done in a moment. Men interested in the lumber business have not always proper men at their command, and may not be able to start out immediately to take advantage of a notice of that kind. There can be no reason why the government should not give more notice. Besides, I take exception to this advertisement being published only in one newspaper in the district and one newspaper in general circulation in the province. Those advertisements ought to be put in more than one newspaper in the province, they ought to be put in newspapers in the centres of population in other provinces, so that men who are interested in the lumber business and do not live in the province where the limits are situated, may have a chance of making a bid. Section 5 of these new conditions provides :

The notice of sale shall give the distinguishing number, the description and area of the berth, the upset price, the place, day and hour in which such sale is to be held.

I for one think that having an upset price is not the best way for the government to act. They should have what is called a reserve bid. That is the system in Ontario where it works exceedingly well. I have known many times when limits were sold by the government for very much more than their reserve bid, but if there is an upset price, it is not at all likely that a limit will bring much more.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The reserve bid is not disclosed.

Mr. PERLEY. No. It is usual to put it in an envelope—one reserve bid for each limit. When the auctioneer finds he has as much bid as he can get, he opens the envelope, and if a sufficient amount is not bid, the limit is withdrawn from sale.

Mr. MILLER. Is the upset price announced at the sale during the bidding ?

Mr. PERLEY. This government provides that the notice of sale shall give the distinguishing number, the description, the area of the berth and the upset price placed upon it. I take exception to that. Then the government ought to determine before hand the sections which are covered with timber, so that they would not put up for sale land which is not valuable for timber purposes. They should have all the limits carefully explored and estimated before putting any up for sale. Further it seems to me that they should only sell a limit when there is any real demand for it from the public—that is when the lumber to be cut on it is needed for the settlers. Another thing that the government should do, which is not now provided for, is to sell these limits in definite areas. Let them state beforehand the exact description of the timber limits to be sold, so that they would sell the good areas with the bad, and in no case allow the purchaser the option of selecting from large blocks. The government should advertise these sales in the official gazette as well as in the papers as I have mentioned before, and if they advertise these limits in the way I have designated and give ample time to explore them, they should give at least three or four months before proceeding to a sale of this description. These are all the comments I have to make at the moment on these new orders in council. If the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) keeps on following the advice given him from this side of the House, we may hope that eventually he may be able to put before the country regulations which are really in first-class shape. This old system has been in force for a long time, and it is unfortunate that an effort was not made long ago to put a new system into effect. Unfortunately the new regulations have been postponed until practically all the good timber areas of the Northwest have been alienated into private hands.

In order that the House may not suppose that the examples given by my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) yesterday are the only glaring examples of this kind, I wish to refer to two other special sales of timber limits. North of the Pas Mission there lie three large lakes. These lakes drain into the Saskatchewan river via Cumberland lake. When the Canadian Northern Railway reaches the main Saskatchewan river at the Pas, logs can be floated down from these lakes to the Pas at a small cost and be sawn into lumber for the Saskatchewan market. These lakes are called Goose, Namew and Amiak lakes. Until the railway reaches the Pas, this region is practically inaccessible ; and when these limits were sold, they were more than 100 miles from the nearest railway point. All the timber around these three lakes was put up by this government at the same time, and the notices of tender stated that they were for a license to cut timber on berth No. 1,050, comprising 125 square miles. These tenders were asked for in the dead of the winter. The advertisement was dated 28th January, 1903 and the tenders had to be in the department here on the 7th March 1903, so that only thirty-eight days altogether were allowed by this wise government to examine these limits. This made it practically an impossibility for any one to really examine them. This berth 1,050 fell into the hands of the Saskatchewan Lumber Company. I do not know who comprise that company, but I am informed that they have offered their limits at $3,000 a mile, which would make the price of this one berth $375,000. I am passing no comment on the value of that berth as I have no means of knowing it, but these limits cost by the way of bonus $13,125, or $105 per square mile, and I infer that the company which bought it for $13,125 must have some reason for now asking $375,000 for it.

The other special case to which I wish to refer seems to me the most glaring I have yet heard of. I refer to limits 1,048 and 1,049 known as the Big river limits. We all know that at Prince Albert lumbering operations have been carried on a great many years—in fact ever since the railway first reached there, and that lumber is manufactured at Prince Albert for distribution all over the Northwest. These mills at Prince Albert have been doing good work for the Northwest Territories in supplying them with lumber, and these mills, I understand, naturally protected themselves by buying what available timber there was within a reasonable distance, say fifty miles of Prince Albert. After all the practical needs of the mills at Prince Albert had been supplied this government put on the market an omnibus proposition that to all

intents and purposes included all the remaining available timber within the vast unexplored region tributary to Prince Albert and also a lot of timber which does not come down that river. This was done in January, 1903, when no less than 500 square miles were put up to tender in one advertisement. In order to explain this matter more fully I wish to read the advertisement calling for tenders. It is dated January 28, 1903, the same day as the case which I have previously referred to on those three lakes north of the Pas.

Tenders for a license to cut timber on Dominion lands in the district of Saskatchewan, Northwest Territories, first choice.

Sealed tenders, addressed to the Timber and Mines Branch, Department of the Interior, marked on the envelope 'Tenders for timber berth Nos. 1048 and 1049' will be received at this department until noon on Saturday, the 7th day of March, 1903, for a license to cut timber on berth Nos. 1048 and 1049, comprising the following described tracts:—timber berth No. 1048, situate in the district of Saskatchewan, and comprising 250 square miles to be selected in not more than twenty-five blocks within the following described tract.

Then it goes on to give the names of the ranges and townships, a long list of them, which, I believe, covers between 6,000 and 7,000 square miles. The advertisement proceeds :

Second choice,—Timber berth No. 1049, in the district of Saskatchewan, comprising 250 square miles to be selected in not more than twenty-five blocks within the same tract as, and subject to, timber berth No. 1048. The length of each block must not exceed three times the breadth thereof, and the blocks must not be nearer to one another than one-half a mile.

Further on, in order to clinch the matter and make sure that nobody could possibly examine the limits in time, this last paragraph is added :

No tender by telegraph will be entertained.

The plain meaning of this advertisement was that out of this vast area of 6,000 or 7,000 square miles this government put up for tender two limits, one first choice of 250 miles and the other the second choice of another 250 miles. Whoever had this matter in hand knew quite well what he was about. He must have had knowledge of this timber previously to having asked to have it put up for sale. The advertisement was published on the 28th January and the tenders had to be in by the 7th March. To have gone from Ottawa in the dead of winter, to have traversed these 175 townships, because that is what is shown on the map as being comprised in this area, and to have made an estimate which would form the basis for a bid would have been impossible inside of months ; yet this government allowed only 38 days for that purpose. The mere publication of such an advertisement would create the suspicion in any fair man's mind that there was something wrong about this transaction. It could not be otherwise. I am told that it is from 150 to 170 miles from the railway at Prince Albert to the end of the territory which was offered for sale, and I can say without fear of contradiction that I believe that if a man had started from Ottawa on the day the advertisement was published he would have found it impossible to have proceeded from here to the end of that region and to have returned again before the tenders had to be in even if he made no examination of the country. In connection with this matter there was a rumour around Ottawa that other parties here in Ottawa had besought the department to extend the time for tendering for these limits in order that they might have a chance to go and examine them and make an intelligent bid upon them. I cannot vouch for the truth of that, but I would like the hon. Minister of the Interior to tell us whether that is so or not. Naturally, Sir, there was no competition worth mentioning for this great tract of timber. How could there be ? There were two tenders for 1048 and only one for 1049. The result of it was that the first choice went for the magnificent sum of $5,000 and the second choice for $1,000. In other words 500 square miles of the best timber out of that 6,000 square miles of territory, because both had their choice; 500 square miles of selected timber limits were sold by this government for a bonus of $6,000, or $12 per square mile or something less than two cents an acre for a lease which is virtually perpetual so long as there is any timber left on the area selected. This did not happen long years ago. This happened in the year 1903. It is notable that many transactions of this kind happened in the year 1903. Why that was I will leave the House to judge, but this happened when every one knew the vast growth that was going on in the Northwest and that these limits would before long become of great value. This limit, 1048, is to-day held by a company without any actual business, without any sawmills, without an office or a domicile, known as the Big River Lumber Company. Inquiries were made regarding this company of a mercantile agency and I will read an extract from a report dated January 13, 1908 :

It is learned that a firm, using this style, contemplate commencing operations here in the near future, but so far nothing has been done, and no definite information can be obtained, until the organization is completed. The company's principal assets consist of some 250 miles of timber, known as timber berth 1048, situated about fifty miles west of this place. This timber is said to be very valuable, and estimated worth, by some, as high as $500,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What place?

Mr. PERLEY. Prince Albert. This timber limit, which was acquired for $5,000,

is stated in this report to be held at $500,000. Again I say I have no means of knowing whether it is worth such a figure, but I presume that the owners must have some reason for valuing it at that price. Under the terms of the sale to these people, they were given the right to select their areas. No definite time was named within which that selection must be made. They were asked by the department several times to make their selection and survey, but they kept putting it off from time to time; and I am informed that it has just been completed. In other words, this company has taken nearly five years to make its selection of these blocks and its survey. It is surely an unreasonable thing for the government to allow such a length of time. It is a manifest advantage to these people to postpone their selection as long as possible. For, until the selection is made, the whole territory is blanketed and nobody else can by any chance get any part of it. Even the people having the second choice cannot exercise that choice until the first choice is made. And if the people holding this second blanket title get five years more, this will make ten years from the time of the original sale.

Mr. SPROULE. And all that time the whole locality is tied up?

Mr. PERLEY. Yes.

Mr. LALOR. Did the same parties get the first choice and second choice, too?

Mr. PERLEY. Not so far as we know. But it is impossible for us to know really who own these limits. They seem to want to keep it a secret from the public. The second choice stands in the name of a lawyer in Winnipeg. Whether he has anything to do with the Big River Lumber Company or not I cannot say. But I would like to ask hon. members whether they believe that concessions of such magnitude could have been granted by this government and by the Department of the Interior unless sinister influences were at work somewhere? It surely is not common sense to suppose that the men in control of this government—and who are credited with a certain amount of good common sense—would have put up these limits for sale on these conditions unless there was some sinister reason for it. So, I ask: Who could have been profiting by this extraordinary concession? And I say that, if there were no other reason, this consideration alone would make it the duty of the government to grant the committee asked for by my hon. friend (Mr. Lake) to probe this matter to the bottom. There is no other means by which it can be done except by committee of this House with power to call witnesses and examine them under oath.

With reference to the methods practised by this government in selling timber limits, I wish to say, in the first place, that they should not have sold the timber of that region until it was actually needed. The people of the Northwest are going to need timber very badly indeed. There will be millions of people living on the prairie, where there is little or no wood, and lumber is going to be for these people an absolute necessity and very hard to obtain.

Mr. BERGERON. To obtain it will be a luxury.

Mr. PERLEY. Yes, with these companies in possession of all the sources of supply, it will be a great luxury. Why should the government have sold these areas before they were needed? It surely was not because of the price obtained, for that price was a bagatelle. This government may be hard up, but $6,000 could hardly help it out of its difficulty. Again, the selling of these limits was not going to provide work for any men. No mills could be put there. I know that there is a clause in the regulation providing for the building of sawmills, but, as a matter of fact, nobody could have put up a mill in that section and sawn lumber and made it pay. That would be impossible. Therefore, this government did not sell the country for the purpose of providing work for the people of the Northwest. Nor had this sale for its object the providing of lumber for the people of the Northwest; for this timber was not available at the time and the mills at Prince Albert had all the timber supply they needed for years to come. I fail to see any possible reason why these limits should have been sold at that time. I have waited to hear the Minister of the Interior give us some valid reason. And, as none has been given us, I say there must have been something underhand about this matter or the timber would not have been sold in this way.

Mr. DYMENT. Why was the timber of Georgian bay sold thirty-five years ago—practically the whole of it?

Mr. PERLEY. Well, my hon. friend (Mr. Dyment) knows that we gain by experience. I am coming to that——

Mr. SPROULE. It was the Reform government under Sir Oliver Mowat that sold it.

Mr. DYMENT. Oh, no; it was before Mowat.

Mr. NORTHRUP. They sold it because they needed the money.

Mr. PERLEY. I propose to say a few words with regard to the general question of our custom of selling timber limits, before I sit down. I wish to take exception to the method of selling berths to be selected afterwards. That privilege is of great value to the purchaser, but it is not so clear why it should be given by the government. We all know that, in the Northwest, the timber grows in clumps, chiefly along the

banks of rivers, creeks and lakes. These people were given the privilege of selecting 250 miles out of this vast region, and were allowed five years in which to do it. That condition enabled the purchaser to take his time, to carefully survey the region and to pick out all the good timber there was. Now, when timber limits are sold in Ontario or Quebec, they are of fixed areas and the purchaser must take the lean timber with the good. Another feature of these sales to which I would object is the selling of such large blocks in one limit. Why should they put up 500 miles in one advertisement, 250 miles first choice and 250 miles second. Even if there were time to get proper bids for the sale, there would be very few people who could undertake the expense and trouble to make the examination which would be absolutely necessary before buying such a vast area. In other words, the selling of such large limits precludes the small operator and the poor man from bidding on them. Then there is the advertisement made of these limit sales. Six weeks was as a rule the amount of notice given. The sale was practically not advertised at all. Let me read the statement of the Minister of the Interior with reference with the manner of dealing with these limits, to be found in 'Hansard,' 1906, at page 3577.

Mr. OLIVER. The person who desires to acquire a timber berth notifies the department and describes it. There is no sale or disposition of timber berths except by competition. The application is considered in the department, and if it does not conflict with some other berth and some other interests and is approved of, notice is given by advertisement in what is supposed to be the nearest newspaper, and printed slips containing the same information as in the advertisement are distributed as widely as may be to persons interested in tendering for timber limits. The advertisement runs on an average, I think, about six weeks before the tenders are opened.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it not sixty days?

Mr. OLIVER. It may run for sixty days and it may be as low as six weeks, but I think it is never less than six weeks. The advertisement announces that the tenders will be opened at noon of a certain day at the department here, and the commissioner of Dominion lands opens the tenders.

Mr. INGRAM. Alone?

Mr. OLIVER. He may be alone or he may be in company, but he is the official who opens the tenders, and the person offering the highest bonus is awarded the limit.

That statement alone is sufficient ground for us to demand an inquiry regarding these transactions.

Mr. LALOR. Who was the commissioner of Dominion lands at that time?

Mr. PERLEY. I believe the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). I consider that it is impossible to explain satisfactorily to any reasonable person why limits should have been sold on the basis set forth there by the Minister of the Interior. No one can say that six weeks is sufficient notice to be given of the sale of these limits. They are advertised in the newspaper nearest to the limit (one insertion only) and in small printed slips which are distributed as widely as may be to persons interested. Who is to know who the persons are? Are these slips sent only to those interested in this particular sale? Sent to those whom the Minister of the Interior would like to see get these limits? Why does he not give public advertisement in the 'Canada Gazette,' why not in all the great newspapers of the country? Were they in such a hurry for a few thousand dollars that they could not wait a reasonable time to let people look at these limits? The result of this system was that any person desirous of obtaining a timber limit in the Northwest could go beforehand and examine it, could see whether he would like to have it, could make a thorough examination of it and then could get the department to put it up for sale and he could have it done in such a way that there could practically be no competition because no one else was allowed time to examine the country. Some members of this House at least know something of the difficulties in connection with the examination of timber limits before purchase. It is not like examining a building, the examination of timber limits requires great preparation. We do not always have men available who have the special knowledge necessary to examine and report on timber limits. Such men are not always at hand and they are usually hard men to get. Then there are arrangements to be made with regard to supplies, provisions, help, &c., for such an examination. More than that most people have to make financial arrangements before they can think of buying a timber limit and carrying on a great business. Our custom in Ontario and Quebec has been to give ample notice of the sale of these limits to enable every one interested to examine them carefully.

Further this government had no right to sell these timber limits without knowing something of their value and having a reserve price on them. Is that the way we act in our ordinary everyday business? Here we have 500 miles of timber limits disposed of in one sale, the government do not know their value or what timber is on them, in fact they apparently do not want to know, they were prepared to let them go for a song to the people who had taken advantage of this extraordinary system to get possession of them. I notice that an order in council of February 28, 1898, provided a minimum bonus of $250 a mile for timber limits in the Yukon. Why have a minimum bonus of $250 in the Yukon and allow these great timber limits to be sold for $12 a mile when they are nearer settlement and in a place where timber must be more valuable?

I now come to what seems to be the most indefensible and suspicious circumstance of all. Tenders for these limits, according to the statement of the Minister of the Interior, were not opened in the presence of interested parties but were placed entirely in the hands of one person; I have just read the minister's statement to that effect. Yesterday the commissioner of Dominion lands of that day (Mr. Turriff) asserted that nothing wrong was done in connection with these transactions. If that is so it seems evident that the commissioner of Dominion lands was most unwise to place himself in that awkward and ambiguous position; most unwise to allow himself to open the tenders alone, thereby giving people cause for suspicion. This gentleman, now the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), has been going up and down with regard to the transactions of this government in the Northwest, and I find that he was reported in the Toronto 'Globe' of December 21, 1907, as saying that the Liberals had disposed of the Northwest limits by open competition.

Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

Mr. PERLEY. I call the attention of the government to these words 'open competition.' Public competition or open competition has a good sound, an honest sound, but that expression cannot be applied to these limit sales with a hole in the corner advertisement and such absolutely short notices that no one could possibly examine them.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) said yesterday, in answer to a question of mine, that there was time to examine these limits. Surely he did not really mean that. I say again that it would be well nigh impossible for any person to have started from here on the day the advertisement was published for limit 1048 and to have gone to the other end of that territory and got back here again by the day when tenders had to be put in. He certainly could not have examined any of the territory except what he actually passed through and a good deal of it must have been passed by night or he never could get back in time. Such conditions are farcical, and it is an abuse of the English language to describe this method as open competition.

Yesterday I listened attentively to what the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) said in reply to my hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames), and I cannot say that I was surprised when he gave no justification whatever for the transactions in question. He did not attempt to justify the short notice given of the sale of these vast territories. He did not attempt to justify the improvident terms on which they were sold, and he did not attempt to justify the opening of the tenders by any one man. What then did he say ? He used the old 'tu quoque' argument we have heard so often and which really has nothing to do with the matter. Surely all of us should gain something by experience, even the Liberals in charge of this government.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) referred to the election in Stanstead and said that the Liberals won that election. But what has that to do with this case ?

Mr. BERGERON. How much did it cost them ? How many barrels of whisky ?

Mr. PERLEY. I do not know. The hon. gentleman said that some one had got into trouble once by making an estimate of the timber on a limit. But we are not arguing that the government should make an estimate of these limits for intending purchasers. The government certainly should not do so, and that has never been done to my knowledge. Then he twitted my hon. friend from St. Antoine Division (Mr. Ames) with regard to the number of million feet on a mile in that country. What has that to do with the question? It does not matter whether the best mile has 5,000,000 or 2,000,000 feet. The transaction is just as bad in the one case as in the other. The hon. member asserted that only a small percentage would be timber land. Surely he did not mean that ? You can take 250 miles of timber limits in small blocks out of 6,000 miles and get practically all good timber.

The hon. gentleman referred also to the prospectus values given by my hon. friend from St. Antoine Division (Mr. Ames). I have also quoted some to-day. The amounts these people are asking for their holdings simply show that they consider their property worth a lot of money. It matters not whether they are asking more than it is worth or not. That has nothing to do with the argument.

The hon. gentleman read a long list of people who applied for timber limits in the year 1883. This list we have seen and heard of many times before, but most of the people who applied for limits at that time never took them up as the conditions were too onerous. They could not comply with the conditions for sawmills, and so on. My name was mentioned a couple of years ago in that connection. True it is that in the days of my youth I did apply for a timber limit in the Northwest intending to manufacture lumber there, but I soon found it was of no value at that time and I relinquished it. To show that the Conservative government did not actually alienate any great portion of the timber limits, let me quote an answer which I received on January 13 last from the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) in reply to a question I put him. I asked :

1. How many timber licenses are in force now in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta?

He answered 367. Then I asked :

How many of the current licenses are renewals of licenses issued originally prior to July, 1896 ?

He answered 56.

Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

Mr. PERLEY. In other words, of the licenses in force to-day only 56 were granted by the Conservatives and 311 have been granted by this government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PERLEY. The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) would have done better not to have spoken at all last night. When he did get up to speak, he should have attempted to justify in some way the transactions criticised in this motion ; and I would say further that, under the circumstances, the hon. gentleman himself ought to be the first man to get up and vote for the committee which my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) asked for.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PERLEY. I wish for a few moments to compare the policy of this government during the last few years with the policy in force in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. I hold in my hand an advertisement for an auction sale of timber berths by the Department of Crown Lands, dated Toronto, August 1, 1903, when the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite were still in office in Ontario. Here are some of the conditions of sale :—

Each berth to be adjudged to the person bidding the highest amount of bonus therefor per square mile.

The berths sold to be subject to the Crown Timber Regulations, except in so far as the said regulations may be inconsistent with any conditions herein specified, and to such acts or orders in council as now exist, or may hereafter be passed affecting timber or territory under timber license from the Crown.

The department reserves the right to one bid on each berth.

No reduction of the area sold to be allowed for water.

This advertisement is dated 1st August, 1903, and the auction sale was to be held at 1 o'clock p.m. on Wednesday, the 9th December. That is to say, four months' notice was given of this sale. And not only that, but the notice was published in many newspapers throughout the province, in order to give everybody a chance to examine the limits. And where were these limits that were thus advertised for sale? Were they in inaccessible places? No. These limits were in Nipissing, Algoma and Rainy River districts. I venture to say that there was not one of them that a man could not reach from here in two or three days. Still the government adopted the wise policy of giving proper notice, because in this way they made sure of obtaining for the people of Ontario the actual value of the property disposed of. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that there is a reserve bid in these cases. Each bid is put in a sealed envelope which bears the number of the limit. When the auctioneer has received all the bids he can get on a particular limit he opens the envelope, and if the reserve bid is found to be greater than the highest bid publicly given the limit is withdrawn. Moreover, there is no reduction for water. But this government, in its sales of timber limits, allows selection to be made. The purchaser can take the timber along the streams and has neither water nor untimbered land to pay for—he takes the best only. Another point is that in these Ontario sales the limits were put up in small blocks. The old system in Ontario was to sell in blocks of fifty miles—sometimes twenty-five miles. A good deal of complaint was made that only wealthy men could bid on areas of that size, and therefore the government decided to sell in small blocks. In this advertisement of Ontario sales to which I have referred, eighty-eight parcels are covered. They run in size from three miles to fifty miles ; and in the whole eighty-eight there are only six that are over eleven square miles in size. Of course, this is mostly a pine country, and the prices to be obtained are beyond all comparison greater than would naturally be obtained for the limits now in question. Still, I may say that one six-mile limit not far from the Sault was lately sold by the government of Ontario for $10.52 per thousand feet board measure. There were also stumpage dues of $2 per thousand feet, making a revenue of $12.52 per thousand feet for the timber on that berth.

An argument that has already been used by the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) refers to the limits disposed of by the Conservatives and in that connection I may say that the history of the lumber trade all over Canada is rather interesting. Years ago limits in the very neighbourhood of the city of Ottawa were of almost no value. At one time one could obtain a timber license by merely applying for it—there was nothing to be paid.

Mr. FOSTER. How long ago was that?

Mr. PERLEY. Fifty odd years ago. There was so much timber in this part of Canada that it was thought to be inexhaustible ; and, naturally, the effort of the government of that time was to encourage in every way the manufacture of lumber, in order to give work to the people. One way they took of doing this was to give away timber licenses without charge. There was no money in the business then, and a person wishing to carry it on could not afford to pay anything for the license. This went on until the timber began to be valuable. But, I am glad to say, the people governing these provinces learned by ex-

perience. They ceased to issue licenses free. Events ran about the same course in the Georgian bay country, to which my hon. friend from East Algoma (Mr. Dyment) referred a few moments ago—timber limits there were sold for small sums in order to encourage work and settlement in that part of Ontario and in the Northwest the Conservative government adopted the same course twenty five years ago. But were these limits 1048-9-50 sold years ago? No, Sir, they were sold in 1903, at a time when everybody who knew anything knew that there was going to be an immense growth of population in the Northwest. This government apparently either did not know this or they ignored it on purpose. How they could have done so I cannot imagine. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway charter was put through, I think, in 1903, so that the government knew that they were going to have a line of railway running through the northern part of the Northwest. They were spending vast sums to bring immigrants into this country, and were constantly boasting about the number who were coming in. Therefore, they knew—or ought to have known—that this timber would soon become of much greater value, and that if they kept it the people of this country, whose heritage it was, would reap the benefit of that increase of value, and not a few speculators who chose to take advantage of these absurd regulations. I ask: Was the Prime Minister the last man to know that the Northwest was advancing by leaps and bounds, and that the value of this property was sure to grow greater and greater? Or was this another case like that of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, where the officials or a few inside men found out that the property was of great value before the government did, so that the government were induced to alienate these valuable limits just as they were becoming valuable? I wonder what comment future generations will make on the way in which the people of this time alienated the country's resources?

Now, Mr. Speaker, is there any remedy for this condition of affairs? The best remedy, of course, would be for the people of this country to rise in their might and put out men who would dispose of the public property on such terms. And I venture to say that the people of the Northwest, when they lealize what was done, will feel that way about it. But is there any remedy that can be applied now? In the first place, I would say that the immediate selection of all timber berths should be insisted upon. A reasonable time should be given the purchasers to make their selections, and, if those selections are not made, the sales should be cancelled. The government has that power and they would be doing no harm to any one, because the people who bought these limits undertook to have them surveyed.

Then there is another remedy which I think ought to be applied. I refer to the sawmill clause, or the lumber cutting clause. I know it has not been the habit to enforce this clause, but these cases to which I have referred, and many others, of the alienation of timber limits in inaccessible sections, are so flagrant that I think this government would be justified in enforcing that cutting clause, clause 12. It is as follows:

> The licensee shall have in operation within one year from the date when he is notified by the proper officer of the Department of the Interior that the Minister of the Interior regards such a step necessary or expedient in the public interest, and keep in operation, for at least six months of each year of his holding, a sawmill in connection with the berth herein described, capable of cutting in twenty-four hours a thousand feet, board measure, for every two and a half square miles of the area licensed.

If that clause were enforced, many of these timber licensees in inaccessible regions would have to give them up, because it would be impossible for them to comply with that condition for the reason that if they had sufficient means to put a sawmill into operation they would have no customers for their lumber. Therefore, I would advocate a reconsideration of the most flagrant of these timber licenses and the enforcement of this clause. I may say that the enforcement of that clause would work no hardship to the real lumber manufacturers, because they would be able to comply with it.

Great harm has been done under these regulations which have just been cancelled. Repentance has come to the government on account of the advice given to them from this side of the House, although it has come very late in the day. I say that an investigation into the transactions of the last ten years with regard to these extraordinary regulations is imperative, as proposed by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake).

In a few words I wish to recapitulate the reasons why this House should support the amendment of my hon. friend. No private owner would have acted in regard to his own property as this government has acted during the last few years, that is if he wished to get what his timber was worth. I think it admits of no contradiction that the minister who allowed these transactions to go through in 1903 would not have acted in that way if he had been dealing with his private property. Now this government is trustee for the people of Canada, and I have always been taught that trustees should be more careful of the property which they are handling for others than they would be if it were their own.

But this government has been clearly improvident in their method of handling the public property in this regard. I claim that the practice of this government in the last ten years shows either gross incompetence or a deliberate design to allow private individuals to grow rich out of the public domain. It seems to me that the government must take their choice of one of these two conclusions. In either case, an investigation is needed into these transactions. I ask in what other way they can explain their course in selling for a bagatelle these limits which were not needed by the public at the time; in selling large areas in one license and allowing a selection of 500 miles out of a vast territory of 6,000; giving this ridiculously short notice in their advertisement of sale, and allowing the tenders to be opened by one man alone. All these things are suspicious. Moreover, within the last few days we have had something more. After discussing the matter for three or four days we obtained from the government the original papers in connection with one of these timber limits. We had a long and hard struggle, but we managed to get what we wanted, and when we saw these papers we no longer wondered that the Minister of the Interior had attempted to be arbitrary in the matter. These papers on their face certainly point to something crooked in the department in connection with timber limits. I do not say they are proof in themselves, but they certainly point to crookedness, and I believe the officials of the department should have a chance of clearing their good name in connection with this matter. The Prime Minister of this country is the official guardian of the public interest, and I submit that on account of the facts which we have given he is bound to grant the committee demanded by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle. I shall, therefore, take great pleasure in supporting the amendment.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE (Strathcona). The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) could have selected no subject the discussion of which would show more clearly how superior have been the methods of this government in dealing with timber lands in the Northwest over those that were followed by the Conservative government. I think our hon. friends opposite have been unfortunate in their selection of a subject, because a discussion will naturally turn upon the methods of administration which were pursued by the previous government. In discussing this subject we can only base it upon the statistics which we have in hand, not upon insinuations or suspicions, not upon hypothetical cases, but upon the actual documents that remain on file. The whole complaint of the hon. member who moved this amendment was that there was no competition for these timber lands, and especially that they were put up prematurely.

If the excuse be valid, Sir, if it be any argument, with how much more force would the same argument be applied to the late administration when the very same territories that they are complaining of having been pilfered away by this government were pilfered to a much greater extent by the late administration? We read that these limits have become valuable. Well if they have become valuable they have become valuable by the lapse of time; they have become valuable up to a certain extent and what is the suspicion or the argument that the hon. gentleman would put forward? His whole speech is eptomized practically in the reasons which he gave for moving this motion. Three of these refer to the increased value of these limits which is an argument decidedly in favour of the present government. The fourth one refers to the lack of competition, the eighth one refers to the difficulty in securing original documents, of which we will say something later and particularly, to what these documents contained when they were brought down, and the ninth refers to the fact that when the original tenders are examined in many instances the bidding is close, that the third tender is almost the same, as the second. I say that any man who thinks that that is a valid reason for casting suspicion upon these transactions does not know what he is talking about. If two companies send competent cruisers over the ground and both of these cruisers do their business properly is it not a natural inference that the bidding will be close? It simply goes to show that their argument as to the lack of competition is invalid. You can make any action in this world suspicious if you choose. You can cast suspicion upon anything in private or public life or elsewhere and you can draw from it any inference you choose. Search through the speeches of the hon. gentlemen who spoke on the debate and you find no manly utterance to the effect that such and such is so, but you find that a competent, or a practical man told me that such and such was so—inference after inference, innuendo after innuendo, but where is the bold, bald statement that anything actually was wrong? They say that my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) did not stand up and defend himself. He did a more manly thing; he said: I take all these statements and suspicions, I put them in this category, I say to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the house that if these suspicions are valid say so, make these suspicions charges and I will be prepared to say that you will have your committee and I will be able to assist you to investigate such charges in every possible way. Now, as regards the remarks of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, (Mr. Ames) I

would like to make a few comments. He stated that certain timber limits were sold, and he gave certain fanciful estimates of the amount of timber on them. It would have been actual information to this House, Sir, had he told us the source of his information. He supposes—supposition is at the foundation of the whole complaint—that there are 5,000,000 feet per square mile of timber on these limits. But his supposition is far away from what actual experience in that country would teach one. He produces photographs to show that there is timber on these areas. It may be confined necessarily to a small area. It is evident to everybody that the camera can only take in a small area and if in a few isolated spots by the riverside there is good timber is it any proof whatever that the whole of an area of 100 miles is a dense mass of timber? Let me recite an instance that came to my own knowledge. A certain lumberman in my district applied by tender in the regular way to secure a timber berth. He paid, if my memory serves me, $3,100 for this berth. The area, if I remember correctly, was six miles. He was supposed to have sent a man over to cruise this limit. The man followed the river valleys and the coolies and he gave an estimate on which this lumberman submitted his tender. But after he had properly traversed the whole limit he came to Ottawa here and told the government that the limit for which he had paid $3,100 was not worth $3.10.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How long did the examination take?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I am unable to answer the hon. gentleman on that particular. I am stating that the cruise was made in the ordinary way. He followed what he thought was the proper method of cruising and then he came back and asked the government if they would not refund the $3,100 which he had paid for the limit and which the government very properly refused to do. There is an instance of where one could have taken a camera and taken photographs along the rivers which would show, I venture to say, as good timber as the hon. gentleman will show in the Cedar lake district and yet for operating purposes a practical lumberman told us that he would not give $3.10 for the limit. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) made use of the argument throughout his whole speech that there was no competition. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, also made the statement that there was no proper competition for these limits. He practically endorses the argument of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle in that particular and yet on a question being asked of him he makes this admission which will be found at page 2359 of 'Hansard':

I see that it will be necessary for me to explain that Mr. Fraser and the McDonalds have no connection whatever and are usually active competitors.

There was no competition in these timber limits and yet as he looks over the file he finds that there are two lumber companies that are invariably active competitors. There is an instance in which an hon gentleman takes back his own statement.

As regards the original documents, as I remember the story which was brought forward by the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, it was that for berth 1108 there were three tenders. Two of these tenders were in the same handwriting. The first was for $1,000, the second, by a man named Currie, was for $6,400 and the final tender was for $7,000. The final tender and the first tender were in the same handwriting. The figures in the third tender were said to have been made in different ink and it was a different style of figure as far as he was able to judge. From that they deduced a wonderful scandal and they had it published in the newspapers before they waited to bring it up in the House. The fact that two of the tenders were in the same handwriting was very astonishing to them. But is there anything in the statute, is there anything in the regulations that will prevent a man putting in half a dozen tenders so long as he is overbidding himself?——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. Would there be anything to prevent a man from putting in two tenders? It is said that this tender is put in in a different name.

An hon. MEMBER. The same date.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. The same date. Is there anything to prevent a gentleman who is an attorney by profession from putting in a tender for himself and putting in another for his client?

Mr. LENNOX. A good deal I should think if he wants to be honest.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman mean to state that it is not objectionable for the same person to put in two tenders?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. Not when he is a solicitor.

Mr. HAGGART. I think you went further than that; I think you said there was no objection to a party putting in two or three tenders one over bidding the other.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes he did.

Mr. HAGGART. That is new morals.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. If an attorney is acting as an advocate for five others he can put in half a dozen tenders——

Mr. HAGGART. That is not what you said.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. That is what I meant to say and if I did not express myself clearly I don't think the hon. gentleman has any right to hold me to a misinterpretation of my meaning. Taking this particular case and dealing with what is called by the other side a suspicious circumstance, I say that if a man were acting as an advocate and tendering for his client and a line of credit had been wired him in a bank, he would make out his tender before he went to the bank and in the bank he would fill in the tender and it would necessarily be in different ink and in somewhat different writting.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think I am twisting the argument, but I can assure them that I do not twist the spirit of fairness as they distort these facts into suspicion.

An hon. MEMBER. That is a joke.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. It may appear to be a joke to some gentlemen on the other side because they have thought about this thing with such suspicion in their minds that all conception of fair play has departed from them. Another point in regard to this matter is that hon. gentlemen opposite have laid great stress upon the bonus paid as being the whole price for the limit. Well, the bonus is not the whole price paid for the limit. There is no limit bought, that there is not an annual rental of $5 per square mile as well as a charge of 50 cents per thousand at the time the limit is cut. Now, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) be an authority on the question, that 50 cents per thousand will yield $2,500 per square mile to the government. That is the real price that is paid for the limit; that is what the person who secures the limit and operates it must necessarily pay the government if the figures quoted by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) are correct. The hon. gentleman from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) wanted to know why the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) had not answered the arguments from the other side, but I should think the hon. member (Mr. Perley) would at least permit the Minister of the Interior to speak on this or any other question when he deems it his own sweet will to do so. One objection raised by the hon. member for Argenteuil was that all tenders by telegraph were cut off. Well, there is good reason for that. The regulations read that all tenders must be accompanied by a certified cheque and how could you send a certified cheque by telegraph? It must naturally follow that a tender must be put in and sealed in the regular way or else there would be a disclosure of the amount stated in the tender. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Perley) speaking of tender 1049 stated that the berth was given away for $100, and I understood him to say there were 500 square miles in the limit. Now, if there were 500 square miles in this limit and each square mile yielded 5,000,000 feet of timber which is the estimate of the hon. member (Mr. Ames) the dues on that lumber would yield to the government $1,250,000, and that would be a fairly good price, and every year such a limit was held the rental would be $2,500. I want to impress the fact upon the House that although gentlemen on the other side have tried to emphasize that the bonus is all that is paid for a limit, as a matter of fact the bonus is an unimportant part of the price paid for the alienation of the timber of this country.

Mr. HAGGART. Was not the same amount per 1,000 feet paid under the Conservative government?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. The hon. gentleman is correct. The same amount was paid under the old regulations as regards dues, but not until 1889. Previous to that time it was 5 per cent. Now, since the hon. gentleman has suggested that, let us run over the history of these timber regulations. Until 1881 we had no timber regulations to follow, and previous to that year the government gave away the timber limits by order in council whether a bonus was charged or not.

Mr. BERGERON. That was not the law in 1872.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. Up to 1881 the timber limits were given away by order in council.

Mr. BERGERON. That is a mistake. There was a law passed by parliament in 1872 under which that could not be done, but in 1874 when the Mackenzie government came into power that law was repealed and limits could be given by order in council. But when the Conservative government came into power they changed that and went back to the old system.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. How did you get the 50 square miles?

Mr. BERGERON. I will explain that to you later. You can have a share in them for nothing if you want it.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I am not aware of the matter to which my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) is referring.

Mr. BERGERON. I can show the statute to my hon. friend.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. My information is that in 1881 the first regulations were made and these regulations provided for a rental of $5 per square mile with 5 per cent royalty. There was apparently no change in that system under the Conservative government until the year 1889, when a competitive system was inaugurated and this continued practically until the year 1898 when the present government was in power. In that year practically the only difference that was made was in the dues charged on the timber. In 1898 a regulation was passed which has given rise to a good deal of criticism regarding the alienation of berths adjoining operating berths.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member says that previous to 1889 there was no competitive system. Is it not a fact that where two or more applied for a limit in the same territory it was given to the party offering the highest tender for it ?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. The hon. gentleman is correct, where competition occurred. They talk about a hole and corner matter, but in this it was absolutely secret, between the government and the people seeking the limit. In 1889 two changes were made in the regulations. One provided for competition throughout the railway belt and the other for the granting of licenses that might be made transferrable. In 1892 it was provided that a mill had to be erected on the timber limit after one year's notice. In 1895 certain small changes were made in the regulations governing the railway belt, but they were not material. In 1896 a return was made to the old rate of 5 per cent of the dues on manufactured lumber in British Columbia, the Northwest Territories and Manitoba, with a refund of 40 cents per thousand feet on exports. In 1898 it was provided that by order in council operators on berths might be permitted to take up adjoining berths by paying double dues and double rents.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says there was no provision in the license or lease for the erection of a mill before 1889.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. There was a provision before 1889, but the regulations were ignored, practically speaking, as I understand it.

In 1899 the only change made was the granting of free timber to homesteaders in the railway belt. In 1901 the licensee was required to pay one half the cost of fireguarding. This is another item of expense to the man purchasing a timber limit, for as is well known the greatest enemy to our timber is fire. Fire guarding is one of the enormous items of cost in the effort to preserve our timber.

There has been no material change in the regulations made from 1898 until the last year. On December 17, 1907, the regulations have been changed to practically this : All timber areas put up for sale are first inspected by the government cruiser, and surveyed by the government surveyor. An upset price is then placed on them and this price is kept secret by the government. The auction takes place at the land office nearest to the berth. The governmnet assume the right to reserve any timber from sale but when a limit is put up at auction if the price bid does not exceed the upset price the area is not sold. This is exactly on a par with the way in which the Dominion school lands are sold to-day.

Mr. AMES. When will the regulations of which the hon. gentleman speaks come into force ?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I am not administering the department, but if the hon. member asks the date of the regulations I can give it; December 19, 1907.

Mr. AMES. Are they in force at the present time ?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I think that no timber is being alienated at the present time; it is all held in reserve for cruising purposes.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have been fighting here for the last two days practically for a principle that has been granted. None of them have put forward so good a proposition as the Minister of the Interior has put in his regulations, and comparing provincial regulations with Dominion regulations, there is no province in Canada to-day that safeguards its timber as the present regulations will safeguard the timber of our Dominion. We have in force to-day the best regulations to preserve our public domain that can be found anywhere, in so far as I am acquainted with the facts. Hon. gentlemen have seen fit to attack the administration of this government in this particular. Let me refer to the manner in which timber areas were preserved by our friends. They tell us that it is no criterion to refer back to what happened 26 or 27 years ago, that that is not a fair comparison, and in the next breath say that to put up timber limits 25 years later is a mistake. But the same timber limits were put up by our predecessors 25 years before and if it is bad policy for this government it was exceedingly bad policy for the other. During the first Liberal administration the government received for public lands alienated an average bonus of $23 per square mile. The Conservative government alienated the territory under their care at an average price per square mile of $4.13.

Mr. FOSTER. On what basis is that calculated ?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. On the number of square miles alienated by order in

council and the amount of money received in bonus.

Mr. FOSTER. Not the number of square miles they were actually given licenses for ?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. The hon. gentleman must admit this fact, that the government had gone as far as it could on its side and if the receiver did not consider it worth while certainly the administration is as much to blame as if the recipient had held on to it. We are not discussing what actually took place but the way in which our Conservative friends preserved our rights. The Liberal administration previous to the Conservative administration alienated land at $23 per square mile, while the Conservative administration alienated the timber limits at the rate of $4,13 per square mile. The present administration has alienated timber at the rate of $81.92 per square mile. This is a comparative statement. You say it is unfair to compare the Conservative administration with the present administration. It stands at a much greater disadvantage when compared with the previous administration.

Mr. HAGGART. Do you base the amount per square mile upon the area that was alienated or given by the Conservative government or upon the area that was retained by the parties to whom it was given. And how much was charged from 1878 until 1896 under the Conservative government ?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. $4.13.

Mr. HAGGART. Where does the hon. gentleman get his figures or his authority for that statement?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. The hon. gentleman can question these figures if he likes, but if he will look up the records he will find that they are correct.

Mr. HAGGART. I have seen no record to that effect.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I can well understand that the hon. gentleman does not like these figures and does not like the way these limits are administrated to-day.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like to have the correct figures.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I notice that the hon. gentleman himself received certain timber limits in 1882 and 1883 for which he did not pay one cent.

Mr. HAGGART. I shall take an opportunity of correcting that misstatement.

An hon. MEMBER. Better do it now.

Mr. HAGGART. I will do it immediately after the hon. gentleman is through.

Mr. CONMEE. Two of the hon. gentleman's partners got a lot more.

Mr. W. McINTYRE.

Mr. HAGGART. Who is making this speech?

Mr. CONMEE. They got 150,000 square miles. The hon. gentleman is giving us a little information; let me give him some, too. And there are others over there.

Mr. WARD. What about the dredging? Would the hon. gentleman tell me one thing while he is on that point? What ground rent was charged in the time he speaks of?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I have no record of that.

Mr. LALOR. Might I put the hon. gentleman a question? Does he base the amount per mile upon the quantity that was alienated by the Conservative government or the amount retained by the party to whom it was given?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I have already explained my point in that particular, but probably the hon. gentleman would like to have it explained again. I am contrasting the two administrations, and I ask if it was any fault of the Conservative administration if all these lands which they gave away by order in council were not retained.

Mr. LALOR. That is not an answer to the question I put. The government received a certain amount of money for timber limits——

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman will have to content himself with the answer given.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. When speaking about the alienation of certain properties at that time, I notice that the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) made the statement that he himself had obtained a certain portion by order in council without competition, and I find that in 1882 he received 50 square miles personally. In addition I find that the firm of Perley & Pattee received also 50 square miles. There is just a little interesting circumstance in this connection that I wish to bring to the attention of the House. The hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) told us many touching stories, among others a story about certain limits in the neighbourhood of Cedar lake. I would like to take up the time of the House to read that little description as given by the hon. gentleman. It will be found on page 2351 of yesterday's 'Hansard':

> I propose only to deal with the reserve supply of Winnipeg, namely, limits 1107, 1108 and 1171, just one small section, just 200 square miles of the 2,400 square miles of which I have been speaking.

Now note the description :

> Just north of Lake Winnipegosis there lies a lake called Cedar lake. Through this lake runs the Saskatchewan river, and where the

Saskatchewan connects with Lake Winnipeg, there is a magnificent water-power which can be used for milling purposes. This lake is about the size of Lake Simcoe, and the location for a sawmill is at the outlet. On the 20th of September, 1903, Messrs. Perkins, Fraser & Gisbon, a firm which includes our friend A. W. Fraser, on behalf of a client, name undisclosed, applied for sixty square miles, to be selected on Cedar lake, around the lake, and on the islands in the lake.

Now, I find that on the 16th of November, 1882, Mr. G. H. Perley applied for 50 square miles, and I have here the order in council giving a description of these 50 square miles. That description is as follows :

Commencing at the discharge of the North Saskatchewan river into Cedar lake, thence to extend up the river to a point on it eight and one-third miles in direct distance from the point of beginning; the western boundary to be at right angles to the general bearing of the river within said distance; the eastern boundary to be the shore of Cedar lake; the southern boundary to be parallel to the general course of the river, and back therefrom a sufficient distance to make the required area.

Practically the hon. gentleman from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) received the same territory as is described by the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal, as having been given to Mr. Fraser, and the hon member for Argenteuil paid absolutely nothing for it.

Mr. WARD. He never got it.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. We are now told by these hon. gentlemen that these limits, thus described, had no value in early days. To-day, however, the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames), speaking of this limit, says :

The government parted with it for $500. It has cost Mr. Fraser $450 a year ground rent, a small sum for fire guarding, and a couple of $2,000 for surveys—and it is on the market for $500,000.

Thus they tell us that these territories were valueless when they gave them away, and then they come back and try to make us believe that they are of enormous value to-day. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) paid for this limit one year's rent on the 17th December, 1883, $250, and, to use his own words, he concluded it was valueless. But we have the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) coming here to-day and citing a prospectus and trying to convince us that this timber is worth a very great sum of money.

Mr. AMES. Was there any railway in 1883 anywhere within 150 miles of that limit?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. There was no railway close to it at that time, but I would ask the hon. gentleman to remark this fact, namely, that it was then just as close to Lake Winnipeg and the waterways as it is to-day. Let him remark this also, that the timber limits given away were some 4,600 square miles in 1882 and some 11,000 square miles in 1883. And why? They were given away because the Canadian Pacific Railway would make timber limits valuable in that country. And they tell us that it has no value—that it was of no use. But to-day they tell us that the same timber limits, with practically no better market facilities, are worth half a million.

The hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) are to be congratulated upon having brought out the comparison of the administration of the two governments, that is, they are to congratulated by this side of the House, for the comparison is all in our favour. The hon. member for St. Antoine is a gentleman for whom every right thinking member of this House must have great respect, because of the industry he shows in rendering what he believes to be good service to his country. Therefore, in any remarks that I make about the hon. gentleman, I would have it understood that personally, I have the greatest respect for him. But it does seem to be that this hon. gentleman harbours suspicion of everything he sees. Living himself, if you will, a faultless life, he cannot imagine anybody who does not follow exactly his course as having any virtue whatever. He does not seem to think it possible for any hon. member on this side of the House to have a mission here except to pilfer from the public purse or grab the public lands. I say that it is a lamentable thing for a man to stand up in this House, and, with no better facts than those the hon. gentleman has put before us, to seek to cover all with a suspicion of having dealt with the public resources in an unfair way.

Mr. AMES. May I be allowed to except the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Wilbert McIntyre) ?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. The hon. member (Mr. Ames) is very kind in excepting me. But the same motive should carry him very much further indeed. He seems to think that no officer of the department feels the responsibility resting upon him, that not one of them would fearlessly do his duty. He seems to think that if even the slightest opportunity were given to any man, that man would betray his trust. The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has asked him to take the usual and established course of making a definite charge in order that he may have an opportunity of showing that he has not betrayed his trust, and I think it is up to the hon. member for St. Antoine to give my

hon. friend that opportunity. But do not give us any fishing committee, a committee that will go into the department and inquire generally about it—practically investigate the policy of the department. The policy of the department must be decided on the responsibility of the government. Instead of making insinuations, instead of throwing suspicion upon unnamed individuals, would it not be more manly for these hon. gentlemen to declare : we believe that such and such wrong has been done and will prove it if given the opportunity to do so ? That is the position that we on this side of the House would like to see hon. gentlemen opposite maintain. For myself, I wish to say that, if there is crooked work going on in the Department of the Interior, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) shall have my sympathy and my earnest support in cleaning that department. I shall be pleased to see any wrongdoer brought to punishment. I believe in fair administration. Also, I believe in manly treatment of every man ; and I do not think that for hon. members to stand up in this House and make these general accusations is exactly the manly thing to do.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this debate. I had not the opportunity of hearing what was said yesterday. But I have listened with a good deal of pleasure to the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. W. McIntyre) with his new moral doctrines and his advice so freely given to this side of the House, and I would like to deal with one or two of the things he said. Let us consider squarely the motion before the House. It is not a motion attacking any member of parliament. It is a motion proposing an inquiry. Tenders were put in for two timber limits. After a great deal of trouble, we succeeded in getting the government to bring the original papers before the House. On examining these papers we find that, in the case of one timber limit there are three tenders, and, of these tenders two are in the same handwriting.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. May I ask the hon. member a question? Does the resolution say anything about investigating these particular tenders?

Mr. HAGGART. Certainly——

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. Is it not general in its statement ?

Mr. HAGGART. —these as well as others. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilbert McIntyre) has made some new additions to the moral code. He stated—though, I must say, he took it back to a certain extent—that it was all right for a person tendering for a contract or for the lease of a timber limit to send in one, two, perhaps a dozen, tenders. I always thought that was wrong; that it was a violation of the principle of good tendering. And, if I found two parties tendering in the same handwriting, I would reject the tenders of both of them. The hon. gentleman seeks to correct us by telling us that the gentleman who tendered was a solicitor, and asks, why should not a solicitor put in a tender for more than one client? Fancy, Mr. Speaker, a solicitor being retained by one party to make a tender on a particular job and then accepting fees from others to put in tenders on the same job. What kind of a solicitor would he be? What principles of honour would he follow—accepting compensation from several individuals and becoming the confidant of each in relation to a tender for a contract on public work? But that upon which the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Wilbert McIntyre) mainly depended was the 'tu quoque' argument. When you find a man driven to use the 'tu quoque' argument, you may know that he has resorted to it in sheer desperation and that he has the very worst kind of a case. Fancy a logician using such an argument. Or, fancy a man accused of theft not able to defend himself better than by saying that his accusers, or the near friends of his accuser, had been thieving also. Fancy an argument of that kind being addressed to this House.

Now, since the question of timber limits disposed of by previous governments and of members of parliaments being interested in the same have been brought up, I may say that I am thoroughly acquainted with all the circumstances. This is not new matter in this House. The whole list read by the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has been read in this House several times. It was read a couple of times by Mr. John Charlton when he had a seat in this House. The erroneous nature of these charges has been shown again and again, and still these old misrepresentations are retailed. As my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) has just told us, some years ago timber limits in Ontario and Quebec were quite ordinarily given for the asking. If you wanted a timber limit, you went to the government, filed your plan and were given your limit. There was ground rent to pay, but no bonus. But, as the timber grew less plentiful, these limits became valuable assets of the provinces, and then they were put up at public auction and sold to the highest bidder. In 1872, when I first entered this House, and until 1874, limits were sold to the highest bidder by the Conservative government of that time. But in 1874, when the friends of the right hon. leader of this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) came into power under the leadership of Mr. Alexander Mackenzie, they changed all this. The Mackenzie government took the power to grant timber limits by order in council and without competition.

There was the law up to 1878. I do not say it was a bad law, I cannot say it was wrong then. It was the most difficult thing for the party administering that department to get people to invest capital in that country and develop it by putting up sawmills to furnish sawed lumber to the people in that country. Again and again efforts were made, parties were asked to take up limits for that purpose. What was the result? Hundreds and hundreds of application were made and they were given out with this condition attached to it, attached both by the government of Mr. Mackenzie and by the subsequent government, that the parties were to survey the property, they were to erect upon it a mill of a certain capacity, according to the number of miles they got. Lots of orders in council were passed granting limits to lumbermen. How many licenses have been issued, and how many of those that were issued have been cancelled? The hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre) told us about the immense tracks of country which had been alienated to favourites by the Conservative government. Out of 300 licenses issued by this government only thirty-nine have been cancelled. That is what their charges amount to. You do not know who their friends were that made application for timber licenses. I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman who leads the government was one of the applicants, but certainly his leader in the old Liberal government was one. Mr. Mackenzie was granted by order in council a certain number of townships, seven or eight townships, on the same terms as any other applicant. We were anxious to settle the country, we were anxious to induce capital to go in, the privilege was open to any one to make application. Was Mr. Mackenzie's name in the list that the hon. gentleman read? Lots of them received grants of townships and timber licenses, but not one of the names was read by either of the hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken on this question. But my name is on the list. I have explained that matter in this House again and again, I explained in answer to Mr. Charlton how I became acquainted with it, and you will find it in the 'Hansard.' I explained everything with regard to that limit, but the same old falsehood is brought forward time and again. Notwithstanding my denial it is still repeated. I became interested because I purchased an interest in the limits from two parties who had them. We got to quarreling and had a lawsuit, and the limits were sold by the court at public auction. I and several others bought them from the court, we had a right to purchase and we purchased them at a public auction in Brantford. One of the conditions was that we were to erect a mill. We erected a mill, and it was burned. The concern went into bankruptcy and was sold out. But after we purchased that limit there was a change in the administration of affairs, a stranger filled Mr. Stewart's throne at that time, and insisted upon a re-erection of the mill, which we were not in a position to do. Orders went forth that if the mill was not erected within a certain time the license would be cancelled. We explained that we had built the mill and it had been burned. We were obliged to sell it for anything we could get, not for the hundreds of thousands of dollars that these gentlemen are getting for their limits at the present time. The only purchasers we could get were gentlemen who are friends of the ministers who are administering this government. The property passed into their hands and afterwards new regulations were made that did not require mills to be erected. I feel a little sore about the manner in which I was treated in this matter, because the property was something which might have been a valuable asset to me in my old age. I was compelled by the gentlemen opposite to part with it and pass it into the hands of parties whom I would sooner not see in possession of it Those are the facts as regards my connection with the timber limit.

Mr. CONMEE. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? If I understood him aright he stated that the Mackenzie government had changed the regulations so that competition was not required, but after the government of Sir John A. Macdonald came in no such regulations obtained.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not say anything of the kind. I said that from 1872 to 1874 the law required competition in the purchase of limits.

Mr. CONMEE. What about the law in 1884-5-6?

Mr. HAGGART. I will repeat the whole of it. In 1874 the regulations were changed by the Mackenzie government, which took away competition or tendering for limits, and gave power to the Governor in Council to dispose of them by order in council. That state of affairs continued I think until about 1889.

Mr. CONMEE. I would remind my hon. friend that he is a little incorrect. That state of affairs did not continue except in certain sections. When the hon. gentleman's government was administering the territory in Ontario in 1885, people got limits there without competition.

Mr. HAGGART. That was explained. Certain portions along the Canadian Pacific Railway, certain sections, were removed from the order in council which was passed in 1874. That was the effect.

Mr. CONMEE. These limits were not along the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) has no right to interrupt without permission of the hon. gentleman who has the floor.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. member reminds me of a conversation I once read of that occurred between Archbishop Whately and the gentleman who was afterwards Bishop Newman, when both were at Trinity College, Dublin. Archbishop Whately was a great authority on logic, as we all know. Our boyhood knowledge of logic is drawn from the books written by Archbishop Whately. He was lecturing one day in Dublin, and this Professor Newman had a habit of constantly interrupting him. Archbishop Whately stood it as long as he could, and at last he was obliged to apply the logic to his interruptor, and told him that a fool can ask more questions in five minutes than a wise man can answer in a year. I do not apply the argument to the hon. gentleman nor did Archbishop Whately say that the party who interrupted him and who perhaps was one of the ablest of the professors in Trinity College is nothing but a fool. I do not mean to personally apply it; I only mean to apply the principle. In reference to the particular motion that we have made, have there not been sound reasons given by my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine in support of it? I have heard no defence? The defence of the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre) is: We get so much more for the limits now than you did then; the dues are fifty cents per thousand feet board measure when the lumber is manufactured and the ground rent is also greater. The hon. gentleman must know that there is no difference in these two items from 1879 to the present moment, that you pay the same amount per thousand feet in all the licenses, that in these scandalous transactions which the hon. member for Strathcona depicts here you had to pay the same amount that you have to pay at the present moment when every one knows that the value of timber has increased so much.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. Does the hon. gentleman say that the same dues have been paid from 1872 up to the present time?

Mr. HAGGART. I asked the hon. gentleman particularly what was the amount of the dues that you had to pay on every thousand feet of lumber cut. I understood the hon. gentleman to answer that it was the same in 1878 as at the present moment. I am giving the information that the hon. gentleman gave me.

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. The hon. gentleman will remember that I said that up to the year 1889 the dues were 5 per cent on the value of the manufactured product.

Mr. HAGGART. What about the ground rent?

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. The ground rent is the same. There is a difference in the dues.

Mr. HAGGART. Ten per cent is the amount you had to pay then?

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. Five per cent was the stumpage charge or dues up to the year 1889, and the ground rent has been the same throughout.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the amount you had to pay on lumber manufactured?

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. Five per cent on the value of the lumber.

Mr. HAGGART. When I was manufacturing it at that time I think it was more. I do not remember at the present moment, but I know that we had to pay a large sum every year to the government for manufactured lumber. I asked the hon. gentleman a question, and I made my statement upon his answer. The hon. gentleman may have forgotten that what he told me was that the dues were the same, and I was basing my argument upon that. However, the principle which at present obtains in every part of the Dominion of Canada is that all licenses to cut timber are put up to public auction. Sufficient time is given for the purpose of making an examination of the limits. The government are possessed of information as to the quantity that is on the particular area offered for sale, and they have an upset price which they have to get before they award the timber to any person tendering for the same. It ought to be the rule of this government that this same principle should apply as to one of the most valuable assets of the Dominion, and we have been urging upon them to adopt that system. It is no use to say that in the past you did so and so; it is no use to talk about times which were entirely different. Times have changed and we have changed with them. If we did wrong, it is not a justification in the slightest degree for the hon. gentlemen to do the same. What ought to be applied are business principles, and these principles, as I have laid them down, should not be embodied only in departmental regulations to be carried out at the will and pleasure of the minister, but the people of this country should embody them in the law and make it imperative that no matter who is in the government of the country the people shall receive the highest possible price for the valuable assets that they have, in-

stead of having them handed over to political favourites. The most contemptible being that ever lived on the face of the earth is the political flesh fly feeding on the sores of the body politic. For these reasons, I hope that the government will introduce a Bill which will relieve the Minister of the Interior of a great deal of trouble and difficulty in reference to these matters. It will keep him from a lot of parasites who are hanging around him and give the country a good return for the valuable assets which it possesses.

Mr. JAMES CONMEE (Thunder Bay and Rainy River). Mr. Speaker, I want to correct a wrong impression which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) endeavoured to convey, or at all events which he left upon my mind. The impression that he left upon the House is that it was the Liberal government, under Mr. Mackenzie, that put the public lands back in the position where they could be obtained without competition, and that under that regime, and while that particular measure was in force, he obtained the limit which he speaks about in the Northwest. I want to remind the hon. gentleman that he has forgotten something. After the Conservative government came into office in 1878, and during the years 1884, 1885 and 1886, they parcelled out over 3,000,000 acres of land in western Ontario, which they thought they controlled. They were dealing with the territory which was known as the disputed territory. They parcelled it out into lots of fifty and one hundred square miles each, and they charged $5 for a permit. The hon. gentleman got one himself.

Mr. HAGGART. No, no.

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, he did. The hon. gentleman's name is on the list and he got one of the 50 square mile limits. His partner J. J. Macdonald got another, and John Shields got another.

Mr. HAGGART. I can state to the hon. gentleman—I do not know whether my name is on the list or not—that I never got one and never applied for one.

Mr. CONMEE. I will tell the hon. gentleman why he did not get it. Every Conservative there got one. Mr. Plummer of the Sault, Mr. Squires, the president of our association at Port Arthur, J. J. Macdonald who was a member of this House, not at that time but afterwards, each got 50 square miles and all they had to pay was $5.

Mr. HAGGART. Was not that a large price to pay for something we did not even have a tax title to ?

Mr. CONMEE. It is not the hon. gentleman's fault that he did not get it, and it is not his fault that he has not got it now. it was because the Premier of Ontario stepped in and drove my hon. friend and his gang out of it. They have not got it because they could not hold it. It was taken away from them not with their good will but in spite of them. I am not going to detain the House ; I can afford to give my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) the pleasure of telling his little story about questions and all that sort of thing, because he is a long time on the floor of this House and he wakes up once in a while like old Rip Van Winkle and he tells us he knows all about it and of course when he makes a statement about anything that settles it. I am just reminding him now of a few little slips he made on this occasion.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 8) respecting the Tobique Manufacturing Company, and to change its name to 'Fraser Lumber Company, Limited.'—Mr. Carvell.

Bill (No. 52) respecting a patent of Eugène François Giraud.—Mr. Gordon.

Bill (No. 72) respecting certain patents of the Windsor Pump and Foundry Company, Limited.—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Railway Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Bill (No. 33) respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 44) to incorporate the Alberta Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Talbot.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Railway Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Bill (No. 46) respecting the Cumberland Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Monk.

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Wilbert McIntyre.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Sloan.

SUPPLY—DISPOSAL OF NORTHWEST TIMBER LIMITS.

House resumed debate on the motion for Committee of Supply and the amendment thereto of Mr. Lake.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY (Calgary). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the case made out by the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) in support of his resolution, and also to the able statements of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) and the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley). I have waited expecting to hear some answer from the other side of the House. And, considering the complete and lucid way in which the facts have been laid before the House, there is little left for me to say. I desire principally to refer to the circumstances under which timber limits were acquired in the province of Alberta during 1902, 1903 and 1904—which period, I think, may properly be termed the 'Reign of the Timber Barons.' The lumber question in the west has been a very live question indeed. Last session hon. members of this House listened to a discussion here as to whether there was or was not a lumber combine in the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia. The House granted a committee to investigate whether or not such a combine existed in that country, this step being taken on the motion of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron). A great deal of evidence was taken and a great deal of time occupied in listening to the testimony of the several witnesses subpœnaed before that committee. The result was a finding on the part of the committee that a lumber combine did exist in the province of Alberta. As to the province of British Columbia, the committee were not so certain—they desired to hear additional evidence. Seven sagacious politicians from British Columbia seemed to be able to persuade that committee that no combine existed in their province. But in the province of Alberta, where the Retail Lumbermen's Association existed—which is practically only a subsidiary concern of that existing in British Columbia—a combine was found to exist. The result was that after a delay of six months from the report of this committee the local administration in the province of Alberta preferred an indictment to prosecute the men who, they thought, were guilty of an infringement of the laws of this country against illegal combines. They entered upon that prosecution under certain alleged disadvantages. After the investigation took place at Ottawa most of the documentary evidence disappeared, it was burnt, in fact a great deal of it was admitted to have been burnt by the officers of this association. But the local government at Edmonton, in spite of themselves, after a long delay, secured a conviction. A test case which was brought in the courts of Alberta resulted in the gentleman who was a defendant in that prosecution being fined $500. Although the question was first brought up by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, after the delay to which I refer the local administration took the matter up and secured, I may say in spite of themselves, a conviction.

Now the situation we occupy in the province of Alberta is this, that heretofore we have been practically dependent on British Columbia for our lumber supply; we are practically at the mercy of lumber dealers in the province of British Columbia. We are living alongside of what is perhaps the best lumber country in the world. Yet we have to pay increased prices for our lumber. During the last year prices continued rising until they got as high as $28 per thousand for rough lumber. Naturally we were then looking forward to the time when we would get free from the control of the lumber dealers in British Columbia by means of the railways which would be constructed into the source of the lumber supply in Alberta. So I can assure you that it is a matter of some surprise to me, and it will be a matter of a great deal of surprise to the people of Alberta, a matter in which they will be keenly disappointed, when they learn that in the years 1902-3-4 practically all the limits that will shortly be accessible by railways in that country have been placed in the hands of three or four gentlemen principally residing in the city of Ottawa, one of them a machine agent in Montreal, another a barrister in Ottawa, and another a mysterious company of whom we can receive practically no information, known as the Imperial Pulp Comapny. So then we in Alberta again find ourselves up against the proposition of having to go to people who can dictate terms to us. Instead of now being at the mercy of British Columbia dealers, we find ourselves at the mercy of a lumber ring with headquarters in the city of Ottawa or Toronto or Winnipeg. I say that instead of having to deal with the province of British Columbia—I care not whether it is the coast association or the association in the mountain region, as I understand there are two associations, but from the information I have received they are practically one and the same, we have to deal with this ring. Now I say that the limits in the province of Alberta have been allowed to get into the hands of this ring, practically without there having been any competition at all, practically without there being any knowledge in that country that these limits were to be disposed of. The government knew exactly what was going on, because we find that the applications came in within the space

of a very few months, and practically the same people are applying. Some two or three are tendering on each proposition, and when one of these fortunate individuals obtains a limit it is only a very short time until an assignment is made to this mysterious Imperial Pulp Company. Now I think the government are to be criticised and censured for neglecting in this respect the interests of the settler. Everybody knows that the practical saw millers, now when they want to get additional limits, will have to come and deal with this ring, and he will be held up for extravagant prices, which will eventually have to come out of the pockets of the settler.

I do not propose to go through the circumstances under which all these limits were obtained, but I propose to deal with two particular sections in the province of Alberta. I propose to show very briefly the circumstances under which about 550 square miles of limits were put up were obtained in the province of Alberta, eleven limits in all. I propose to show the season of the year when these limits were put up for tender, the places where they are situated and the circumstances under which they were acquired and as I say I will only deal with these two localities. The first one to which I refer is a section where it is possible to bring down the lumber to Athabaska Landing, which is only about a hundred miles north of Edmonton, and from which the map I have in my hand shows a railway constructed to Athabaska Landing. I refer particularly to the limits which have been alienated and which are to be found on the Pembina, McLeod and Athabaska rivers. As I understand the situation there, the northern part of the province of Alberta is dependent upon that section of the country for their lumber supply. It is expected that within a comparatively short time the Canadian Northern will be extended from Edmonton to Athabaska Landing. When the railroad reaches this point the timber limits along the upper waters of the Athabaska and its tributaries will become valuable. Logs cut above this point on the Macleod and Pembina rivers can be floated to Athabaska Landing, manufactured at that point from whence there is but 100 miles rail haul to Edmonton. In this hitherto inaccessible region the government up to this summer had granted leases covering 400 square miles. When genuine sawmill operations are undertaken at Athabaska Landing it will be found that fifty per cent of the timber supply, and that the very best is in the hands of the member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows), a senator who deals in these transactions and a gentleman named Fraser, a lawyer of Ottawa, who have been quietly waiting for the past four years for the railroad to come and make valuable the holdings which cost them but comparatively little.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there have been granted in that locality four limits, 1046, 1191, 1192 and 1122. It is to the circumstances under which these were acquired that I desire to call the attention of the House. I propose to give the date that the application was made, the tender on each limit, the time the tenders were opened, the name of the applicant, the area of the limit, the price he paid for the same and the name of the successful tenderer. No. 1046 situated in Range 5 west of the fifth meridian, about sixty miles from the city of Edmonton, was put up for tender in six blocks. The advertisement appeared in Ottawa on January 28, 1903, the tenders were opened on the 7th March, 1903, at Ottawa, the applicant was J. S. Walker, there was an interval of thirty-seven days between January 28 and March 7 and if you consider the time it takes a letter to leave Ottawa, get to the end of railway construction and the time it would take a tender to return from the end of railway construction to Ottawa you would be justified, in 1903, in assuming that it would be fourteen days; so that about twenty-three days were left to any party in that part of the country who would be lucky enough to see the advertisement to select an area of forty square miles out of an area of 108 square miles. The bonus for this limit was $3,500 and the successful tenderer was Mr. T. A. Burrows.

1191 contains ten blocks, the advertisement appeared first on October 28, 1904, in Ottawa, tenders were opened on the 7th December, 1904, at Ottawa, the applicant was F. L. Grantham and there was a forty day interval. Taking the time required for the transmission of the mails, it would leave about twenty-six days for fifty square miles to be selected out of 234 square miles. The bonus was $1,075 or about three and a half cents an acre. The successful tenderer was Mr. T. A. Burrows, M. P., for Dauphin.

1192 consists of 10 blocks, the advertisement dated on October 28, 1904, at Ottawa, the tenders were opened on the 7th December in Ottawa, the applicant was F. L. Grantham, 50 square miles had to be selected out of 250 square miles, the bonus was $5,500 and the successful tenderer was Mr. T. A. Burrows. I noticed that the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) in asking a question of my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, (Mr. Ames) last night said: Did I apply to have these berths put up for tender? Mr. Burrows never applies to have berths put up to tender in so far as Alberta is concerned but we find that when the tenders are opened he usually gets there just the same.

1122: in reference to this berth, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I think this is the most glaring case of any that I have mentioned yet. I desire to give the date when it was advertised, the date of the applica-

tion and the location of the limit simply for the reason that I want to ask the people in that section of the country to judge for themselves whether or not they consider there has been fair competition in this transaction. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to get up in this House and say that the time they allowed was sufficient for competitors to examine the property but the people of Alberta can judge for themselves. Berth 1122 consists of seven different areas. One of them is about 50 miles north of Edmonton, the next one 20 miles west of that, the next one 50 miles southwesterly and within about six miles of where the Grand Trunk Pacific will go through the Yellow Head Pass, which will give an idea of the value of that limit, the next one about 50 miles farther west and the next one about 10 miles west. This limit was advertised on the 15th December, 1903, at Ottawa. Tenders were opened on January 27, 1904, at Ottawa, or an interval of about 43 days was allowed. If we allow for the transmission of the mails, as the mail service in that country, I can assure you, four years ago was not the best, nor was the transmission as speedy as it is to-day, we would say that there would be an interval of 29 days approximately, to allow the people who were fortunate enough to see this advertisement in the city of Edmonton about 29 days to get out and inspect this one limit situated in seven different localities of the country and very widely separated. I state without any fear of contradiction that to go and visit these limits located north and west of Edmonton and as I have said widely separated, and return would involve a journey of at least 500 miles. In addition to that any person who desired to tender for these berths would be called upon to cruise an area of 110 square miles in seven different localities widely separated. The successful tenderer for these seven sections so widely separated, put up in the months of December and January, when travel by river was practically impossible, was Mr. A. W. Fraser, lawyer, of Ottawa. Now, I am quite prepared to leave the particulars in connection with the alienation of that limit to the judgment of the people of this province of Alberta and I ask them to determine for themselves whether or not there was any competition in this transaction. To suggest that there is fair competition in this transaction is simply playing with words and is nothing more than an idle suggestion.

Mr. FOSTER. Was Mr. Fraser the applicant as well as the successful tenderer ?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. No, the applicant was a Mr. A. McLean, who, I am given to understand, does considerable cruising for Mr. T. A. Burrows, M.P. If I am wrong in that statement, he no doubt will correct me.

An hon. MEMBER. How much was paid ?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The price paid was $11,000. The next tender was $10,025, and the second tenderer was Mr. K. A. McLeod. As you will find in almost all these instances with regard to limits which are secured by Mr. Burrows, or Mr. Nolan, or by the Imperial Pulp Company, they manage to get above the next tender by a very small margin indeed. One of these seven blocks, as I have said, is within a very few miles—about 4 miles—of the intended line of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Two others are on the Pembina river to the west of it, another is on the McLeod river and another further up is on the Pembina river. By looking at this map you will see that they are all in very desirable locations. As to the quality of timber on these limits, I of course, cannot speak with any local knowledge but from the best information I can get I understand it is spruce, tamarack, jackpine and poplar, all to be found in large areas, the growth is very dense, these limits will be very valuable for railway ties and this limit is to be found all along the proposed line of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I have nothing further to say in regard to the other limits which were obtained there or the logs which, will eventually be floated down to Athabaska Landing. I desire to occupy the attention of the House for a few minutes while I discuss some limits which have been alienated on the head waters of the North Saskatchewan. Northern Alberta, as any person who knows anything about the geography of the country is aware, will depend for its timber supply on the wooded regions at the headwaters of the North Saskatchewan. For 100 miles above the city the timber has been acquired mainly by companies engaged at Edmonton and Strathcona in the manufacture of lumber. But when these lumber merchants and others in their efforts to meet the requirements of that section of the country shall have exhausted these nearby limits, they will doubtless endeavour further up the stream and among the foot-hills and along the base of the mountains to secure a reserve supply. Here, however, they will find that the speculator is ahead of them. The homeless company with a post office box at Winnipeg, known as the Imperial Pulp Company, controls 300 square miles on the upper waters of the North Saskatchewan. Some day the bona fide dealers of Northern Alberta will have to negotiate with the Imperial Company or close down their mills.

I propose to give the several dates when

these limits were advertised, when the tenders were opened, the time allowed for inspecting the limits, allowing for postal service, the successful tenderers and other information. There are in all seven limits, all now under the control of the Imperial Pulp Company. The particulars of the disposal of these limits are as follows :—

HEADWATERS OF THE NORTH SASKATCHEWAN.

No.	Description.	Blocks.	Advertised.	Tenders opened.	Applicant.	Time allowed for inspection.	Area, square miles.	Price.	Number of tenders.	Granted.
	Foot Hills west of					Days.		$		
118	Lacombe .	20	Dec. 10, '03.	Jan. 20, '04.	F. L. Gran-tham.....	27	100	500	2	Nolan.
119	Lacombe .	10	Dec. 14, '03.	Jan. 27, '04.	J. E. Hed-erly.....	27	20	600	2	Nolan.
1031	N. Sask. River ..	11	Nov. 19, '02.	Dec. 31....	Foulger	30	118	31,575	1	Imperial Pulp Co.
1052	Brazeau, Tp. 44, R. 10..	....	Jan. 21, '02.	March 11...	Craft & Lee.	35	....	300	3	Imperial Pulp Co.
1058	Brazeau, Tp. 45, R. 9....	....	Mar. 16, '03.	April 22 ...	Craft & Lee.	21	....	500	3	Imperial Pulp Co.
1097	Brazeau...	2	Sept. 14, '03.	Nov. 11.....	J. M. Young	45	100	1,000	4	Imperial Pulp Co.
1098	Brazeau...	....	Sept. 15, '03.	Nov. 11.....	J. M. Young	45	40	2,500	3	Imperial Pulp Co.

On limits Nos. 118 and 119 Mr. Nolan tendered $100 more than Mr. Burrows in each case, Mr. Nolan's tenders being $500 and $600. The two limits so secured, I understand, have since been assigned to the Imperial Pulp Company. The second highest tender for No. 1031 was only $414 less than that of the Imperial Pulp Company, so that there is a very small margin between the second and the first tenderer, but the Imperial Company have again been successful in this case.

This is simply a bald statement of the facts in connection with the alienation of these limits, and I have been told by people who know, who have looked at the map on which are designated the different timber limits that have been transferred by the government in those three years, that these three or four people, with one or two others, practically control the timber situation at the present time in Northern Alberta. As to the southern part of the province we will perhaps hear more later on.

The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) took up a great deal of the time of the House in casting insinuations, although he objects very strongly to them himself. I think it would have been far better for him to devote more of his time to explanations and not so much to insinuations. It is no answer to what has been said or to what I am going to say, for him to cast insinuations. The people of this country, at least I think I can speak for the section of Alberta from which I come, are not worrying very much about what was done by the Mackenzie government between 1874 and 1878 or the Macdonald government in 1884. What they are worrying about now is how the public domain is being administered by the Laurier government and I must apologise for having to refer, in answer to some statements made by the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turiff), to certain limits which were granted by the Mackenzie government because I know, just as well as any other member in this House, that what the Mackenzie government did in 1878 has nothing to do with this question to-day, nor has what the Conservative government did in 1884 anything to do with the question before the House. The Mackenzie government came into power and went out of power presumably for sins of omission or sins of commission. The same may be true of the Macdonald government. But, Sir, what the people of this country demand now is an explanation from the government in power as to why they have sacrificed the timber limits of that western country and put them into the hands of a few favourite political friends. The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre) ventured to give us what purported to be a history of the administration of these western timber limits by the Mackenzie government, but they did not tell the whole story. I think I am in a position to say that when these hon. gentlemen made the statement that only 310 square miles were alienated by the Mackenzie administration, they made a statement which is not in accordance with fact. If the hon. gentleman from Strathcona will be kind enough to give me the details of his calculation of that 310 square miles I shall be very glad to have them, but in the meantime I hope I am doing him

no injustice when I say that his statement in that regard is not in accordance with the facts. What really did happen under the Mackenzie administration? The Mackenzie government was defeated at the polls on the 17th September, 1878, and I am informed that the government resigned on the 8th October, 1878. Now, by referring to the Sessional Papers No. 20, 55 Victoria, under date the 7th October, 1878, will be found the following memorandum which, in the light of the present discussion, will prove extremely interesting. That memorandum reads as follows :

On a memorandum, dated October 4, 1878, from the Hon. the Minister of the Interior, representing that being of the opinion that it would encourage and facilitate settlement in the valley of the Saskatchewan if facilities were afforded for obtaining lumber at a reasonable price, which he learns cannot be done at the present time, he recommends that a timber limit to the extent of 200 square miles on the Saskatchewan river and its tributaries in the Northwest Territories be granted to Messrs Cook and Sutherland, the same to be selected by them in blocks of not less than 20 square miles, the bonus payable on the said limit to be at the rate of $15 per square mile. And further recommending that the applicants shall have a period of three years within which to make selection of the limit.

Here we have in this memorandum to council 200 square miles transferred to H. H. Cook and Hugh Sutherland.

Mr. BERGERON. Where were they to make the selection?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. All over the Saskatchewan valley.

Mr. BERGERON. All over the west?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Surely hon. gentlemen opposite will see that if ever a timber limit was given on favourable terms, it was this limit given by the Mackenzie government to Mr. H. H. Cook and to Mr. Hugh Sutherland. I would apologize for referring to this were it not that gentlemen opposite seem to base their whole defence on the allegation that preceding governments committed acts of mal-administration in connection with these timber limits at least as censurable as those which are alleged against the gentlemen now in office. But here, in one solitary instance, the Mackenzie government—after they were turned out of power, mind you—on the very day before they threw up the reins of office, granted to two political favourites a limit of 200 square miles of timber which was to be selected all over the valley of the Saskatchewan, and as if that were not the height of generosity, they gave them three years in which to make their selection. One hon. member opposite seemed to take great comfort out of the statement that an ex-Conservative member of parliament had received 50 square miles of limits in the west in the year 1883. And his friends around him applauded that statement. Now, I am not going to make the insinuation which the hon. gentleman from East Assiniboia made last night ; I am not going to say that the Mackenzie government gave these limits to political favourites to help the campaign fund, because I suppose whatever may be thought of Conservative members requiring a campaign fund it is a matter of history, both in the courts of the land and in this parliament, that Mr. H. H. Cook in the days gone by required a very substantial campaign fund indeed. At all events, here we have this Mackenzie government order in council of October 7, 1878——

Mr. BERGERON. A month after the people of the country defeated them.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Yes. And when the hon. member (Mr. Turriff) says that a 50-mile limit was given to an ex-Conservative member, and given for the purpose of graft, what does he think of this grant of 200 square miles to an ex-Liberal member of parliament? Does he think, to use the ingenuous words of this order in council, that it was given—

To encourage and facilitate settlement in the valley of the Saskatchewan.

If hon. gentlemen were to search the records of the Mackenzie administration, no doubt they would find other limits given to Liberal members and Liberal ex-members. Indeed, I think the hon. gentleman from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) referred to-day to a limit which was obtained by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie himself. But all that is past history ; let us deal with the facts of to-day, and let us judge the government of to-day by these facts. The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) said last night—I quote from 'Hansard' :

During the Mackenzie administration there were some people in that part of the country, and the Mackenzie government disposed of a small amount of timber between the years 1873 and 1878. They disposed of 310 square miles and they disposed of it practically under the same conditions that timber has been dealt with ever since. The Mackenzie government received a bonus of $7,150 for the timber they sold, or an average of a little over $23 per square mile. Now that is a long time ago, but in those days of the Mackenzie government when the timber of the west was properly administered, was put up for competition, was sold to the people who wanted it, was sold to the highest bidder, was handled in a proper manner and not given away for nothing, as it was to the pets and favourites of the late Conservative government.

Let me ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) if he considers that this 200 square miles was given to Mr. H. H. Cook and Mr. Hugh Sutherland by public competition? Let me ask him if these limits went to the highest bidder? Let me ask him if he discovers any difference between this grant

to H. H. Cook and Hugh Sutherland and the grants which he alleged were made to ex-Conservative members of parliament? Yes; he may find this difference, that Mr. Cook and Mr. Sutherland received far more generous treatment than any member of parliament or ex-member of parliament ever received from a Conservative government.

Mr. FOSTER. Did he include that 200 miles in the 310 miles he spoke of?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I have tried without success to get that information from hon. gentlemen opposite, but probably they did not include the Cook-Sutherland grant, because shortly after the Mackenzie administration went out of power this order in council was cancelled by their successors in office. Faults may have been committed by both political parties in the past, but let us get down to the facts of the present time; let us consider this particular case which is now before the House, and let the government now in office give the people what explanation they have of the criticisms offered by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake). It is quite reasonable to expect that timber limits would have been sacrificed in the year 1872, and it is also reasonable to think that the same might have happened in 1883. With no railway facilities in that country, with no opportunity for getting a lumber supply from the province of British Columbia, it was urgent that something should be done to provide lumber for the settlers. The settler in the prairie provinces must have lumber, and it was good policy for any government to do everything it possibly could to encourage the manufacture of lumber in that country. With no railways in that country, with no means of transport for the lumber, a government might be justified in sacrificing these limits in days gone by, but what is true of those days would not be true of to-day, because conditions have entirely changed. Let us concede, if you will, that both political parties in the past were equally at fault, if fault there be, for sacrificing the limits. But while we do that, let us see what this government has done, and why it has done it. It would be just as reasonable for a member of this parliament twenty-five years hence, when the lands are all settled, as I have no doubt they will, and when there is no more free land for incoming population; it would be just as reasonable for a member of parliament a quarter century hence to criticise the government for giving away homestead lands as it is for us in this parliament to criticise governments of years past for giving away timber limits. Let me deal with a few of the statements made by the hon. member for Strathcona. He criticised the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley in connection with his application for a limit on Cedar lake.

I do not know the date of the applications, but I presume it would be about the year 1883. But he practically attempts to argue that a limit in 1883 should now be worth as much as it is to-day. He says that although there was no railway facilities then near the limits in question, the water connection with Winnipeg was just the same as it is to-day. Well, what was the population of Winnipeg in 1883 and what is its population to-day? What was the demand for lumber in 1883? To come nearer home to the hon. gentleman, I would ask him what was he paying for property in Strathcona in 1883 and what does he pay to-day? It is absolutely no answer to the argument that these limits were sold at ridiculous prices to-day to say that the same limits applied for twenty-five years ago had to be abandoned because the parties who got them found they could not be worked profitably. It would be no answer to the charge that the limit obtained by Mr. Fraser was sold to him at a sacrifice, and that it was put into the hands of a speculator at such a ridiculously low price as to enable him to make an immense profit—it would be no answer to that argument to say that the same limit in 1883 was practically valueless. The hon. gentleman also referred to one timber limit as having been competed for by two parties, namely, A. W. Fraser and Macdonald, but it may be that Mr. Fraser was acting for both parties, and was not representing any lumber company but speculators in Ottawa. Well, I do not think a lawyer can be said to be discharging his duty properly when he takes charge of applications on behalf of two people who have conflicting interests in the one transaction.

The hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre) spent some time discussing the regulations which are to come in force before long. When these regulations are to come in force we do not know nor can we get any enlightment from him on that point. But what is the use of passing regulations concerning timber limits when, as is the case in northern Alberta, the supply there has been practically all alienated. This is only another instance of hon. gentlemen opposite locking the stable door after the horse has been stolen.

The hon. gentleman further said that the quantity of lumber on these great areas is not known. Is not that an additional reason why we should have the investigation asked for by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) and find out just what lumber has been alienated by the present administration?

For the reasons I have given and for the following reasons, I submit that this investigation should be granted. It should be granted in order that we may find out the

value of the timber disposed of and who the Imperial Pulp Company are, because the suspicion is current in that country, among the men interested in the lumber business, that there is no use in their applying for any timber limits because they cannot do any business with the present administration unless they get under cover. We should also have this investigaion in order to discover who this undisclosed client of Mr. Fraser really is. Surely we are entitled to know the names of the people who are acquiring our public domain at such ridiculous prices. Then the circumstances surrounding the publication of these advertisements, the reasons why reasonable time was not allowed for the exploration of those limits, the circumstances surrounding the reception and opening of tenders—all these call for a thorough investigation. No doubt the right hon. the First Minister, by means of his large majority, can take such position as he may see fit, but I trust that he will see that it is his duty, as leader of the government, as a statesman and as an honest administrator, to have this matter probed into and not allow his followers to try and draw away public attention from the question by showing what the Conservative and Mackenzie administrations did from 1873 to 1884.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). I have listened with much pleasure and interest to the very moderate and reasonable speech just delivered by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) and also to the speeches of the hon. gentlemen who preceded him—some of them containing reasonable statements, but others, to my mind, containing statements not so reasonable. Referring to the speech of the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames), I notice that he says he has no objection to the man who cuts the timber. He says that we should welcome him to the country—that we should welcome the man who is an actual lumberman. Not only should we welcome the man who is an actual lumberman securing timber for his immediate use, but also the man who, with shrewdness and foresight, secures a timber supply for twenty years to come. Yet immediately after making the very proper statement that the actual lumberman ought to be welcomed to the country, he attacked my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Burrows), who has never been anything else but a lumberman, who has been engaged in the lumber business out in the west all his life. If the actual lumberman is entitled to protection and to welcome, why should any distinction be made between one lumberman and another, and why should not the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) be entitled to the same fair play and treatment as any other man who is actually engaged in the lumber business?

In his speech, on page 2345 of 'Hansard,' the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) said :

That hon. gentleman has reserved limits that he, or those who come after him as inheritors, will some day cut into lumber, and yet I think that the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) woud not be unwilling to sell those limits.

I submit that the hon. gentleman had no business to surmise what the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) intends doing, and should not speak regarding his inentions unless he had some definite knowledge as to what those intentions are. Then the hon. gentleman added :

And if rumour is correct, he would not take half a million dollars for the timber lands which he holds on the slopes of the Porcupine hills.

Well, the business of a member of this House is not, in my opinion, to consider and give currency to mere rumours. It is not part of his public duties to deal in rumours as Mrs. Grundy does. He should confine himself to dealing with facts, which are matters concerning which we have some information.

Again, the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames), speaking of the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows), said :

He has acquired on the Pembina and Mcleod rivers, lying north and west of Edmonton, 28 square miles of timber limits. I understand that these limits are even now—he may correct me if I am making a mis-statement—under option for sale at a large amount.

My hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) did correct the hon. gentleman and said that that statement was entirely incorrect. Therefore, this information or the rumour on which it was based was unfounded and there was nothing in the story. My hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) assures me that of all the timber limits he holds—no matter from what government he may have obtained them—he has not put any price upon them or offered any of them for sale, but holds them for the purposes of his business, and he has been for thirty years in business as a lumberman in the west and has three large mills under operation.

Mr. AMES. Will he say that they were never under offer in whole or in part?

Mr. MILLER. He assured me that he has never offered them for sale, and how could he have given an option upon them unless he had offered them for sale ? It was unreasonable and unfair for the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) to speak as he did, and I think he owes the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) an apology, and so do many other members on that

side, for what they have said regarding him, not only in this House but on the hustings.

An hon. MEMBER. Great Scott.

Mr. MILLER. Who is it says 'Great Scott?'

An hon. MEMBER. Everybody.

Mr. MILLER. Is it the hon. gentleman sitting on the front bench who himself has appealed for mercy in this House because of his own feeling and the feelings of those near and dear to him? And yet that hon. gentleman does not hesitate to cast reflections on and make insinuations against the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows), as have done other members, without the slightest ground.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say 'Great Scott,' but if you like I will say it.

Mr. MILLER. The hon. gentleman sitting upon the front bench who did not say 'Great Scott' has said 'hear, hear' every time the name of the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) was mentioned, as though it were a crime for that hon. gentleman to secure a timber limit, whether he secured it from the Conservative government or the Liberal government or secured it by assignment from somebody else who had obtained it by legitimate means and at the highest tender.

One of the arguments made has been that the timber berths have been sold remote from settlement. Who can say where settlement will be in that great western country a year from to-day? Under the administration of the present government, settlers have been coming in in great numbers, and some of them are settled far from the railways in order to secure land that will be valuable when the railways come. In that way, lands are occupied fifty, eighty, a hundred miles from the railway. Who can say where settlement will or will not go a year hence? Again, as has been pointed out by hon. members on the Conservative side, a timber limit may be far from settlement if you measure by miles, but may be near to a settlement because of the course of streams down which the timber may be floated to settlement. But, surely, without dwelling too much on the tu quoque argument, if the timber limits sold since 1896 are remote from settlement, the much larger number of the limits sold from 1880 to 1896 were still further from settlement at that time.

It has been said that timber disposed of by the present government has been given to government favourites. But, Mr. Speaker, there is one very important fact in this debate, and that is that not one of the speakers who have supported this resolution—some of them experienced in timber and some of them not so experienced—has told us of a single case in which a Conservative engaged in the lumber business has been discriminated against or has been treated in any way differently from a man who has been in the habit of marking his ballot for the party now in power.

Mr. AMES. Give us the opportunity and we will show it.

Mr. MILLER. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) has had his opportunity, and so have his friends. They have made long speeches, and, not one single instance of discrimination against a lumberman who happened to be a Conservative has been even alleged. I was pleased to hear the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) speak, for he is a fair-minded gentleman, a respectable gentleman who well deserves the esteem in which he is held both inside and out of this House. He has, moreover, the advantage as a speaker in this debate of being a practical lumberman. He objected very strongly to the method of advertising these timber berths. Now, a timber berth is advertised first by notice posted in the nearest post office to that timber berth; second in the office of the Crown Timber agent; third in a newspaper published in the locality in which the timber is located, and fourth in a newspaper having a general circulation in the district. These methods the hon. gentleman mentioned, but objected to as not being sufficient. But he did not mention one means of advertising which is always adopted, and which, I think, is of greater value than any other method that is now in use or that the hon. gentleman himself suggested. He did not refer to the fact that the advertisement is sent to every man who has requested the department to place his name upon a list for that purpose. This is the practice under existing regulations and under regulations that have existed for many years. If any man in Canada, whether engaged in the lumber business or not, will simply spend two cents to send a letter—or, rather, will write to the department without spending even one cent in postage—he may have his name on this list. Then, instead of having to depend upon seeing the advertisement in a newspaper, where, though published, it may escape his attention, he has the notice sent to his post office address so that it is impossible for him to overlook it or neglect it. The hon. member for Argenteuil has suggested that these advertisements should be inserted in the 'Canada Gazette.' How many people does the hon. gentleman think read the columns of the 'Canada Gazette'? It may be that, if this method were accepted, some of the lumbermen who have large capital invested in the business would subscribe for the 'Canada Gazette' and follow these advertisements. But, so far as men of smaller capital are concerned, so far as nearly all the lumber operators in this Do-

minion are concerned, they might as well have the advertisement inserted in a paper published in Hong Kong as to have it inserted in the 'Canada Gazette.' The hon. gentleman (Mr. Perley) as well as others, have contended that the sale of a timber berth should be advertised for a longer period than sixty days. There may be something in that contention. I think that the Court of Chancery provides for the sale of property, after advertisement, within a shorter time than this. I think that a mortgagee advertising property under a mortgage is not bound to give as long a notice as sixty days. Still, it may be expedient and proper to give a longer time in the case of the sale of timber berths—it is a matter of opinion that may properly and reasonably be argued.

It has been said that large profits have been made by some of those who have secured timber limits from the present government, and from other governments as well. I think it likely that the present value of some of the timber limits has been greatly exaggerated. The evidence that has been laid before us thus far has been the evidence of what somebody has heard somebody else say; we have had no evidence from cases in which the property was transferred and the money paid. Still, I fancy it is true that some large profits have been made on timber limits procured from this government. But we know, also, that large profits have been made by individuals who have bought limits from other governments or from individuals. Such cases are known in the older parts of Canada. These large profits have been due to the increase in the price of lumber. We know that certain kinds of lumber are selling to-day at $20 a thousand, that, a few years ago, could be bought for $6 a thousand. But, if these large profits have been made on timber limits in the older parts of Canada, is it not much more likely that great profits would be made on timber limits in the western country where there has been such rapid development or such a great inflow of settlers, and such a noticeable increase in the railway mileage?

Now, the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) and some of those who preceded him stated that the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and other speakers on that side had not made any explanation of recent transactions.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLER. An hon. member says, 'Hear, hear.' If there has been any failure on the Liberal side of the House to make explanations, surely there has been at least an equal failure to make explanations by the speakers on the Conservative side. For instance, I will quote again the figures already quoted, that in 1880 and the eight years following, a Conservative government disposed of 23,987 square miles of timber, in the one year, 1883 alone, 10,328 square miles; while since 1896 to 1908 the present government has only disposed of a little over 6,000 square miles, a little more than one-half of what our Conservative friends did in the year 1883 alone. Now surely if between 6,000 and 7,000 square miles of timber is too much to have disposed of between twelve years 1896 to 1908, then surely 10,326 square miles was too much to be disposed of by a Conservative government in the one year 1883, when there were no settlers and no population in that western country. It was stated by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) that what the people of the western country most want, and what they must first have, is lumber. It is true that one of the first wants of the settler is lumber; but you cannot have a demand for lumber until you have the settler; and in 1883 when the Conservative government disposed of over 10,000 square miles of timber there were no settlers in that region to demand lumber, none to use it if it were there. I have not heard from any Conservative speaker any explanation of this large disposition of timber lands in 1883 and in the years immediately following and immediately preceding; and I will ask any Conservative speaker who may follow in this debate to make some explanation, tell us why such a tremendous area of timber limits was disposed of in those two or three years. I quote the figures that have been already quoted to say that there has been no explanation of them, and to ask some hon. gentleman of the opposition to give an explanation.

It has been shown that under the Mackenzie government timber limits brought $23.06 per square mile; it has been shown that under the Conservative government, from 1878 to 1896, instead of bringing $23 per square mile, limits only brought $4.13; and it has been shown that under the Laurier administration timber areas brought on an average $81.92 per square mile. I ask for an explanation, I thought we would have had heard an explanation, but so far no explanation has been forthcoming. It is easy to understand that timber in the west is worth more money in 1908 than it was in 1896, but I do not think any valid reason can be shown why it should be worth more than twenty times as much in 1908 as it was in 1896. We have heard no explanation, and I think there is none to give, why timber in 1878 to 1896 was not worth at least one-fifth as much as it was during the five years preceding under the Mackenzie government.

Our Conservatiove friends have said, was all this timber granted by the Conservative government actually taken, was it actually retained? Now a large part of it was not retained, but I say that that has nothing whatever to do with the argument. Orders

in council were passed disposing of the timber, orders in council were passed giving this timber away, without competition, without any bonus, giving it away at a tremendous rate. Now for an illustration, the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) says, I did make an application for 50 square miles of timber. He paid his first year's ground rent, but then he concluded that he did not want to hold the timber. A great many others were in the same position. They made their application, orders in council were passed granting them the timber. He did not retain his 50 square miles because he thought it was not of any particular value, and so, after paying one year's ground rent, he let the timber go. Some other hon. members not having even as much faith as he had in the value of the timber, did not pay even one year's ground rent, and to them licenses were not issued. But taking the case of the hon. member for Argenteuil as an example, he made his application, the timber was granted to him, there the transaction, so far as the late Conservative government was concerned, was ended. He made the application, they granted the timber. I will not say that they were to blame, I will not say that the hon. member was to blame. But if there was credit to be attached to the government for what they did, credit was due to them when they passed the order in council. If there was any blame reasonably attachable to them, that blame was attachable when they passed that order in council.

The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) said that the timber was not retained, the berths were given up, were abandoned, because of the onerous conditions that were contained in the leases from the Conservative government. But not a single member upon the Conservative side of the House has given one instance in which any man's timber berth was cancelled or taken away from him by a Conservative government because he failed to put up a mill or because he failed to cut timber. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee), a great many of those berths were cancelled, a great deal of that timber had to be thrown up, because Sir Oliver Mowat stepped in and told them not to meddle longer with that to which they had no title.

Again referring to the very reasonable argument of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) who says that the actual cutters of lumber are deserving of every consideration and ought to be welcomed to the country. Let us look, if you will, at some of the names of gentlemen to whom our Conservative friends granted these timber berths, and see whether they were actual cutters of lumber and manufacturers of timber. We have the name of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). Now that hon. gentleman says, I do not know whether my name is in that list or not, but I do know that I never made an application for timber. Now I will not say that any member, or anybody else, who obtained a timber license or berth from the late Conservative government was in any way to blame for having obtained it, but I do say that if the hon. member for South Lanark obtained a grant of timber made by order in council, though he had made no application for it, it simply shows that the late Conservative government were willing, not only to give timber to their friends who applied for it, but also to their friends who had not applied for it. The papers show that on the 20th of September, 1879, Messrs John Shields and John Haggart applied for certain timber berths on Fairfield river, which was granted to them by order in council on the 23rd June, 1880, the grant being made to Shields, Haggart, MacLaren and Nichol. The first license was issued on that berth in 1886, for timber berth No. 14. Berths Nos. 25 and 25a containing 25 miles each were applied for on the 3rd March, 1881, by Mr. E. P. Leacock on behalf of himself and Messrs. Shields, Haggart and MacLaren. These berths were granted, on the 23rd May, 1882, by order in council to Messrs. Shields, Haggart, MacLaren and Nichol. These were good berths and they were men who had sufficient faith in the value of these limits to hold them as they are now held by Mr. John Hanbury, of Brandon.

Mr. LALOR. Who is the owner of those berths now ?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. John Hanbury, of Brandon.

Mr. LALOR. Under what circumstances did he become the owner ?

Mr. MILLER. You will have to ask Mr. Hanbury.

Mr. LALOR. Why should you not ask the government ? They sold them to him. They took them away from Mr. Haggart.

Mr. MILLER. You will have to look at the records.

Mr. LALOR. That statement was made in the House by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) and never was denied.

Mr. BOYCE. You are only telling half the story.

Mr. MILLER. I am telling all the story that I know, let the honourable gentleman look up the records. Not only were our Conservative friends willing to give to the hon. member for South Lanark timber berths but when he had investigated these limits and found that they were not as valuable as he would like to have and not

as valuable as some other limits he had learned of and would like to get, they were willing to exchange these berths for other berths of greater value or that suited them better and so, on the 2nd February, 1881, Mr. Haggart made application to exchange his fifty square miles on Fairfield river, that had been granted by order in council in June, 1880, for an equal area on Shell river. He made that application to exhange these limits on the 2nd February, 1881. The then very kindly and generous Conservative government did not take time to investigate, they did not send any official of the department to see whether the fifty miles on Shell river were of greater value than the limit on Fairfield river, but while the applicant made his application for exchange on the 2nd February, by an order in council, five days afterwards, upon the 7th February, the exchange was made and the new berth was granted to Messrs. Shields, Haggart, Maclaren and Nichol, and I am told that the first license was issued to T. Nichol in 1886 upon that berth which is also held by Mr. John Hanbury, of Brandon.

Now, the hon. member for South Lanark is not the only gentleman by whom application was made for timber berths in Canada and I want the House to consider these names and, from their knowledge of the gentlemen, to conclude as to whether they were or were not likely to be actual manufactures of lumber and of timber. We have the name of Mr. T. G. Blackstock, a Conservative lawyer of the city of Toronto, down for 100 miles, and Mr. Nicholas Flood Davin for fifty miles. Mr. Davin was a man of whom Canada might in many respects be proud, but I think it was never known to the House that he was a practical lumberman. Then, there is the name of Mr. Joseph Gibson to whom was given fifty square miles. I think that Mr. Gibson was likely one of those who did not hold his timber limit, but finding that the timber limit was rather a gold brick, to use an expression which an hon. member of this House is fond of using, he exchanged it for a post office and was appointed a postmaster. Then we have a gentleman named Gouin. He obtained from this good government fifty square miles and he too gave up the timber limit and obtained a post office. Fifty square miles more is set down opposite the name of Mr. McLeod Stewart, I believe, a prominent Conservative lawyer. Mr. D. Tisdale has a grant of fifty-two miles and then a grant of fifty miles. Then, the Hon. J. G. H. Bergeron—I am anticipating a little in calling him the 'honourable'—is down for fifty square miles. Mr. Devlin, an Ottawa hatter, is down for fifty square miles, Mr. Birkett, an Ottawa hardware merchant and at one time Conservative member of parliament, fifty square miles, Dr. D. W. Montague, whose name is familiar to our Conservative friends, fifty square miles, and the Hon. W. E. Sanford, Conservative senator, fifty square miles. In regard to the list I have read I simply want to point out that these were men who were not actual lumbermen—and that the government must have known that they were not actual lumbermen. Perhaps all of them were honest and honourable men and I do not want to impute anything improper to them because they got timber limits upon the terms upon which timber limits were being given away, but if the hon. member for South Lanark were here I would like to ask him if he thinks that these gentlemen were actual lumbermen to whom the hon. member for Montreal (St. Antoine) is willing to give some consideration, or whether they were the men to whom he so strongly objected in his speech this afternoon and whom he described as political flesh flies. I would like that some of our Conservative friends should give to us some explanation as to why that good Conservative government gave away timber in such large quantities in the years 1882 and 1883 and in smaller quantities comparatively in the two or three years following to these men who, they knew were not saw millers, and who, they knew, never would cut a stick of timber into lumber. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, has said to us that forty or fifty per cent of the timber limits of the west are now in the hands of speculators which is another way of saying that fifty or sixty per cent of the limits of the west are in the hands of men that he knows to be practical lumbermen. It is a good thing to have even the admission from the hon. gentleman that fifty or sixty per cent of the timber limits that have been disposed of by the present government are in the hands of men who are actual saw millers owning saw mills and intending to cut that timber into lumber. Of the remaining forty or fifty per cent I imagine that the hon. gentleman does not and cannot have the knowledge that will enable him to decide as to whether these men are speculators or as to whether they intend to manufacture lumber. I would like to know how the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), how the Department of the Interior, or any of its officials are to know and distinguish as between the speculator and the man who intends actually to manufacture. There is no way by which he can tell. The only thing they can do is to insert in their licenses some provision that upon notice they shall be compelled to manufacture the timber. The old Conservative government did make such a provision, I understand, in their licenses, and that is what has been referred to as an onerous condition, but I would point out that the present government has been just as careful to insert just as good a safeguard and conditions that are just as onerous and just as binding and

calculated to bring about just as good results. It is true that our Conservative friends, while they had such a provision in their licenses, did not generally, did not in any case that I have heard of, enforce that provision. It is equally true that the present government, while they have had similar conditions in their licenses, have not seen fit always or in many cases to enforce those provisions whatever they may do in the time to come. Referring again to the hon. gentleman for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) we find by the record that Perley and Pattee received fifty square miles of timber and that to Mr. Geo. H. Perley another fifty miles of timber was allotted, 100 square miles in all. I think that these gentlemen were perfectly entitled to take the timber that they got on the terms upon which they got it. If they gave it back, if it has since proved to be valuable and if it has been sold by the present government at a greatly increased price and upon better terms that was their misfortune and their loss due perhaps to their lack of judgment at the time.

These men, honourable business men, engaged in an honourable business, had a perfect right to take the 50 square miles and the other 50 square miles of timber that they got at the time they got it and from the persons from whom they got it. I admit at once it was right for the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) and his partner to secure from a Conservative government, away back in 1882 or 1883, 100 square miles of timber; they were practical men, but were not carrying on any lumbering business in the west, not residing in the west, having no interests in the west; yet this was in all respects an honourable transaction, and they were quite within their rights; it was no reflection on their honesty that they took the timber which was given to them. But I say that it was surely equally right that the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows), who is a lumber manufacturer in the west, who does nothing else, whose only interests are in the west, who has resided and carried on business there for a long time, should be allowed to obtain limits by open competition with the world—not as was done in 1883, when these other gentlemen obtained these limits without any competition. Surely he had a right to obtain a larger number of square miles, as he has mills actually in operation, and that is the only business in which he is engaged.

Some hon. gentlemen have attacked the government upon their timber policy; but they are mere infants at that work, they do not understand how to attack a government upon its timber policy. There are other members in this House who could teach them a great deal along this line. In the 'Mail and Empire' of December 17, in the report of the nomination proceedings at Thornhill in the late by-election in Centre York, I find these words:

Hon. George E. Foster speaking about the timber limits said that the farmer in the northwest could not go out and cut timber to build a shack for himself or his cattle because the government had given away the lumber which belonged to the settlers before 1896.

And so the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), as I heard him upon the hustings in that by-election, addressed the farmers of Centre York. Why the farmer of Centre York could see the settlers in the west in the cold blast, in the bleak November days, with winter approaching, shivering out in their fields without a stick to build a fence or a board to build a shelter, without fuel, without material to shelter their cattle or a shingle to keep out the rain. It was a terrible picture which the farmers of York saw because of the wicked acts of this government, which kept every stick of timber from the poor settlers. But he was excelled by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. A. C. Macdonell), who was reported in the 'World' on the same occasion as saying:

He referred to Colchester, Brockville and Northumberland, and the victories of the Conservative party. What will they say after the elections of Centre York, said the speaker, and the crowd yelled in concert——

A very pleasing prediction.

He charged that every stick of timber from the eastern boundary of Manitoba to the foothills of the Rockies had been ceded over to the Liberal heelers and grafters.

Is it not a wonder that the Liberal party succeed in carrying any by-elections in the face of these wild flights of imagination on the part of hon. gentlemen who are sent out by the Conservative party to advocate their cause and tell the story of the wickedness of their opponents?

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. member is groaning.

Mr. MILLER. I do not wonder you groan. I hope it is a groan of repentance the hon. gentleman is emitting. Then we will notice a change in his speeches, and I hope his repentance is genuine.

Mr. BOYCE. It was a gentleman opposite who groaned.

Mr. MILLER. Then no doubt he groaned because of the wickedness of the Tory speakers to whom I referred.

The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) was rather pleased with the new regulations of last December. They were not in his opinion perfect. Many men have many minds, but he thought they were at least a great improvement, and he rather taunted the Minister of the Interior because he had been advised by and had listened to

the advice of members of the Conservative party. I thank the hon. member for thus taunting the Minister of the Interior, because it is a very dangerous thing for any cabinet minister in these days to listen to any advice given to him by gentlemen on the Conservative side. It should not be, and in times past it has not been so. I do not think the Minister of the Interior has on this occasion either sought for or acted upon advice from members of the Conservative party, but I do believe there have been other instances where he has not only accepted, but has sought the advice of certain Conservative members whom, because of their particular calling, the locality in which they lived or the particular interest and attention they had devoted to certain things, he thought capable of assisting him by their judgment, and he, as I believe, has sought their advice. I think that is a sign, not of weakness, but of strength. I think that any minister of any department of the government may well listen to and ought to be able to listen to, and ought to be big enough to accept the suggestions of opposition members when he felt that they appealed to his judgment and were sound. Conservative members are not without brains and intelligence, many of them are clever men, and if they would devote more of their time to thinking of what suggestions and improvements may be made in place of spending time, as they do, in hurling across the floor of the House and spreading in the country insinuations which are the result of their own disordered digestive apparatus, of their own suspicions, their time would be very much better employed and they would be doing better work than they have been doing for this country and for their constituents. The hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) is a man of great intelligence—a statement which he will not deny. But if that hon. gentleman would go about with his leather bag, with his microscope, with his photographic apparatus, with the brains that are within his head, with the industry that is in his general make up, and would divest himself of the suspicion which he so entertains——

Mr. JOHNSTON. There would be nothing left.

Mr. MILLER. He would do better for the country and a great deal better for himself. Suspicion is not a virtue. I know of no other animal that is so suspicious as a fox; I know of no other animal that will quicker rob a hen roost. Now, referring to the particular case that is before the House, it is a case where three tenders were put in for a timber berth, one of them at about a thousand dollars, one between $6,000 and $7,000, and the other at the even $7,000. And this microscope with a man behind it or the man behind the microscope, whatever way you put it, has discovered that the $1,000 tender and the other tender at $7,000 are upon the same paper having a rampant lion as a water mark, and in the same handwriting, and that in the $7,000 tender the amount of the tender is inserted in a different pen and with different ink. And that is taken by this man with his suspicion as an evidence of wrong doing. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) thought he had some trouble to get hold of the original documents, and he did have, because he went about it the wrong way.

Mr. BOYCE. He got them.

Mr. MILLER. He might have got them more quickly had he gone about it in the right way.

Mr. BOYCE. He got them in spite of you.

Mr. MILLER. I don't claim a bit of credit for it. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) having obtained the original documents, he no doubt felt that having laboured so long to obtain them and having fought so hard to get them, he must find a cause of some kind that would show some gain to his party. But let us look at the matter, not from the view point of the man who is filled with suspicion, but let us look at it with common sense and as fair-minded people.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That shuts him out.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Fraser is a Conservative lawyer——

Mr. AMES. We don't claim him.

Mr. MILLER. I should have said that he is a Reform lawyer. Mr. Fraser has been pictured to us to-night by Conservative speakers as a very shrewd and clever man. Now, I think the facts that have been brought forward to prove his guilt, effectually go to prove that there was no guilt and no wrong in the whole transaction. If Mr. Fraser had been a bungler, if he had been a man without business experience and was intending to do a wrong thing, he might have done that which he did do. But Mr. Fraser is a lawyer, a lawyer of very considerable practice, a lawyer who has done a good deal of work with the departments, a lawyer who has done a good deal of work in the courts. He has submitted evidence to judges and to juries; he has seen a good deal of evidence submitted to judges and juries and if at the time he put in these tenders he had been doing a thing he knew to be wrong, and if he felt guilty of wrong he would have avoided anything that might have attached to it the slightest appearance of wrong doing, and he would have been very careful to see that the writing was done by a different person, on different paper and with different ink. The very fact that he did use the same paper, that he did use the same pen, that he did use the same ink (except for filling in the amount of the tender), is evidence that any

judge experienced in the weighing of evidence or that any advocate addressing a jury would point to as an evidence of innocence rather than of guilt.

I shall conclude by quoting the words used this afternoon by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) when he said that times have changed and we have changed with them. Times have changed and we have changed with them, and as times have changed under the Laurier government the people of Canada realize, the people in the constituencies where we have had the by-elections realize, the people from the Atlantic to the Pacific realize that in 1896 times changed and changed for the better. And these gentlemen of the opposition will have to do more than make insinuations; they will have to indulge in more than suspicion before they will be able to change the minds of the electors of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. JOHN HERRON (Alberta). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) who has last spoken devoted a great portion of his speech to asking questions and demanding information as to the reasons why timber limits were given away in such quantities in 1882 and 1883. Well, a brief answer to his questioning would be to repeat his own words: Conditions have changed in the Northwest. As I was a resident of that country in 1882 and on the ground in these years, I will give him some reason why the Conservative government parted with so much timber in the west, and I will tell the hon. gentleman also why the conditions in the Northwest have changed. There are no doubt a good many hon. gentlemen here to-night who have travelled over the prairies of recent years in a pullman car, but there are not many of them who have gone over those prairies by a long and tedious journey before there was a railway. The advent of the railway has changed conditions in that country. In these years there were only a few thousand settlers in the Northwest; I think the census of 1881 gives 6,000 white people as living in what is now the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. To-day we have 450,000 inhabitants in these two provinces. The 6,000 people who were in the country in 1882 were scattered over the plains from about Qu'Appelle to the Rocky mountains and on the North Saskatchewan. Of course, even though there were only 6,000 people in the country at the time, and even though there should be only 2,000, they would need buildings and houses in which to live and to seek shelter. At that time I do not think there were more than one or two sawmills south of Saskatchewan, perhaps there was not one sawmill south of that river. There may possibly have been some sort of a small mill at Prince Albert and perhaps another small mill in the vicinity of the Crow's Nest Pass. On the expanse of prairie extending for 1,000 miles from Lake Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains, there was, for a distance of 300 miles from north to south, generally speaking, not a sawmill, and those who settled in any portion of that large area were compelled to draw their lumber from some of these points I have mentioned. You can at a glance realize what a serious hardship that was for the few settlers in that country. That was one of the principal reasons why the Conservative government tried to induce some practical lumber operators to establish mills in that district. The Conservative government offered these inducements, but they were not the first to offer limits for nothing because the Mackenzie government had done the same. What the Conservative government did was to offer these limits to men who would be likely to build mills and go into the operation of making lumber. When application was made for a timber limit, it was allotted to the applicant and he was given a certain period of time —I am not sure of the exact period—in which to define his limit, make a survey and get a license. Then, after the license was granted, he was given a certain further period in which to erect a sawmill. I think the regulations were to this effect. He had to erect a mill inside of twelve months and keep it running for six months during each year. At first sight this appears to be a great inducement to men in the lumber business ; but after those who took advantage of these regulations got into the country and made a survey, they found that the cost of erecting a mill, the small demand for lumber, and the conditions generally would not warrant the investment. Further, it must be remembered that in order to bring machinery into that country, it had to be transported overland a distance of 400 or 500 miles if brought from Montana, and if brought from Winnipeg, 1,000 miles west of that city. This was a big undertaking, and when these men saw what they were up against, very few of them took out a license. And those who did, saw it was hardly worth while to follow up their license by actual operations, because there were not sufficient settlers in that country to consume the lumber. What was the result? The result was that these limits were practically all given back to the government. I do not see, therefore, why we should blame the Conservative government for what they then did. It was necessary that there should be a supply of lumber if that country was to be settled. Without such supply, you could not get further settlement into the country, and that is the explanation why so much timber land was granted during the years 1881 and 1882. But since then conditions have changed, and during the last four or five years we have an immense settlement in that country. Ten years ago settlement

began to come in rapidly. Then was the beginning of the great influx, and to-day these vast prairies are all settled. Ten years ago this government still retained a large portion of good timber in the Northwest around the skirts of this great prairie; and when settlement began to come in, if this government had been wise, they would have changed the regulations. But they did not. The timber regulataions have continued the same practically up to the present. In fact the present administration have even become more lax in their regulations.

But going back to 1882, I know of numerous cases in which the government insisted on these men who held licenses erecting sawmills and going into the business of sawing lumber. It was by enforcing these regulations that these men were compelled to give up their limits. Would it not then have been wise for this government, in the last four years, to have taken the whole question into consideration and have forced these men, who were applying for license, to erect sawmills, or else keep the limits in the hands of the government? A wise administration would have taken that course in the general good of the country.

The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) replied to the attack from this side by saying that if the transactions which were shown up are all wrong, this government was no worse than its predecessors. I fail to see how such a reply can be at all dignified by the name of argument. The Conservative party ran their day. I presume they did what they considered was best for the country, but the people did not approve of their administration and they were turned out of office; and if the signs of the times mean anything, this present government will go the same way the very next time the people have an opportunity of pronouncing a verdict. But there will be this difference between the two parties. It can be said to the credit of the Conservative party that the majority of the members who went out in 1896 went out poor men. But if rumour be true——

An hon. MEMBER. Facts.

Mr. HERRON. I think we may say facts. There are a lot of gentlemen opposite who will never be compelled to go to the poorhouse. A great many of them have profited immensely by the lax way in which these regulations concerning timber lands have been administered. These timber lands have been described in this debate as extending from Lake Winnipeg on the east up along north Saskatchewan to the Rockies, a distance of about 1,000 miles, and down the foothills of the Rockies to the boundary line. That is the timber range which is just outside the fringe of the great prairies of the Northwest. This prairie country is not only a good market for timber to-day but is going to be for years to come. It will probably be one of the greatest markets in the world, and we find that all the timber limits are practically in the hands of speculators. Yet on only a few of these limits are there any mills in operation. Nearly all of them are being offered for sale.

I want to speak more particularly about two or three limits in my own riding, which are of great value, and which, I have no hesitation in saying, are held for speculation. Last year, a committee was appointed by this House to investigate the lumber conditions of the Northwest. And we found that a lumber combine existed. On that being made clear, would it not have been a wise policy for the government to enforce these regulations? They say they have power to force the holder of a timber limit to build a sawmill. Would it not have tended to alleviate the condition of the settlers to compel the holders to operate these limits? At that time, things had come to such a pass that many settlers were absolutely unable to secure lumber to erect houses. And yet, in the face of that, we had these timber areas held unused for mere purposes of speculation. Now, it was proved last session before that committee that men who owned limits in the Northwest were in this combine. I think it was proven—it certainly was proven to my satisfaction, and I think to the satisfaction of every member of the committee that the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) was a member of that combine. There were others who obtained these limits—I do not say fraudulently—but I am saying this to show that the government should have enforced the regulations in order to help relieve the situation at that time.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Does the hon. member (Mr. Herron) know of any limits in the Northwest, such as he has described, that are tributary to existing markets and are not being operated?

Mr. HERRON. I have two or three such cases, and, as I am anxious to satisfy the hon. member (Mr. Duncan Ross) I will tell him about them now. In the first place there is timber berth 114, area eighteen and a quarter square miles, date of advertisement November 20, 1903, date of opening tender December 30, 1903. The applicant who applied to have the berth put up was G. A. Sharp. The tenders were K. McDonald with a bid of $2,327; A. J. Maguire, with a bid of $275.75 and G. A. Sharp, $51.50. K. McDonald was the successful tenderer. On the same date, berth 115, area seventeen square miles, advertised on November 20, tenders opened December 30—a period of forty days—applicant C. G. Frith. The tenderers were C. G. Frith, $1,275; A. J. Maguire, $255; and G. A. Sharp, $51.50. The successful tenderer was C. G. Frith, a gentleman who was associat-

ed with Mr. McDonald in all his lumber transactions in that country. The third berth to which I would refer is berth 1,157, thirty and a half square miles, advertised February 27, 1904, tenders opened April 6, 1904—a period of thirty-seven days. The applicants to have the berth put up was G. A. Sharp. The tenderers were A. and H. McDonald $501, C. G. Frith $501. In this case Mr. Frith was the successful tenderer. Now, limits No. 114 and 115 are about from four to six miles north of the town of Coleman and not more than six miles north of the Canadian Pacific Railway. They are not more than six miles from two other flourishing towns—towns from two thousand to three thousand inhabitants.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. The McDonalds are active sawmill men, are they not ?

Mr. HERRON. They have no sawmill there.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. They are running a sawmill in the Crow's Nest Pass are they not ?

Mr. HERRON. Not to my knowledge—not in the province of Alberta.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. But they are active sawmill men, are they not ?

Mr. HERRON. I cannot answer that.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Herron) knows whether they are or not.

Mr. HERRON. So far as I am aware, they have not a saw-mill in Alberta ; that is all the information I can give my hon. friend (Mr. Duncan Ross). Berth No. 1157 is situated about five or six miles south of the town of Coleman and easily accessible to means of transportation either by stream or railway. Yet these limits, thus close to towns affording a market, are held for speculation. They are offered for sale by these men. If the limits are not worked, it is not because timber is not badly needed in that country. Nor is it because there is much opposition, for there is only one sawmill within fifty miles. Another fact worth noting is that these limits lie near to the prairie country where there is no timber. They are practically on the very border of the great prairies of Alberta—the wheat growing belt. I suppose the timber stands within ten miles of the wheat-growing belt. But that is not the only thing that makes these limits valuable. Underlying that country are great beds of coal ; and it is believed that the timber will be valuable for mining purposes—making props and other timbers needed in the mines. It is believed that timber will be an actual necessity when coal mining begins. Some of the mines in that district use imported timber now. I suppose that this prospective demand is the reason why those parties would rather hold the limits for the prices I will mention. They paid $4,104 for these three timber limits. The last speaker, (Mr. Miller) said that others who have spoken in this debate exaggerated the value of the timber limits. I take issue on that point, and I say that not one of the speakers has put an estimate on this timber of anywhere near half its value. Of course, I cannot speak for the accuracy of their statements regarding the timber in the northern country ; but I do speak with confidence of the three particular limits in my own riding. I am prepared to give my figures and let the people of the country in which I live judge whether my statements are correct or not.

Hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the values of timber have estimated that these limits will furnish anywhere from 1,000,000 to 5,000,000 feet of lumber per square mile. According to my estimate, the quantity of timber on each mile is about 8,000,000 feet.

Mr. BURROWS. What kind of timber ?

Mr. HERRON. Mostly red fire pine, and some spruce. In that locality the average is about 7,500,000 feet, but it runs from 5,000,000 to 10,000,000 per square mile, east of the Rockies. If hon. gentlemen here think these figures are not correct, I am prepared to make the statement that there are areas of timber in that country that will yield 25,000,000 feet to the mile.

Mr. MILLER. What I said was that there was no instance of actual sales given to us to prove the value, they are only estimates.

Mr. HERRON. I will show before I am through that it is not the fault of these gentlemen if there are no sales made, because I have their offer here to make a sale.

Mr. MILLER. Have you any case in which the offers have been accepted ?

Mr. HERRON. No, I have not, but I am going to show you what I think timber is worth. I say there is timber land in that country that will run as high as 25,000,000 feet to the square mile ; but that is the exception.

Mr. BURROWS. How big does it grow ?

Mr. HERRON. Three feet at the stump and 65 feet high. I know miles of timber in that country where it stands as thick as it can grow. I consider therefore that 8,000,000 feet to a square mile is a fair estimate for these limits, I believe these particular limits will average that at the least. Now suppose it is worth a dollar a thousand on the stump, and I think it is surely worth that at a speculative value. It has been estimated in this debate that

timber should be worth $2 a thousand, and even $2.50. I am told that the Hudson Bay Company sell no timber for less than $2.50 a thousand on the stump. Whether that is correct or not I do not know. But estimating it worth $1 a thousand on the stump, and 8,000,000 feet per square mile, these 65 miles that these gentlemen own in that country would consequently be worth $520,000. If you estimate the quantity at 5,000,000 feet per square mile, that would reduce the value to $325,000. Now these gentlemen obtained this timber for $4,104, they have held it for four years, and they are now offering it for $100,000. Mr. McDonald, of Ottawa, has offered this timber limit for sale at $100,000.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Does the hon. gentleman say that it is worth $525,000, and that the McDonald brothers are offering it for sale at $100,000.

Mr. HERRON. Yes, and I think they would make a very good profit out of it at $100,000, seeing they got it for nearly nothing. That would yield them a net profit of $96,000.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Is the hon. gentleman aware that immediately across on the British Columbia side, you can buy timber for 25 cents a thousand on the stump, which would bring the price down to about what they are offering it for, instead of $2 a thousand.

Mr. HERRON. I estimate it at $1 per thousand. If there is any good timber east of the mountains for 25 cents, I think it is very cheap. But these gentlemen are getting an immense profit out of their speculation, even at $100,000.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Does the hon. gentleman say that anybody has offered to purchase that property at that figure?

Mr. HERRON. No one has offered to purchase it, but they are offering to sell it for that figure. So I think that is a fair indication that they have been holding it for speculation. I think their offer is a very moderate one.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. And nobody will buy it?

Mr. HERRON. I think all the facts go to show that the government have not been handling the assets of this country to the advantage of the people. If this timber is worth $100,000, why don't the government dispose of it instead of putting it into the hands of men who are simply holding it for speculation?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me, as I am looking for information? He says this timber is within six miles of the town of Coleman, and that it is convenient to the Canadian Pacific Railway. He is well aware that the timber industry in the Crow's Nest country has been one of the chief industries there, that there are a number of mills in the Crow's Nest Pass, and a number of lumber operators there. He also says that forty-two days were given to advertise this timber, and he knows that under the regulations of the department a notice that this timber is for sale is sent to the different people who are interested in the lumber industry. Now, I want to ask him this question: Under these circumstances, why, if this timber is worth so much money, was there not a bid from other people for more than $4,000, when they knew all about it, and it was within six miles of a railway, so that they could go and see it at any time?

Mr. HERRON. An answer to part of the hon. gentleman's question is that at the time this timber was sold I do not think there was a newspaper within forty or fifty miles of the locality, perhaps within sixty or seventy miles, that is on the Alberta side.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. But notices were mailed to the timber men.

Mr. HERRON. We have no guarantee that they were mailed. That is supposed to be the regulation, but we have no guarantee that it is carried into effect. I do not think any one can come forward now and prove to this House that notices were sent to mill operators all over the country that these limits were to be sold. I think it has not been the case that they have done so. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that if these limits are worth more than is offered by these gentlemen, the government should not have sold these limits; and if they could not be sold at some near approach of their value, then they should be retained for the good of the settlers of the country. That is one of the reasons why the House should support this amendment and grant an investigation into this whole question. I might say, with perhaps some justice to the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), that I know cases where application has been made to have limits put up for sale, and he has refused to allow them to be put up. Whether that is only within the last year or two, and whether it was for the protection of the people or not, I give the minister credit at least for doing that, and I am glad to see that the regulations have been changed. I think, however, it is a case, as I said the other night, of locking the door after the horse is stolen. The settlers will have to pay these enormous profits that are now going into the hands of speculators, and the country is just set back that much by the lax way in which its timber resources have been handled.

On motion of Mr. Boyce the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 3, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General, which was read by Mr. Speaker, as follows :—

GREY.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the twelve months ending 31st March, 1908, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, February 3, 1908.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, the estimates, together with His Excellency's message, were referred to the Committee of Supply.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF ROYAL GRAIN COMMISSION.

On the orders of the day being called :

Mr. LAKE. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask when the report of the Royal Grain Commission, which was presented some time ago, is likely to be printed and distributed ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Inquiries will be made by the clerk and the information given.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the government whether or not there is any objection to bringing down without further motion additional papers connected with the Metlakatla Indian reserve ? The Minister of the Interior will no doubt remember that papers were brought down last year up to that time ; the statement then was and the fact was that no grant had been issued. I understand that since then there has been an opinion from the Department of Justice upon which a grant has been issued. Of course if a further motion is required I will make it but I thought it might perhaps be not out of place to ask that these papers should be brought down without further motion in order to complete the return.

Mr. OLIVER. A motion was passed a few days ago and papers were brought down subsequent to the order of last year ; if my hon. friend will examine these papers he can let me know if there are any further papers desired and I shall bring them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was not aware that papers had been brought down ; what I wanted particularly was the opinion of the Department of Justice and the grant. I shall examine the file and let the minister know.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—REPORT OF COMMITTEE MEETING.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw attention to a report of a committee meeting in the 'Globe' of Saturday, February 1, which reads :

Mr. Bennett, with characteristic unscrupulosity, spent a couple of hours in the Public Accounts Committee to-day in a vain effort to 'get level' in his own elegant parlance, with a political opponent in his own constituency, and to discredit Hon. A. G. MacKay, the leader of the opposition in the Ontario legislature. What he did succeed in doing was to prove once again the egregious folly which governs the actions of the opposition in these days. The facts demonstrated were these: In 1905 certain dredging works had to be done in Matchedash bay, and following the usual course the Department of Public Works called for tenders. These were put in, one by the Penetanguishene Dredging Company, another by the Owen Sound Dredging and Construction Company, and a third by Mr. H. W. Prendergast, Montreal. Mr Prendergast's tender, being the lowest, was accepted.

And further down :

When it is remembered that the successful tenderer was neither Mr. McKay nor Mr. Kastner, but Mr. Prendergast, against whom no suggestion of collusion is made, the absurdity of Mr. Bennett's case is manifest, and yet this is the way in which the time of the committee and of the House is being wasted, simply that Mr. Bennett may indulge his personal spleen and political prejudice.

The subject of the inquiry was not at all the dredging to be done at Matchedash bay; it was the dredging at Matchedash bay and Penetanguishene and it was proved beyond peradventure by the production of the original documents that Mr. McKay had——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member of course is referring to something which took place before the committee and has not yet been reported to the House. While the hon. member did not say so, I understood that he was introducing this as a matter of privilege. As far as it is a matter of privilege it is proper to refer to it here ; but what has happened in the committee is not a proper subject of reference in the House until it is reported.

Mr. BENNETT. The newspaper article attributes certain things to me which are untrue, and I am endeavouring to make an explanation of the true proceedings. What was proved beyond peradventure was that Mr. McKay——

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is entitled to set himself right but beyond that it would not be proper for him to go.

Mr. BENNETT. That is all I ask the House to permit me to do. I did not endeavour to prove before the committee what the 'Globe' said I did, but what I did endeavour to prove was that there were two separate and distinct contracts, that on these two, the Hon. Mr. Mackay, the leader of the opposition in Ontario, had based a tender, that these two tenders were contained in an envelope, that two tenders of a rival contracting firm were contained in an envelope of the firm of Mr. Mackay, the leader of the opposition in Ontario——

Mr. JOHNSTON. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is discussing a matter that is still before the Public Accounts Committee; and until such a time as the committee reports, he has no right to give an ex parte statement in this House.

Mr. FOSTER. What, it seems to me, the hon. gentleman was endeavouring to do was this, and I think he had the right to do it. He is charged by the 'Globe' newspaper of having done certain things in the Public Accounts Committee. He rises to a question of privilege and says he did not do them, and then goes on to say what he did endeavour to do. He is not saying what was done in the committee, but simply what he endeavoured to do, and he is showing this in order to set himself right.

Mr. SPEAKER. When the hon. gentleman complains of having been misreported by a newspaper, he is in order in making a correction or personal explanation.

Mr. BENNETT. That is what I am endeavouring to do. I endeavoured to prove in the committee by the production of the original document that when Mr. Kestner, representing the Penetanguishene Dredging Company had inclosed two tenders—one for the work at Penetanguishene and another for the Matchedash bay—in an envelope, it was the office envelope of the Hon. Mr. Mackay, used by him in his law office in the town of Owen Sound. I then endeavoured to prove that Mr. Mackay, as the president——

Mr. SPEAKER. That is going beyond what is permitted under the circumstances. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that a newspaper had misrepresented him. It is quite open to him to set that right, but not to enter upon a discussion of what occurred before the committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. All I understood he was doing is this. The newspaper in question charged him with endeavouring to prove a certain thing. He says that he did not endeavour to prove that and then goes on to relate what it was he did endeavour to prove.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. BENNETT. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I am endeavouring to show that Mr. Mackay, as president of the Owen Sound Dredging Company, had inclosed two tenders.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is going contrary to your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is perfectly in order to state in what respect the newspaper in question misrepresented the hon. gentleman and to set that right by denial or otherwise, but it is quite apparent that the line of discussion which the hon. gentleman is following is simply a discussion here of what has occurred in the Public Accounts Committee, and that is not in order until that committee has reported.

Mr. BENNETT. I bow, Sir, to your ruling. But there is a part of the newspaper report which the House probably will permit me to mention. The newspaper says:

> Mr. Bennett to-day, in a vain effort to get level, in his eloquent parlance, with the political opponents in his own constituency—and so on.

That paragrapher implies that I said in the committee that my examination was solely for the purpose of getting level with a political opponent. I have this to say. Whoever wrote that paragraph wrote a statement that is absolutely devoid of truth, the writer was never informed by any one that I had made such a statement, it is absolutely false in every particular. The penny paragrapher who wrote this item, I congratulate upon being able to meet the wishes of the grafters who own the 'Globe' in publishing such untrue reports. There is another report in that newspaper, on page 13, written by a gentleman, and I have no fault to find with the report on page 13, written by a gentleman who is attached to the 'Globe.'

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BOYCE. I would like to ask when the return with reference to timber berths 1048, 1059, 1152, 1068, 1050, 1265, 1274, 1275, ordered the 18th December last will be brought down?

Mr. OLIVER. They are being prepared, but there are a large number of orders for returns, and it is impossible to furnish them any faster than is being done.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask with respect to returns which I moved for some weeks ago regarding the distribution of fishing bounties in the county of Cape Breton. As the hon. the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) is not in his place, would my right hon. friend the First Minister call his attention to it?

Mr. FOSTER. Also a return called for some time ago from the Department of Agriculture, which, I understand, the Minister of Agriculture had about ready before he made that memorable trip to Stanstead. Perhaps that trip rather obliterated the return from his memory, but I should very much like to have it; and if he has now leisure to devote to that part of his work, I hope he will do so.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend has good reason to remember Stanstead. The return was made out and sent to the Secretary of State, but it was found there was some correspondence with the Marine department which had not yet been sent in. As soon as that is prepared—and the Minister of Marine promised it for this afternoon—the return will be laid on the table.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the Minister of Public Works lay on the table the report of the architect who drew the plans for the departmental building? I would like to have an opportunity of looking them over before we discuss the hotel site.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Plans were called for from architects in Canada generally, and a board of Council was appointed to determine their relative merits. Is it the report of that board which the hon. gentleman requires?

Mr. FOSTER. No, the report of the one who was adjudged to have furnished the best plan.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was distinctly understood, when the board or committee was appointed and architects invited to furnish plans, that the department would not be under any obligation to accept the plan which got the first prize, so that no plan has yet been accepted. I think perhaps that the best information I can give would be to supply the hon. gentleman with the report generally upon all the plans and particularly upon the one which received the first prize.

Mr. BOYCE. When may we expect the return ordered on the 18th December with regard to dredging in Kaministiquia river, Port Arthur, Sault St. Marie, and the Mission river? It is important that the preparation of these should be accelerated because the documents are very much needed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is impossible to tell just how soon the report can be laid on the table. A few days ago I laid on the table a very voluminous report which had just been completed. I am informed by the officials that there are not sufficient of them to make the returns with any degree of promptness. The rooms of the department are very limited. There is no accommodation for additional clerks and it is not regarded as good practice to employ the present clerks after hours for the purpose of copying these returns. I shall do the best possible to get the return down, but there are a large number called for, and each must come in its regular order.

ALIENATION OF TIMBER LIMITS.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to ask the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) if he can send me, or lay on the table of the House, his make-up of the statistics that he read here the other night in his speech. He had them in his hand and he gave us a statement of the number of square miles of timber limits which were alienated by the Mackenzie government, the number that were alienated by the Liberal-Conservative government succeeding, and those of the Liberal government since 1896, giving areas, amounts received and a calculation as to the average per mile. In his speech he said those were the records of the department. I would ask very kindly if he would send me his statement of the make-up so that I may verify it if possible.

Mr. TURRIFF. I have not got the papers in my hand, but I think I can get them and will send them to him.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 86) to incorporate the Northern Empire Railway Company—Mr. Caron.

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the Institute of Architects of Canada.—Mr. Walsh (Montreal, St. Anns).

QUESTIONS.

SOURIS, P.E.I., PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked:

1. Has any contract been entered into for the construction of a new block on the east side of the railway wharf, and connected with it, at Souris, Prince Edward Island? If so, who has the contract?
2. Was the contract let by public tender?
3. What is the amount of the contract?
4. How much has been paid to the contractor to date?
5. Is this block being constructed for government purposes? If so, what?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works):

1. Yes; for an extension to the present wharf at Souris. Contract awarded to E. A. Wallberg, his tender being the lowest.
2. Yes.
3. Schedule rates.
4. $47,460.44.
5. Yes, for the requirements of the Prince Edward Island Railway.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY BETWEEN MONCTON AND WINNIPEG.

Mr. KEMP—by Mr. Foster—asked:

1. How many miles of the National Transcontinental Railway have been located between Moncton and Winnipeg?

2. How many miles remain to be located?
3. How many miles of construction are there now under contract, and in what districts is such construction being carried on?
4. Is it the intention to let further contracts during the year 1908? If so, to what extent, and in what districts?
5. What is the total amount of obligations entered into, together with disbursements already made in connection with the surveys, terminals, administration and construction of the National Transcontinental Railway between Winnipeg and Monction?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways) :

1. Approximately 1,803 miles.
2. Approximately 4 miles and revision at a number of points already located.
3. 859 miles as follows : District A, 58 miles Moncton westerly; 61 miles easterly from Quebec; boundary to near Grand Falls. District B, 150 miles Quebec bridge easterly; 195 miles Quebec bridge westerly. Districts C and D, 150 miles from eight miles west of the Abitibi river, crossing easterly. District F, From Lake Superior Junction westerly about 245 miles.
4. Yes. District A, about 138 miles; district B, about 52 miles; district D, about 100 miles; district E, about 75 miles.
5. Estimated amount of obligations entered into about $38,000,000. Disbursements made to 28th January, $21,364,364.34.

I.C.R.—PASSES TO MR. P. S. ARCHIBALD, C.E.

Mr. EMMERSON asked :

1. Were any passes issued by the Intercolonial Railway to Mr. P. S. Archibald, C.E., and to any member of his family during the year 1907?
2. If any, what are the names of the members of the family to whom any such passes were issued, and the dates of issue respectively?
3. By whose authority were such passes issued, if any?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways) :

1. Yes, in accordance with the usual courtesy extended by one railway system to another, an annual pass was granted at Ottawa in favour of P. S. Archibald as general manager of the Elgin and Havelock Railway.
2. June 14, 1907, a trip pass in favour of Mrs. Harris (Mrs. P. S. Archibald's daughter living with her) ; August 22, trip pass in favour of Mrs. P. S. Archibald ; November 14, trip pass in favour of Mrs. P. S. Archibald.
3. The above trip passes were granted by the general manager of Canadian Government Railways at Moncton on account of Mr. P. S. Archibald, general manager of Elgin and Havelock Railway.

Mr. KEMP.

THOMAS WILLIAMS, EMPLOYEE, I.C.R.

Mr. EMMERSON asked :

1. Is Thomas Williams, formerly the accountant and treasurer of the Intercolonial Railway, now in the employ of that railway?
2. If so, what is the nature of his employment and the salary paid him therefor?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways). 1. Thomas Williams is still in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway, in the accountant's branch, as accountant, specially engaged in checking up the Grand Trunk accounts on the joint section in consequence of the arbitrator's award against that company, his salary being $2,700 per annum.

LOBSTER FISHERIES, P.E.I.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

Has the government received the following numerously signed petition? If so, what is the intention of the government as to the matter therein set forth :—

'To the Honourable L. P. Brodeur,
'Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
'Ottawa.

'Hon. Sir,—The petition of the undersigned, fishermen and other citizens of Prince Edward Island, humbly showeth:

'1. That under the present system of control in the lobster fisheries of the coast, licenses are restricted to certain parties with a right to catch and put up lobsters within a certain coastal area and within a given season.

'2. That licenses for new factories have been exceedingly difficult to obtain.

'3. That a number of the larger packing establishments, especially those in the hands of foreigners, have gradually acquired the plant and licenses of the less important local packers.

'4. That such control of the industry by monopoly is detrimental to the best interests of the province.

'5. That by such restriction of licenses the poorer fishermen are shut out from the larger emoluments of the industry.

'6. That rich corporations, especially those with headquarters in foreign countries, have recently acquired many franchises in the province of Prince Edward Island.

'7. That these corporations are a menace to the rights of fishermen, and may control the prices paid, raising them for the moment, thus driving out the smaller firms unable to compete with them, and then lowering the prices to the great damage of such fishermen.

'8. That this system of license inaugurated for the preservation of the fisheries should be modified as occasion requires, and certainly in such circumstances as we have cited.

'Therefore, we ask for the restoration of the rights of the fishermen of the province to secure licenses whenever such conditions as these arise, and thus prevent great injury being done to the fisheries and fishermen.

'And your petitioners will ever pray.'

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Marine). Yes. It has been the subject of representations which are receiving the most serious consideration.

SALE OF CATTLE BY CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Mr. WM. JACKSON asked :

1. Did the management of the Central Experimental Farm, Ottawa, sell any pedigreed cattle during the years 1906 and 1907? If so, how many in each year, giving the different breeds?

2. What is the name of purchaser, his place of residence, price paid, and breed?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I would ask the hon. gentleman to put this in the form of a motion, as the answer would be rather long to read. In doing so I would ask him whether he uses the term 'cattle' in its restricted sense as meaning horn cattle ?

Mr. WM. JACKSON. Yes.

PORT BRUCE HARBOUR.

Mr. MARSHALL asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to spend any money on the Port Bruce harbour this year?

2. If so, how much?

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

1 and 2. It is the intention of the department to perform some dredging in the harbour of Port Bruce during next season; the estimated cost of the work is $855.

SEIZURE OF STEAMER 'COQUITLAM.'

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY asked :

1. Has any action been taken recently by the government to secure compensation from the United States authorities for seizure of the steamer 'Coquitlam'?

2. Is the government aware that such seizure has been declared by the United States courts to be illegal?

3. Is it the intention of the government to press for speedy settlement of several outstanding claims by Canadian sealers against the United States government?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes.

2. The government is aware that the United States court of Appeal reached a decision in favour of the 'Coquitlam' and dismissed the libel against her.

3. The government has been and is continuing to press for a settlement of all outstanding claims against the United States government.

FISHERIES IN LAKE WINNIPEG.

Mr. SCHAFFNER asked :

1. Does the government contemplate any legislation having for its purport the closing of Lake Winnipeg to commercial fishing for whitefish by tugs?

2. Has any representation been made to the government regarding the depletion of fish in Lake Winnipeg?

3. What action has been taken by the government to preserve the fisheries in Lake Winnipeg?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. No such change is at present contemplated.

2. Yes.

3. The following changes were last year made in the regulations for Lake Winnipeg : A 5¼ inches mesh was required in whitefish nets instead of a 5 inches mesh as previously. The fishing season for whitefish under 'domestic' licenses was limited to the 'winter fishery' beginning after the 30th of November. Previously there was a close season for such fishing only from the 5th of October to the 30th of November. The fishing season for 'commercial' whitefish fishing which was previously from the 1st of May to the 31st of August was restricted to, from the 1st June to the 15th of August. A 4¼ inch. mesh was required in pickerel nets instead of 4 inch as previously. The close season for pickerel which was previously from the 1st of April to the 15th of May was extended to the 20th of June, and it is the intention to have a commission inquire into the conditions of the fisheries of Lake Winnipeg and other western waters during the coming summer, with a view to reaching regulations to best meet the requirements.

MR. F. F. FORBES—APPOINTMENT AS DISTRICT JUDGE.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. What information did the Department of Justice possess, or what inquiries or investigations did the department make as to the character, fitness and professional standing of Mr. Frederick Fraser Forbes, before and at the time of his appointment as district judge in the province of Saskatchewan?

2. Was the department at the time of said appointment aware that matters affecting Mr. Forbes were reported in the territorial law reports, volume 2, at pages 410, 423 and 447?

3. Was any action taken subsequent to the 11th June, 1897, with reference to the matters in said report referred to? If so, with what result, or where is the record thereof to be obtained?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. Mr. Forbes was considered to possess the qualifications required for the position and no question was raised as to his character or professional standing.

2. No.

3. The department is unable to say.

SALVATION ARMY IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. MARSHALL asked :

1. Has the attention of the government been called to a public statement recently made by General Booth of the Salvation Army, in Birmingham, England, to the fol-

lowing effect:—' He had wired to the government of Canada and had received a reply to the effect that of the twenty thousand immigrants sent out by the Army during the last two or three years, a hundred could not be found who were out of employment?

2. What are the terms of General Booth's message and the government's reply, to which reference was made in the above statement?

3. If the reply of the government was such as General Booth states it was, what means did the government adopt to ascertain the actual number of unemployed among such immigrants?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The government has no information on the subject.

CANADIAN CLAIMS FOR SEIZURE BY RUSSIANS.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Is the government aware that the sum of $82,544 has been paid to the high commissioner in England for the Russian government in settlement of outstanding claims for wrongful seizure of Canadian vessels? If so, has the government received the same?

2. Has the government determined the nature of the distribution?

3. Who will participate in such distribution?

4. What will the parties severally receive?

5. When may the owners expect to receive the payments due them?

Rt. Hon. SIR WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

1. The government has received in such connection the sum of £16,962 5s. 8d., equivalent to $82,549.77 through the High Commissioner.

2. The matter is now under consideration.

3, 4 and 5. Answered by No. 2.

REVENUE FROM WHARFS AND PIERS.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

What amount of revenue has been received from wharfs, piers, and harbours, for the years 1895 and 1907 respectively, showing amount received in each province?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The revenue is by fiscal year for nine months.

Province.	1894-95.	1906-07.
Ontario	$1,249 64	$2,844 27
Quebec	2,059 74	3,125 26
Nova Scotia	3,989 41	3,876 63
New Brunswick	848 21	1,995 85
P. E. Island	1,003 78	1,001 90
B. Columbia		262 00
	$9,150 78	$13,105 91

GOVERNMENT WHARF AT SPRY BAY, N.S.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

What amount of money was paid for repairs on government wharf at Spry Bay, N.S., in the year 1907, what was the nature of said repairs, and to whom was the money paid?

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

1. $101.98.

2. The work, which is satisfactorily completed, consists of the filling with stone and brush a breach that was made, last winter, by sea and ice, in the approach to the public wharf.

3.

Prest Lumber Co., timber	$16 69
G. A. Leslie & Co. (Ltd.), logs and iron	8 29
I. J. Leslie, wages, as foreman	27 50
John Logan, wages, as labourer	15 00
Sydney Leslie, wages, as labourer	15 00
Ernest Prest, wages, as carter	10 00
D. I. Leslie, hire of horse and truck.	9 00
Total	$101 98

NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING COMPANY.

Mr. LENNOX—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Referring to letter of Mr. F. C. Blair, as set out on page L—80 of Auditor General's Report for the year 1906-07, were any measures taken to ascertain whether or not the 10,636 persons referred to in said letter, or any of them, were induced or influenced to come to Canada by any act or proceeding of the North Atlantic Trading Company or its agents?

2. If so, what measures and with what results?

3. If not, why not?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. No.

2 and 3. Because the contract with the company stipulated that if a certain amount of money was expended by the company, in countries mentioned in the contract, in emigration work on behalf of Canada, the government would allow the company a bonus on agriculturists and domestics arriving in Canada from the countries covered by the said contract.

Steps were taken to assure the government that the amount named in the contract was spent and the Immigration Branch examined incoming immigrants in order to discover those on whom bonus was due according to the contract.

DREDGING AT MOUTH OF BECANCOUR RIVER.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. During the year 1907 did the government have any dredging work done at the mouth of Bécancour river, in the county of Nicolet?

2. If so, by whom was such work done?

3. Was it day work or by the yard?

4. Who was in charge of the work, and what was his salary?

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

1. Yes.

2. L. E. Dufresne and F. E. Turcotte.
3. By the yard.
4. Paul Leduc ; salary, $2.50 per day.

MR. WM. MAXWELLL SMITH, FRUIT INSPECTOR.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. What is the annual salary or remuneration of W. Maxwell Smith, Dominion fruit inspector in British Columbia?
2. What are the terms of the contract or arrangement under which he is employed by the government?
3. Is he paid a salary for twelve months in the year? If not, for how many months, and for what period?
4. How many days was he actually engaged in the performance of his duties during the years 1906 and 1907, respectively?
5. What were his expenses for 1906 and 1907, respectively?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. $1,250 per year since April 1, 1907.
2. He was appointed Dominion Fruit Inspector on August 1, 1903, at a salary of $1,100 per year, since increased as above, with actual expenses allowed when travelling on government business.
3. Yes. He is paid for 12 months services in the year.
4. He was engaged in the performance of his duties continuously during the years 1906 and 1907. A portion of his time was spent in attending fruit growers and farmers institute meetings and acting as an instructor in orchard work.
5. In 1906.. .. .. $961 38
In 1907.. .. .. 215 80.

DISPOSAL OF PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. What land has been withdrawn for settlement, or set apart, or sold, for colonization purposes, since 1896?
2. What is the location and amount in each case, specifying townships, sections, half or quarter sections?
3. To whom has it been sold, or alienated, and on what terms of settlement?
4. What was the price per acre, on terms of payment, and what is the nationality of the settlers in each colony?
5. When was the land sold, alienated, reserved, or set apart, for such purpose, in each case?
6. How many of these companies have complied with their contracts, and to what extent?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). This requires a very voluminous answer and I would ask the hon. gentleman to move for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

QUEBEC BRIDGE—DOMINION GOVERNMENT GUARANTEE.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. What is the amount of money that has been raised by loan or otherwise, and guaranteed by the Dominion, by the Quebec Bridge Company?
2. Has the government paid off these loans, or other obligations?
3. If so, how was the money raised for that purpose?
4. On what terms, and at what rate of interest?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The bonds of the Quebec Bridge Company guaranteed by the government have not been sold. Money were raised by the company on the pledge of the bonds with the Bank of Montreal at the interest rate of five per cent per annum. The amount due the Bank of Montreal by the Bridge company for such advances and interest on June 30, 1907, was $5,561,507.23.

EXPENDITURE ON PUBLIC WORKS AT CLARK CITY, QUEBEC.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Barker—asked :

1. What is the total amount expended to date by the government on public works at Clark City, in the province of Quebec, or in the Bay of Seven Islands?
2. Are there any further works to be executed at the Bay of Seven Islands, and what is the estimated cost of projected works still incompleted?

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

1. $91,708.37.
2. Nothing proposed except completion of work now under contract with the North Shore Power Railway and Navigation Company, there is still a balance of $16,105.52 to be paid.

WHARF AT POINTE-AUX-TREMBLES.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Barker—asked :

1. Up to the date of January 7, 1908, how many tenders did the Department of Public Works receive for the completion of the construction of the wharf at Pointe-aux-Trembles, county of Portneuf?
2. What is the name of each tenderer, and the amount asked by each of them?
3. Has the contract been awarded? If so, to whom and at what date was the contract signed?
4. If not, why not?
5. If the contract has been awarded, what amount has the contractor deposited as security?

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

1. Two.
2. Onésime Poliquin, $22,490 ; J. A. Lemay, $24,500.

3 and 4. (a) Yes. (b) Onésime Poliquin. (c) Contract forwarded for signature and not yet returned.

5. An accepted bank cheque for $2,500.

JURISDICTION OVER FISHERIES.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens) asked :

1. Has the government taken any steps to arrange the dispute existing between the Dominion and the maritime provinces concerning the fisheries? If so, what are they?

2. What difficulties prevent an amicable settlement of those disputes, and what is their nature?

3. Is the government aware that this 'divided jurisdiction' between the federal government and the governments of those provinces has proved detrimental to the fisheries interests of those provinces?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. The government is appointing a delegate with power to discuss with accredited representatives of the various local governments affected, the question of the relative rights and jurisdiction with respect to the fisheries.

2. The government is unaware of any difficulties which should prevent an amicable settlement of rights.

3. No ; but the government appreciates that the fisheries interests could proceed on a better and more satisfactory basis with undivided jurisdiction.

COAL LAND LEASES.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked :

1. How many coal land leases have been issued under the new regulations of April last?

2. What are the names and addresses of lessees?

3. How many applicants have withdrawn their applications to lease, and have obtained refund of application fee?

Hon. F. OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. No leases have actually been completed under the provisions of the regulations referred to, but 35 applications have been granted and the rental paid for the first year.

2. Following are the names and addresses of the applicants whose applications for leases have been granted :

Lease No.	Name and Address.
1	Mrs. Emma Coolidge, Spokane, Wash., U.S.A.
2	Dolph Coolidge, Spokane, Wash., U.S.A.
3	Alfred Coolidge, Spokane, Wash., U.S.A.
4	Robt. Bosville Durrant, Lundreck, Alta.
5	Frederic E. Ponto, Wabamun, Alta.
6	Paul Driscoll, Taber, Alta.
7	Martin Kelly, Montreal, Que.
8	Morrice J. Pierce, Estevan, Sask.
9	Mrs. Mary F. Rogers, Victoria, B.C.
10	J. B. Wilkie, Coleman, Alta.
11	D. M. Rogers, Victoria, B.C.
12	John J. Sullivan, Edmonton, Alta.
13	Walter E. Glenn and R. Preffer, Nanton, Alta.
14	W. L. Waines, Calgary, Alta.
15	B. K. Bullock, Taber, Alta.
16	Chas. E. Scriber, Colfax, Wash., U.S.A.
17	Josiah Skinner, Taber, Alta.
18	M. H. Davison, Taber, Alta.
19	Roland A. Laird, Lundreck, Alta.
20	W. E. Austin, Okotoks, Alta.
21	Pierre Gervais, Morinville, Alta.
22	A. W. Jackson, Content, Alta.
23	Jas. Franklin Brandford, Herman Valbrath Kabald and Russel McKenzie Macleod, Medicine Hat, Alta.
24	Andrew Laidlaw, Spokane, Wash., U.S.A.
25	H. R. Drummond-Hay, Winnipeg, Man.
26	Robert Sims, Taber, Alta.
27	Daisie E. Sauder, Calgary, Alta.
28	William Yates, Coleman, Alta.
29	Harry Stone, Raymond, Alta.
30	E. H. Mallory, Macoun, Sask.
31	John Gaitz, Estevan, Sask.
32	Duncan C. Drain, Blairmore, Alta.
33	John Robertson, Brantford, Ont.
34	Geo. H. Scott, Blairmore, Alta.
35	Jerry Pevey, Ferry Point, Alta.

3. Thirteen.

TIMBER LICENSES.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. How many timber licenses, including renewals, affecting lands in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, were issued by the Department of the Interior during the departmental year 1896-7?

2. What area in square miles did the renewals and the new licenses cover?

Hon. F. OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. 69.

2. Renewals, 1860·04 square miles ; new licenses, 68·00 square miles.

WITHDRAWAL OF INDIAN LANDS FROM SALE.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. In what townships in the district of Algoma have the undisposed of Indian lands been withdrawn from sale?

2. When was this ordered, and for what purpose?

3. Has any one been appointed to re-examine and revalue the same?

4. If so, who has been so appointed, and upon whose recommendation?

5. Is there any application filed in the department for these lands so withdrawn from sale, or any of them?

Hon. F. OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The townships of Sheguiandah, Assiginack, Tehkummah, Sandfield, Howland, Billings, Campbell, Carnarvon, Gordon, Bidwell, Allan, Dawson, Robinson, Burpee, Barrie Island, Cockburn Island, Mills, Macdonald, Laird, Meredith, Kehoe, Duncan, Archibald, Tupper, Tilley, Vankoughnet, Fenwick, Ley, Herrick, Fisher, Kars and Dennis.

2. 2nd May, 1907, for the purpose of having the lands re-examined and re-valued.

3. Yes.

4. John Fraser, timber inspector and valuator, Gore Bay, recommended by the minister.

5. Yes, a number of applications have been received for individual lots.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

A copy of all correspondence between the Railway Commission and the Department of Railways and Canals, or the Intercolonial Railway, and between the Railway Commission and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Grand Trunk Railway, and between the Railway Commission and the Fredericton Board of Trade, in reference to the alleged discrimination against the City of Fredericton in the matter of freight rates. And also for a copy of all other papers and documents on file with the Railway Commission in relation thereto—Mr. Crocket by Mr. Blain.

A copy of all correspondence, contracts, telegrams, reports, plans and specifications, together with all other information not already brought down, in possession of the government, relating to the construction of piers or docks already constructed or under construction at the following places: Bayfield, Huron County, Ontario; Grand Bend, Huron County, Ontario; St. Joseph, Huron County, Ontario; together with a statement of all moneys expended, and to whom paid, and the date of payment, and the nature of the work done or material used—Mr. Armstrong.

A return showing during the last ten years how much money has been expended by years by this government for printing and lithographing done inside of Canada; and for what reason such work was done out of Canada—Mr. Macdonell.

A copy of all correspondence between the government and any person or corporation with reference to the export to the United States of electrical power or energy produced at Niagara Falls, Ontario, together with the names of all persons or corporations exporting such power or energy, and the amount thereof and the duties thereon, respectively; together with a copy of all leases or licenses granted, and of the regulations of the Governor in Council in that behalf; and for a copy of all other papers and documents in relation to the above pursuant to the Electricity and Fluid Exportation Act, 1907.—Mr. Macdonell.

A copy of all correspondence, telegrams, engineer's reports, &c., in the hands of the government or any member or official thereof, respecting proposed repairs to the wharf at Little Sands, in Prince Edward Island—Mr. Martin (Queens).

A copy of all tenders, contracts, correspondence, plans, specifications, certificates, schedules, and all other papers and documents, including settlement agreements, claims or adjustments thereof, relating to the contract of Messrs. Murray & Cleveland to do the work at the eastern gap at Toronto Harbour, which work was completed in or about the year 1896.—Mr. Macdonell.

A copy of the clauses and conditions, regulations and the specifications contained in the contracts, in virtue of which the National Transcontinental Railway is being built, and that are for the purpose of safeguarding, securing and guaranteeing the suppliers of the contractors to whom the work of construction has been accorded, the payment of their claims against the said contractors; likewise a list of the contracts signed, up to the present, in which appear the said clauses guaranteeing or securing the said suppliers the payment of their said bills or claims.—Mr. Morin.

A copy of all correspondence, reports and papers, respecting the salary, expenses, duties and annual period of employment of W. Maxwell Smith, Dominion fruit inspector in British Columbia; also, full detail of his expenses during the years 1906 and 1907, respectively.—Mr. Sproule by Mr. Blain.

A return showing what special immigration agents the government of Canada has in the British Islands; their respective names, and from what parts of Canada they came; the arrangements made by the government with the said agent or agents as to salary and expenses; the date of their respective appointments, and at what time they left this country to take up their work.—Mr. Uriah Wilson.

A copy of all letters, correspondence, applications, advertisements, reports, memoranda, valuations, estimates, tenders, transfers, or other writings or papers in respect of or in connection with timber berths Nos. 1413, 1414 and 1415.—Mr. Lennox.

OLD AGE PENSIONS.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE (Stormont) moved:

That a select committee of nine be appointed to inquire into and consider a scheme or schemes by state aid or otherwise for making provisions for the aged and deserving poor, with special regard in case of any proposals of which they may approve, to their cost and probable financial results, and that the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses on oath and affirmation.

He said: During the session of 1907 I brought to the attention of this House a resolution in favour of something being done for the relief of the aged and deserving poor. That resolution was debated on the 20th of February, and at the conclusion of the debate the right hon. the Prime Minister made some very sympathetic references to the matter, and the Minister of Labour made the statement that his department would certainly cooperate in the preliminary work required to be done before any legislation was presented to the House. In view of these statements I considered it in the best interests of those for whom I desire this legislation that the motion should be then allowed to drop so that we might have an expression of sentiment throughout the country in regard to the question. I announced then that I reserved to myself the right to move for a special

committee to deal with this question. Unfortunately owing to the pressure of work during last session—although my resolution was on the Order Paper—it was not reached and consequently at the opening of this session I placed the same resolution upon the Order Paper. The question is a large one; it is a very important question; it is a question which has occupied the attention of the statesmen of all countries. Since we discussed this question here in the session of 1907 it has been most thoroughly discussed in the British House of Commons and a Bill dealing with the subject has been submitted to which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has given his support and has stated that a measure shall go through before the expiration of the present parliament. I noticed in the press of two or three days ago that a labour delegation had interviewed the right hon. the Prime Minister and the Minister of Labour and of that interview the press said :

In the matter of old age pensions Sir Wilfrid Laurier said if such a scheme were established they would have all the paupers and criminals of the United States coming to qualify for the 20 years residence. The scheme was certainly ahead of the times for Canada and although Sir Wilfrid Laurier was open to conviction as to its necessity, he would like to see the man who would convince him.

Well, I do not think I am the man who will be able to convince the right hon. the Prime Minister if he is prejudiced against any scheme which will provide some relief for the old and aged poor. But I would like to convince him that it would be a wise policy for this parliament to at least submit this question to a committee of the House so that it may be fully considered. Whether it could be considered this session or not I cannot say. But I do say that if this matter were submitted to a committee of this House for investigation, I believe that committee would be able to get at some result which would be for the benefit of the class of people for whom I am speaking. Hood's famous epitaph could still be written over the graves of many :

Rattle his bones over the stones
He's only a pauper whom nobody owns.

However, the question as it affects the man who, having spent the better part of life in working in the interest of his country, finds himself in need at the age of 65 or 70, in the twilight of his life, is an important question. It is a question which I think is worthy of the attention of this parliament. It is an old question. It is a question which has been before the public, I may say, since 1872, when a pamphlet was issued by Baron Maseres, containing a proposal for establishing life annuities. That was subsequently embodied in a Bill which passed the House of Commons in 1873, but was unfortunately rejected by the House of Lords.

It is in Daniel Defoe's 'Essay on Projects' that we first meet with a suggestion of a pensioning scheme, 'whereby all mankind, be he never so mean, so poor, so unable, shall gain for himself a just claim to a comfortable subsistence whenever age or disablement shall reduce him to a necessity of making use of it.' The 'project' of the brilliant journalist who wrote 'Robinson Crusoe' cannot, however, be taken in any but a strictly limited sense, to be a forerunner of modern old age pension schemes. Defoe probaby held the belief of his time, that the misfortunes of the poor were in no way connected with the organization of society, but were the outcome of their own thriftlessness and vice. However, he saw more clearly than any man of his time the defects of organized society as it then existed, and perhaps he saw, as Thomas Paine did half a century later, the helplessness of the individual in the days of his decrepitude, when all the forces of society were arrayed against him.

A very interesting discussion on this subject took place in the Senate last session. I spoke to my resolution on the 20th of February, 1907. On the 22nd of February, 1907, a question, with regard to old-age pensions, was asked in the Senate by Senator McMullen, and on a later day Sir Richard Cartwright brought down a draft Bill in regard to annuities. In the debate which followed, Sir Richard Cartwright, who made a very able speech, expressed himself as opposed to old age pensions on the ground that they would discourage thrift. Let me refer for a moment to the language he used on that occasion. It was on March 6, 1907, that he laid his draft Bill on the table with the remark : 'I now lay the document on the table for the information of the House' ; and in his speech, he said :

My own impression is that in a great many cases such a scheme would be found to encourage extravagance, and the result would be that the thrifty, industrious workingman would find himself compelled ultimately to bear the burden of his less industrious and possibly dissolute companion.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that those who have given to this matter the greatest consideration do not agree with the statement of Sir Richard Cartwright. I do not wish to take up the time of the House by quoting from reports of royal commissions in England, or from other sources, but I do say that the evidence shows that the statement made by Sir Richard Cartwright is not a correct statement. On the contrary, it shows that old-age pensions in Denmark do not discourage thrift. Take the evidence of the expert who appeared before the commission of 1893 ; take the evidence of the Hon. Mr. Reeves, who appeared before that commission as the agent of New Zealand ; take the report of the commission itself; and all are absolutely against that conten-

tion. If our great banks, our great industrial corporations, our great railway corporations, the Dominion parliament itself, thought pensions would discourage thrift, do you think pensions would be given by these institutions to their aged officials and by the Dominion government to the judges of this country ? I say that the evidence is entirely against the statement of Sir Richard Cartwright that old age pensions would discourage thrift.

Another ground which Sir Richard Cartwright took in the Senate was that the individual should be the sole contributor to his annuity scheme, the government contributing only slightly to the expenses of carrying it out. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the thrift schemes were thoroughly tested before the different committees which dealt with this matter, and those committees decided absolutely against them. Lord Aberdare's commission quoted with approval the opinion expressed by Mr. Chamberlain, 'that he had never seen how you could apply compulsion to any but persons who are in regular employment.' He was referring more particularly to the compulsory scheme in force in Germany. Lord Aberdare's Commission goes on to say :

> And the results were not more favourable in regard to the schemes contemplating voluntary payments.
>
> Those who would avail themselves of the advantages of the scheme would be limited in numbers, and would be mainly confined to the higher strata of the working classes.

I am not saying that I would oppose such a scheme as that proposed by Sir Richard Cartwright. The scheme may be a good one and when the hon. the Finance Minister brings down his Bill I shall be very pleased to discuss it fairly on its merits. There are advantages in the annuity scheme but we have that to-day in Great Britain and other countries, and yet the question of an old age pension which would reach a class that would be unable to contribute towards the annuity scheme is still to the fore in those countries.

We have had different commissions dealing with this matter in England and I shall run over them very hurriedly and briefly. We had the select committee of 1885 and 1887. Those who have taken any interest in that matter will remember that that commission dealt more particularly with an annuity scheme propounded by Canon Blakeley, who had taken a keen interest in this matter. This might be called a thrift scheme by which those who ultimately participated had to contribute. The members of this committee after dealing with the scheme in 1885 and 1887 said that :

> Although the reference was to inquire into the system of national providence insurance against pauperism, the inquiry has practically narrowed itself into one particular scheme, namely that formulated by the Rev. W. L. Blakely, Hon. Canon of Winchester.
>
> The committee were unable to recommend the adoption of the scheme, partly on account of the difficulties connected with the proposals as to sickness and accident and also on account of the general objection to any system of compulsion.

The next important step was in 1893, when a Royal Commission was appointed under the chairmanship of Lord Aberdeen to consider the question generally ; although the commissioners examined a large number of pension schemes they did not recommend the adoption of any. After that four committees were appointed ; the committee on old age pensions, Lord Rothschild chairman, in 1896, was appointed to consider the scheme for encouraging the industrial population, by state aid or otherwise, to make provision for old age. That committee examined over 100 schemes but found fault with them all. In the library are to be found very voluminous works dealing with the work done by all the committees that had this matter under their consideration. The second of the four committees was the select committee on the aged and deserving poor, Mr. Chaplin's committee, which was appointed in 1899 to consider and report upon the best means of improving the condition of the aged and deserving poor and providing for those of them who were helpless and infirm. Differing from its predecessors, this committee discovered a suitable pension scheme and reported definitely in its favour, with the result that the efforts of the two subsequent committees were expended in developing and improving a pension scheme thus discovered. These two last committees were officially designated, the one the departmental committee on aged and deserving poor. Sir E. Hamilton, chairman, appointed in 1900 ; and the other the select committee on the Aged Pensioners Bill, appointed in 1903. These are the committees which have investigated the subject authoritatively and elucidated its leading principles. Their labours have been so thorough that by common consent there is no further need of elaborate inquiry into the principle of the subject, all that remains to do in England is to settle the details. That was the opinion expressed by the last committee, the committee of 1903. The committee reported

> That, all the materials available apart from actual experiment for the purpose enabling parliament to arrive at a decision upon the subject of old age pensions, have been exhausted in the numerous inquiries that have already taken place.

And the president of the local government board, declared in the House of Commons on the 10th of May, 1907, that

> If anything was to be done it should be worked out not by a committee but by the departments of the State.

However, Sir, from all this mass of exhaustive information one pension scheme emerges, namely that which gained the support of Mr. Chaplin's committee of 1899 and was further developed by the two subsequent committees. Of all the pension schemes which have been propounded in the United Kingdom this one of Mr. Chaplin's is now the most authoritative. It has enjoyed sympathetic treatment and development at the hands of three parliamentary committees when no other pension scheme could gain any commendation at all.

We have heard a great deal of the operation of old age pensions in some of our newer British colonies. We have heard of the operation of old age pensions in New Zealand. I do not intend to detain the House by going through the whole history of old age pensions in New Zealand; but I do wish to say that great credit is due to the late Mr. R. G. Seddon, who persisted from 1894 down to 1898, until he secured in placing upon the statute-books of New Zealand, a Bill providing for pensions for the aged. We remember that when that matter first came before a committee of the New Zealand House in 1894 it met with great hostility. In 1896 he introduced a Bill in the House and in 1897 he was able to carry a Bill through the House but the upper House threw out the Bill. He persisted and in 1898 put through the first old age pension Bill for the colony of New Zealand. This Bill was put through as a temporary measure, the understanding being that it was for three years, that the people of New Zealand might have an opportunity of thoroughly considering it and at the end of three years if they were not satisfied with it, then the Bill would be repealed. In 1901 when the three years were up they increased the pension to the pensioners of that colony. In 1905 they made certain amendments to that Bill so as to make it more workable and to-day it is the most popular measure in the colony of New Zealand. There is no public opinion opposed to it. Mr. W. P. Reeves, in giving his evidence before the commission stated that since the Bill had become law there had been one or two elections and there was no public opinion opposed to it. Some will say, oh New Zealand! New Zealand is burdened with a heavy debt. It is true that New Zealand is burdened with a heavy debt, but if you analyse the debt of New Zealand you will find that she owns all her railways, telegraph and telephone lines, and these are all a source of income to her, so that New Zealand to-day is in a very happy and prosperous condition. I read a short time ago in one of the Canadian magazines, a report written by Mr. Russell. I think his article is called the 'Soldiers of the Common Good' and he refers to conditions in New Zealand. He went to New Zealand purposely as he says to make a study of conditions there. In this article he says, referring to New Zealand:

> In their view again, fear is the arch enemy of the human mind, and no life can be complete or sane or kindly when led under fear's shadow.
>
> They believe the fear of penury and old age to be the most devilish of the fear devils originally responsible for the cruel, callous and vicious things men do to gather a fortune, and they resolved to cast it out of New Zealand at least.

Then he goes on to show that Mr. Seddon introduced a Bill himself in 1898 and he says:

> I need hardly say that it provided additional, I suppose I need hardly say that it provided additional suffering for the representatives of formula and conservatism. Elsewhere, as in Germany, something had been done to inaugurate a compulsory self-insurance against old age incapacity, but nothing like this had been attempted anywhere. All duly qualified persons reaching the age of 65 years were declared by the Bill to be entitled to pensions from the state if they were not in receipt of an income of more than $300 a year.

He then goes on to deal with the provisions of the Bill and afterwards said:

> In other words, the dread of penury is lifted from New Zealand, no poorhouses are to be there, no man need fear that in his old age he will be a burden or in want.

In Canada, Sir, there is no large extent of poor people. We are fortunate in that respect, and consequently this wide measure of relief to the few old aged poor whom we have with us, would not be a burden upon this country. Canada is a rich country. Look at the savings of the people, over $600,000,000 in the saving banks, and you will see that Canada can well afford to be well abreast of the times in so far as legislation towards social reform is concerned. But we are told this is paternal legislation. Well, is it any more paternal than is our legislation giving to the industries of this country over $13,000,000 in bonuses and giving to the manufacturers of this country protection? Not only do we see this Dominion parliament enacting paternal legislation but the provinces every day are doing the same thing. Only a short time ago the province of Manitoba took over the Bell Telephone system of that province. I say therefore it is a foolish objection to urge against this matter that it is paternal legislation. The pensioning by a nation of its own aged citizens is a practical question and one which Canada can very well afford to work out successfully. We know that the principle of pension schemes to-day—and I am going to pass over this hurriedly—are the two schemes, namely, the universal scheme and a scheme such as suggested by the Chaplin Committee. After having given this matter some

study, I am not in favour of the universal scheme. I find, on looking into the evidence and reports of the different committees, that no committee has as yet committed itseft to the universal scheme, although, I must say, in Great Britain to-day, it seems the most popular scheme of all. That scheme, as it is understood, requires no specific conditions from pensioners and imposes no limitations with regard to character. Once a man reaches the age of 65, he is entitled to receive his pension. The scheme, as submitted by the Chaplin Committee, seems to me that which is the most practicable of any suggested. It was the last of the four schemes developed by the Hamilton Committee of 1900 and approved by the Select Committee of 1902. It is the favourite child, the Benjamin of the pension family. It has received more kindly treatment than any of the others. Its progress towards maturity has been uniformly smoothe and pleasant. From the weight of these official recommendations, this is by far the most authoritative of all the pension schemes. Let me state briefly the plan of the Chaplin scheme :

Any person, 65 years of age, being a British subject, would be paid a pension of an amount varying from five shillings to seven shillings a week if he could show that:

(a) He had not within the previous twenty years been imprisoned without the option of a fine.

(b) He had not received poor relief other than medical relief unless under circumstances of a wholly exceptional character during twenty years prior to the application for a pension.

(c) He was a resident in a district of the pension authority.

(d) That he had not an income from any source of more than ten shillings a week.

(e) That he had endeavoured to the best of his ability, by his industry or by the exercise of reasonable prudence, to make provision for himself and those immediately dependent upon him.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Is that the scheme likely to be adopted by the British government ?

Mr. PRINGLE. If my hon. friend will have patience, I shall come to that shortly. It seems that the British government have introduced a Bill very much wider in its scope but there is no certainty that the Bill will go through in its present form.

Mr. LOGAN. What is the date of the Chaplin report ?

Mr. PRINGLE. The report of the committee in 1899, but it was referred to a committee in 1903 which also reported. The latest report is that of 1903. The last of the four schemes is that enunciated by the Chaplin Committee in 1899, developed by the Hamilton Committee in 1900, and approved by the Select Committee in 1902.

That was the last committee, so far as I can find which discussed the matter. I might say a word with regard to the problem we are trying to solve. We are all aware that the modern conditions of industry do not favour old age. Work is driven faster and needs more nerve and is changing new methods continually displacing the old. The community may gain but the old men suffer. Hence their claim to special consideration. We all know that the influence of age, as a factor in pauperism, is demonstrated by irrefutable arithmetic. Large sections of the populous, wage earners and small shop keepers in Great Britain, in proportion as they grow old, become poor. The majority of paupers in England are old people. This is the conclusion proved by official figures obtained at different dates between a period of eleven years, from 1892 to 1903. It is shown that 58 per cent of the adult paupers (that is those sixteen years of age and upwards) are old people of 65 years or more. This conclusion is not drawn from the evidence of a single investigation, but is gathered from a series of impartial official investigations made throughout that period. When stated in a slightly different manner the close connection between pauperism and old age is even more clearly shown. In the whole adult population, comprising persons of 16 years of age and up, one out of every 43 persons is a pauper, but among those who are 65 years of age the one out of every five is a pauper and among those who are over 65 years of age, one out of every four. In those over 80 years of age, one out of every three. Among those who are 75 years of age, one in every 74 is a pauper, of those over 80, one out of every 3.

To provide for the effective assistance of these aged poor is a problem which Great Britain is now wrestling with. I am glad to think that the percentage in Canada is very much smaller than the percentage in Great Britain.

Now, I may say a word with regard to the difference between the urban and the rural populations. Before I began to look into this subject I was of the opinion that the larger number of poor people were to be found in our cities and large towns, but that is not the case, as the larger proportion of aged poor is to be found in the rural districts of this country. It appears that the young people leave the farms and rural districts and go to towns and cities, leaving the older people at home. It is an interesting study to ascertain the proportion of old people in the various provinces of the Dominion of Canada. In Ontario the number of persons over 70 years of age to the thousand, including Toronto, is 34, while the number in Toronto is only 23 per thousand. In the province of Quebec, outside of Montreal, the number over 70 is 31 per thousand, while in Montreal it is

only 19. There is a still greater discrepancy to be found in other directions. In British Columbia the number is only 11 per thousand; in the Northwest Territories and the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan it is only 12 per thousand; in Manitoba, 13 per thousand; in New Brunswick, 35 per thousand; in Nova Scotia, 42 and in Prince Edward Island, 43. They seem to have the largest percentage of old people in Prince Edward Island. I suppose the reason of that is the larger movement from the east to the west and from the country to cities, and as my hon. friend here (Mr. Lefurgey) suggests, it is the healthiest part of the Dominion.

Now, the question arises, if this matter should go to a committee, as I hope it will, what persons shall be pensioned. In all the different schemes for old age pensions there seem to run two main ideas which determine the classes of the population admitted to pensions. There is first the desire to confine the pension scheme to the really necessitous among the aged only, and to provide them with nothing more than the very minimum sum required to maintain existence. The idea is to give relief to every real necessitous person; that is the French system formulated by the law of July 14, 1905, and it is the predominating idea in the system of Victoria. There is no question that when it is confined to the real necessitous the percentage to be aided is much smaller. When we return to the statistics of Victoria and compare them with New South Wales we find that there is quite a difference in the percentage of the two colonies. As a result of this different treatment, the proportion of pensioners in the aged population is very much smaller in Victoria than in New South Wales. Let me just give the figures, which I have taken from the Year book of 1905. The estimated number of persons aged 65 and upwards in Victoria is 68,760; in New South Wales 53,900. The number of persons receiving old age pensions in Victoria was 11,055; in New South Wales, 20,737. The proportion of those eligible on the age basis, receiving a pension in Victoria, was 16 per cent and the proportion of those eligible receiving pensions in New South Wales is 38 per cent. But notwithstanding this difference exists, it is going to be continued. Mr. Brent, the Prime Minister of Victoria, speaking at Brighton, Australia, on the 16th of February, 1907, said:

> We intend to increase the payment to old age pensioners from 8 shillings to 10 shillings a week. These men and women (that is the pensioners) helped in the pioneering of this country, and when we now find them old and decrepit I am sure I may ask you to say that they shall have 10 shillings a week.

Now let me give you the frequently quoted words in the preamble to the New Zealand Pension Act of 1898. I do that for the purpose of showing this House that New Zealand took the broad ground that this pension was not a question of charity, but it was a question of right to the citizens of that colony. That preamble reads as follows :

> It is equitable that deserving persons who, during the prime of life, have helped to bear the different burdens of the colony by payment of taxes and to open up its resources by their labour and skill, should receive from the colony a pension in their old age.

I may say that in New Zealand, New South Wales and Denmark the schemes are based upon the principle of rewarding the deserving poor. Now I will hurriedly give you the position in regard to the different schemes in the different countries. Denmark has a non-contributory scheme for the deserving poor. This scheme has proved very popular and seems to have conferred great benefit upon that country. France has a non-contributory scheme for the necessitous aged poor and persons suffering from incurable maladies. Germany has a contributary scheme with compulsory insurance for persons earning £100 and up a year. New Zealand's scheme is non-contributory; so is New South Wales and Victoria, but in Victoria it is insisted that claimants must also be really necessitous. Belgium has a non-contributory scheme. They also have what was suggested by Sir Richard Cartwright, namely, a system of voluntary insurance. Nearly all countries have that voluntary insurance, but they have also the non-contributory scheme which provides for aged poor who are in want.

Now then the age limit is one concerning which there seems to have been a great deal of discussion. The general consensus of opinion seems to be that while France has 70 years, Denmark 65, and so on, 65 is the proper limit. Now I may say a word with regard to what might be a good method in regard to this country and would be a proper scheme. I may say at once that I think a universal scheme has to be ruled out. I see no reason why there should be any pension given to the well-to-do people of this country. It seems to me that a good method would be to grant a pension only to the aged poor who lack the most humble necessaries of life and who are unable to provide themselves with these ; and to leave it to the proper authorities—probably the local authorities with the assistance and guidance of the instructions issued by the head authority—to apply the definition in individual cases. Or, a useful plan might be to graduate the amount of the pension in proportion to the age of the individual receiving the pension. A good pension scheme, giving nothing more than a small amount of money at the age of seventy years, would be infinitely better than no

pension scheme at all and should be regarded, under certain circumstances, as the beginning of a more thorough-going pension scheme which would certainly provide real assistance for many necessitous aged people and that is a great deal. Now, Sir, poverty unquestionably is a burden on the state. We, in the province of Ontario, have grappled with the question and I say that we have grappled with it well, but it is a great expense to the province. We have expended as a province considerably over $2,000,000 in assisting the poor. We have some forty houses of refuge, commonly called poor houses ; the province gives to each one of these, towards construction, some $4,000, and the municipality pays the balance. Then the province contributes a certain amount towards the maintenance of the inmates of these poor homes, the municipalities contributing the balance. It is a burden on the municipalities throughout the province. If there were a universal scheme by which the aged poor would receive a reasonable pension it would reduce to an enormous extent the amount of money that has and is now being expended upon the poor in the different provinces. We go to the province of Quebec ; the extensive charitable organizations there put a burden upon the Catholic and Protestant churches and upon the people of that province, but they have met the burden and they have met it very well. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman has said in England that there are twelve million of the population living on the poverty line. There may be some and I have no doubt that there are people living on the poverty line in the Dominion of Canada probably through no fault of their own We have seen this question thoroughly discussed by the Commonwealth of Australia and as I desire to hurry along I will only refer to the report of the Commission of the Commonwealth of Australia which took this matter into consideration and which recommended a scheme of old age pensions for the Commonwealth to be paid out of the consolidated revenue and to be payable to all sixty-five years of age who came within certain provisions and to some at sixty years of age in cases of permanent incapacity. The commissioners in their report said :

> We do not consider that the grant of pensions will discourage thrift, and suggest that a spirit of independence will be encouraged by the establishment of an assurance system enabling those who work to provide for old age, to do so under assurance of a government guarantee.

I do not intend to take up any more of the time of the House in discussing the laws as they now stand in Denmark, New Zealand, Victoria, New South Wales, Germany, Iceland, Austria, France or other countries which have made provision for the aged and destitute poor. I say, Sir, that in opposition to the argument of Sir Richard Cartwright in the Senate we should provide some scheme of assisting our aged poor. One of the most powerful arguments in favour of the scheme is the argument that was in the mind of Bismark who, when he commenced his advocacy of old age insurance said that he had no doubt that it would retain the people in the country. I always take interviews with a grain of salt and I am not at all sure that this interview is right, but if it is I cannot agree with the argument advanced in it by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If the interview is correct it seems to me very peculiar that he should put forward the idea that it would bring over from the United States of America an undesirable class of citizens if we attempted to put this scheme into operation. On the contrary, it would have a tendency to retain in our country a very desirable class of citizens. A man who had spent some years here would know that, if he continued in the country for twenty-five years, if he was a British subject, if he had done his share towards the development of Canada, at the end of that term, provided he had in all respects behaved himself and had come up to the conditions of the Bill, he would be entitled to some small pittance for his remaining days. In addition to that it would be an incentive to a good class of people to come to this Dominion, because a young man would know when he came to this country that if he spent twenty-five years of his life in assisting in the development of Canada, at the end of that term there would be some compensation for him. The question has been asked : Where can we provide the fund ? I do not see any difficulty in providing the fund. I do not see that the argument of Sir Richard Cartwright that it would be a burden upon the poorer people of this country is a fair argument. The rich have to look after the poor and not the poor after the poor. The revenue can be raised in such a way that it would not bear upon our farmers, artisans or labourers. Why, Sir, we can raise $13,000,000 to give in the form of bounties to the industrial enterprises of this country. I am glad to say that the province of Ontario at least have not been afraid of the ghosts of millionaires. They have put a succession duty upon these large estates and they have derived from that succession duty a large fund which goes towards the maintenance of our hospitals, asylums and other charitable institutions. When we see men standing high in the realm of finance, who can take out of the pockets of the people millions of dollars, they should be called upon, out of their wealth, to contribute something towards the assistance of their fellow men. I have no doubt that a committee, if the matter is referred to a committee, can very well find ways and means by which the revenue necessary for this provision can be maintained.

Now, Sir, what is our population? According to the census of 1901 the number of people in Canada over 65 years of age is 267,000, and the number over 70 years of age is about 160,000, and taking the same proportions as in New Zealand or Victoria, this would only leave a matter of 40,000 or 50,000 at the outside, who in Canada would require assistance after they had attained the age of 70 years. It has been said by some gentlemen who discussed this matter in the Senate: Oh, but these people should have provided for themselves; we will give them a scheme by which if they pay in every week or every month a certain amount, then when they arrive at 65 years of age there will be an annuity for them. But how many of those poor people can afford to pay for that annuity; how many can afford to contribute by the week or by the month for this purpose? The average rate of wages in this country for the labouring man is considered a fair rate—the highest rate is in British Columbia and coming east the rate seems to decrease—but as the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) pointed out last year, all the labouring man in the cities of this country could now do, was to feed and clothe his family. And what about the man who intending to make an investment for his old age, may have put his money in the Sovereign bank or in the Ontario bank, or in one of these great enterprises handled by these great masters of finance which the Royal Commission speaks of in the name of—the gentleman who can't wait—and the Canadian Bank of Commerce, and a number of others who the Royal Commission told us joined hands to form that beautiful syndicate that unloaded on the people of this Dominion securities by which the people of Canada had taken out of their pockets $36,000,000. This poor man may have been prudent; he may have been thrifty, he may have had confidence in these high financiers; he may have been led into the belief that when he invested in Dominion coal at 148 he would have a nice return upon his investment for the rest of his days. He didn't know the inside working, he didn't know that there was a pool, as was shown by the Royal Commission, consisting of bankers, brokers, and other financial men to unload these stocks upon an unsuspecting public at a very high price and afterwards to put them down to the lowest price and get them back whatever they liked to offer, and thus take out of the pockets of the people of this Dominion over $36,000,000. I say it is high time there was some plain talk in regard to this high financing. We have heard of frenzied finance in the United States; but when the Insurance Bill comes down for discussion we will hear of more frenzied finance that has been taking place in the Dominion of Canada. However this is not the time to discuss that phase of the question. I simply mention it to say, that I know men, poor men who have put their money into these enterprises headed by these financiers, thinking they were putting it into a safe investment and who to-day are without a dollar in the world. I know men who have attained the age of 65 years and some older, who are in this unfortunate position. Misfortune may befall any man; he may, with the greatest confidence place his money in an enterprise which may be wiped out while he is wiped out with it, and left to the care of the state. I say that we should give every consideration to this matter and I would like very much if the Prime Minister could see his way to have it sent to a committee which would thoroughly consider it. I am not going to say that I am opposed to an annuity scheme. We have annuity schemes in nearly every country, we have them in Great Britain; but I say that an annuity scheme will not reach the class of men I desire to see reached by a proper provision in an old-age pension Bill.

This matter was debated in the British House of Commons last session and I am glad to say there was not one dissentient voice as to the principle, and that the House was unanimously in favour of old-age pensions. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in his budget speech pledged himself that before the expiration of this parliament a Bill would be put through providing for old-age pensions. I quote his words from the debates of the British House of Commons (Vol. 172, April 18, 1907.)

Mr. Asquith (Chancellor of the Exchequer). There is another thing near the other end of life which makes a quite strong, though hitherto unavailing appeal, both to the interest and conscience of society. I mean the figure of the man or woman who perhaps, spent out with a life of ill-requited labour, find themselves confronted in old age without fault or demerit of their own with the proposition of physical want and the sacrifice of self-respect.

Sir, I never could, nor so far as I know, did any of my colleagues on this bench give any pledge on the subject of what is called old age pensions.

We knew something of the magnitude of the problem, and we thought it wrong to raise expectations without the knowledge that they should be met, nor do I now commit myself or any of my colleagues, to any specific scheme, although both my honourable friend the Prime Minister and myself have laid down certain conditions, to which in our judgment, any practical proposal must conform.

Whatever is done in this matter, as I have said before in this House, must be done by steps and stages, and cannot be achieved by a single step, but this I do say, and I wish to say it with all the emphasis of which I am capable, speaking for the whole of my colleagues who sit upon this bench, that in the sphere of finance we regard this as the most serious and the most urgent of all the demands of social reform, and that it is our hope—I will go further and say—it is our intention before the close of this parliament, if we are allowed to have our way—it is a large

'if'—to lay firm the foundations of this reform.

Later on in the discussion Mr. Askwith stated (p. 1211, Vol. 172):

Then in regard to the future, there are urgent, long-delayed and over-due problems of social reform and we have begun to provide the nucleus of a fund for the relief of necessitous old age.

I shall have next year, however, and earmarked for the purpose one million five hundred thousand pounds to which I have just referred, together with the uncollected arrears of this year's income tax, amounting to seven hundred and fifty thousand pounds, which will make a total of at least 2,250,000 pounds, and an additional sum from the increased estate duties.

I count with confidence on future economies and expenditure, and let me add as time goes on, nowhere with more hope than in the department of expenditure for the relief of the poor, and if I expect economies from my colleagues, I appeal for that with still more emphasis to this House.

You cannot have everything at once, or everything all together, but if you have set your purpose, as I believe you have, and as we have, on this greatest and most urgent of social reforms you must be willing to sacrifice or at any rate postpone other forms of useful and even beneficent expenditure.

Colonel Williams, member for Dorchester West, said (p. 1238, Vol. 172):

He hoped the right honourable gentleman would carry out his schemes of old age pensions. He himself had always been an advocate of old age pensions; he had watched the sentiment in favour of old age pensions gradually growing, and he was glad to think that it was coming near the time when they would be able to accomplish something, even if it would not be all that was expected in some quarters.

Mr. Madison said:

He had always felt that there was a real cause for dealing with the aged poor, who, from various causes, found themselves, not by any means all of them helpless, but in such a condition that public money might well be devoted in securing them in the twilight of their lives.

And so the debate continued, there being almost a unanimous sentiment in favour of the proposal. Sir Charles Dilke said:

They all on the ministerial side of the House rejected the view that in dealing with old age pensions the government should adopt the plan recommended by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer. They thought the arguments adduced against the thrifty and contributory plans were overwhelming, though, on the other hand, that rejection was made on account of the great expense involved by it. He himself would offer the most uncompromising resistance to a scheme of old age pensions based on thrift and contributions, and would fight it to the death, because it would be monstrously unjust against the poorer classes of men and women workers.

Labour members criticised the postponement. They wanted the measure to be brought down that session. Mr. Theodore Taylor, speaking of it said:

He believed in the genuineness of this government's promise to the House of Commons that they would make a real beginning of old age pensions.

I have a copy of the Bill which was brought down to the British House of Commons; I have read the debate that took place on that Bill, and I believe that this session that Bill will become law, and that Great Britain has been struggling with this problem for the last twenty-five years will at last solve it by making provision in that country for the aged poor.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Will the hon. gentleman tell the House what the Bill provides for?

Mr. PRINGLE. The Bill is a very wide one. The summary of it is as follows:

This Bill, with the exception of clauses 1 and 16, has been drafted on the lines of the Old Age Pensions Bills that have been introduced in preceding sessions of parliament by Mr. Channing, now Sir Francis Channing. The object of this Bill is to provide pensions for persons of 65 years of age and upwards. But in order to secure an immediate commencement of an old age pensions system and to provide for the gradual establishment of the organization and control that will have to be called into existence for the proper and efficient carrying out of the provisions of the same, as well as for the raising of the necessary funds required for payment of the pensions to aged persons, it is provided in clause 1 that during the first year of the Bill coming into operation pensions shall be paid to all persons of 75 years and upwards, and in the second year to all persons of 70 years and upwards, and in the third year and thereafter to all persons of 65 years and upwards. The funds required for payment of the old age pensions are to be provided nine-tenths out of the imperial exchequer and one-tenth from local taxation funds. The registrars of births, marriages and deaths, and the superintendent registrars of the various districts, are provided as the local authorities for carrying out the provisions of the Bill under the control and rules and regulations of the Local Government Board.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I think the time has come in Canada when we should at least make a start by having a committee appointed to thoroughly consider this question. There are different ways of assisting the aged poor. It may be that this country is not ready to go as far as New Zealand, New South Wales or Denmark have gone, or even as far as France has gone; but surely this country is ready to consider some proposition for giving assistance to the aged and deserving poor. Mr. Speaker, I move the resolution which stands in my name, seconded by Mr. A. C. Macdonell.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I have very great pleasure in adding a few words to what has been so well and ably said by the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. A. Pringle) who has moved this resolution. It is quite obvious, I think, to every hon. member in this House that little, if anything, can be added to what he has said. I think he is entitled to the thanks of this House and the thanks of the country at large for the immense amount of information which he has collected bearing upon this important matter—information showing the experience of other countries situated very much as Canada is in dealing with this resolution and for focussing that information so as to make it applicable to our present conditions and to the proposal contained in the resolution. For these reasons, it is not necessary for me to add much to what the hon. gentleman has said. I can only say that I heartily support all that he has advanced and would join with him in urging that the select committee which he has asked for be appointed. It does appear to me that in our present good financial condition, when we are spending large sums of money in bringing young and vigorous people to our shore to help to increase our population and develop our industries, we should not overlook those who came of their own volition, without any state aid, or aid of any other kind, and hewed out homes for themselves in the then wilderness of Canada. In matters of social reform, we are very apt, and properly so, to look to the mother country; for experience and example and guidance, and we have precedents for the present resolution both in the old country and in other British colonies. I think that the first move for legislation of this kind took place in Great Britain in 1885. The movement in Germany goes as far back as 1877 or 1878; but the German system is contributory and is compulsory, not based on the same free principle that the proposed English legislation is. In 1885 a select committee of the British House was appointed to deal with the matter on the national provident insurance principle. That was the pioneer committee in Great Britain. That was followed in 1893 by a royal commission, which examined a large number of pension schemes, but did not recommend any special scheme. Following that Royal Commission there were the four select committees which had been spoken of by the hon. member (Mr. Pringle) and without dilating upon the work of these committees, I will say that the result of their labours and of what had been done previously is embodied in the Bill now before the British House of Commons.

I have mentioned these facts to show that as far back as 1885 the matter was first undertaken by the British House of Commons. We are now 23 years past that date, yet nothing has been finally accomplished in Great Britain although it is expected that in the present year an Act will be passed. Thus it will be seen that it is not too early for us to move in this country, at least in the direction of considering this important subject. The question presents itself in a great many aspects and as the mover of the resolution (Mr. Pringle) has said it has been dealt with in a very large number of countries. It has been dealt with in Denmark where they have a pension scheme which is not contributive. The objects of that scheme are the deserving aged poor. In France it is not contributing and the objects are the necessitous, aged poor and persons suffering from incurable maladies. In Germany it is contributing, compulsory insurance. In New Zealand it is non-contributing, the object being the deserving aged poor. In Australia it is the same as in New Zealand. In Belgium it is contributing insurance and the object is the deserving poor and the aged poor who are in want.

In these various countries we have practical schemes in actual operation. What is asked for here is merely the appointing of a committee to consider the matter. We have in this country many bodies distributing charity, and on the whole the aged poor are reasonably well taken care of, but as the country grows everybody's business becomes more and more nobody's business. In the earlier days when every one knew his neighbour, both in the country and the city, the deserving poor were pretty well taken care of on the basis of neighbourly treatment, but now as the country is opening up and the population is increasing so rapidly it is well known that there is a change from this condition and no one can walk the streets of our large cities without seeing the aged and helpless poor drifting along, helpless derelicts, with no hand extended to them with no means wherewith to purchase the necessities of life.

We have in many walks of life pension schemes in operation. In Great Britain they have a large scheme applied to the army and navy while many trades unions apply pension schemes to their members; they have accumulated sufficient money to provide for the aged poor and we actually find them taking care of their old fellow tradesmen. We find various charities taking care of the poor in this country, but it seems to me that with one body administering all this charity in a methodical way more satisfactory results would be secured than by having it doled out through the various channels I have referred to. If this matter goes before a committee and is fairly considered I think it can be shown that all the expense entailed will be the expense of subsidizing the fund; the machinery for the distribution is practically in existence, as we find various charitable organizations throughout the whole Dominion already thoroughly established and the avenues are there through which these pensions could be distri-

buted. It might be found on consideration of the matter that a recommendation should be made that the federal authorities or the central authorities should contribute only a portion of this fund, that part of it should be contributed by the local authorities who are now bearing the entire expense, and part by the central authorities. There is no doubt that a special committee could do great good by going thoroughly into this matter and it may be found that the expense entailed would not be excessive.

It has been thought by some that the effect of a pensioning scheme upon the object himself would be unfavourable, that it would diminish thrift and lessen the incentive to wage earning; that its general effect upon existing labour conditions would be detrimental. There is no argument in that, because those who are foremost in the administration of the labour organizations of to-day, have no apprehension on that score, and I believe would favour the introduction of some such measure as has been outlined.

For these various reasons and for the reasons urged by the mover of this resolution, I certainly think it would be a wise and proper thing to permit the appointment of this committee. The committee will have means of obtaining information that no individual or municipality can have. The committee can take evidence at Ottawa, the central point, from all parts of Canada; all conditions of the people can be heard. To-day various creeds and nationalities or various provinces may make spasmodic efforts to establish such schemes, but there is no systematic treatment of this whole wide subject, and it seems to me that this is the proper place in which to move in this matter. It may be that I believe that information will be gained here by a special committee that will be of great benefit to the country at large. Such a committee would accumulate information and statistics of incalculable value, to philanthropic organizations which are now endeavouring to relieve the existing situation, to labour organizations, to the provincial and municipal authorities, in fact to the whole people of Canada. This question well deserves the earnest consideration of the government; it is agitating the mind of the public, there is upon it a live public opinion and I hope and trust that the government will be able to view this matter in that light, and to regard it as a matter of sufficient importance to at least warrant the appointment of a special committee with the usual facilities and machinery to investigate and to report to this House.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). Mr. Speaker, I desire to congratulate the hon. member from Stormont (Mr. Pringle) on his very able presentation of this matter before the House. The information he has given us makes it unnecessary for other members of the House who may feel strongly upon this subject to go into it in any great detail. His argument has been exhaustive and the quotations he has made have been amply sufficient to support it. I am convinced that there is no question before this country to-day which should appeal more strongly to the sympathy and judgment of members of the House than this scheme of giving a pension to the deserving and aged poor. By this resolution it is simply proposed to appoint a committee of this House to consider this matter. When that committee is appointed it will have an opportunity of examining all schemes proposed and enacted in other countries and it will have the definite advantage of the investigation and discussion which is now in progress in the Imperial parliament.

I presume that all members of this House have read within the last few days the speech of the Hon. Mr. Askquith, who is looked upon as one of the most conservative members of the British cabinet, as a man who has never appealed to the masses in any demagogic way. When we read the argument of that hon. gentleman who, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, states that it is the policy of the British government to establish old age pensions, we must realize that such a policy, supported by him and other conservative statesmen, must be a sound one. I say, therefore, that if this committee be granted—and I trust the government will grant it—we will have an opportunity of carefully considering the arguments which have been advanced in the British House of Commons. One suggestion made is that we should limit the pensions to those who have spent twenty-five years in Canada. Some argue that the age limit should be at sixty, others at sixty-five and others at seventy years. Surely we can admit that a man who has spent twenty-five years in Canada deserves some support from the hands of the state if, unfortunately, in his old age, he is deprived of the wherewithal to purchase food and clothing. My hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) has referred to the wages of the working men in this country. Well, take the case of a man who is paid $1.50 per day. Suppose that man is blessed with a large family. How can he possibly on that wage support his wife and family, educate his children so as to fit them to be good Canadian citizens and put anything away for old age? He gives his life to the state; he hands over to the state a family of good Canadian citizens. Do you not think that the state owes him something if, in the twilight of life, he finds he has not sufficient to provide him with food and clothing? I do not believe that we should accept the argument often used that this will produce paupers and discourage men from thrift. This old age pension will apply to

men who do not need to be encouraged to thrift. Their struggle is to provide food and clothing for their children who are dear to them and educate them so as to enable them to become good citizens, and after having given thirty-five, forty or fifty years of their life to that work, surely they are entitled to some gratuity. I do not intend to prolong this debate. All I wish to do is to urge upon the government to grant this committee so that it may investigate all the schemes that may be put before it. That committee, I trust, will be properly organized and have power to send for persons and papers so that an investigation may be made of a most thorough character and thus have this question gone into in its most minute detail. I therefore desire to add my request to that of the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) and the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) who has spoken so eloquently in favour of the government granting this committee, and I trust that the result will be the placing upon our statutes of legislation which will provide support, in the evening of their lives, to those who have fought the fight of Canadian life, who have hewn down our forests and produced wealth; who have brought into this country large families; who have given their honest strength to Canada, and who in their old age are entitled to some small comfort from the state.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo). It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to take up more than a few minutes of the time of the House, but I am anxious to record my vote in favour of the resolution brought in by the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle). Last year when a similar resolution was presented to the House; I was unfortunately not able to be present during its discussion, or I would have spoken in favour of it. I have followed for many years the discussion and investigation in the British parliament on this question and had something to do with agitating in favour of a Royal Commission formed in 1885, 1886 and 1887 to deal with this matter. Later on I was interested in influencing by petitions in that country the formation of select committees in the British House of Commons to consider this question. I have under my hand at present complete reports of all these select committees and Royal commissions. It is hardly necessary for me to say that the principle of old age pensions is a most complicated one, but one which must be dealt with. The hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) rejected entirely the scheme of universal pensions. Well, I do not propose to be controversial, but simply desire to support the resolution, and in doing so it is quite unnecessary that we should discuss the various schemes. But in my opinion, there is no system of old agen pension, which will be supported by the masses, other than the universal system. The difficulty, of any system which stipulates special conditions of poverty and distress, as a qualification for, which discriminates against certain people, a pension, will ever be accepted by the people generally. To discriminate against any one who may have been just as enterprising, sober and industrious as another, but who owing to special circumstances, is placed beyond the pale of the statute, is bound to create the greatest dissatisfaction, and the supervision necessitated by any partial system entails tremendous cost in the carrying out of any such scheme. My hon. friend has described the different schemes existing in different countries. In Denmark they have a non-contributory system which applies only to the deserving poor, but it has been found that the cost of supervision of that system is enormous. It creates any amount of friction in deciding who the persons are who shall come within the range of the statute. In France where they have a non-contributory system, the same trouble exists and in France the system takes in people suffering from incurable diseases. In Germany they have a compulsory insurance scheme, but the objection to that is the principle of compulsion, and no principle, especially in British countries, would be acceptable which would involve compulsion. In New Zealand, the non-contributory system which they have for the deserving poor meets with the same objections of the tremendous cost of supervision and the difficulty of discriminating between the deserving and non-deserving poor.

Of all the systems, the only conclusion I can come to is there can be none, which will give absolute satisfaction which does not include every one. What is the experience in England at present ?

Mr. FOSTER. Do you advocate a contributory or non-contributory system?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. A non-contributory system ; I do not at all agree with a contributory system.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Does that include women ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Of course, she has to live the same as a man, and has to meet the disabilities of life the same as a man.

Mr. MACDONELL. Does that include the wealthy ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. That would include all classes if they were not specially provided by a certain income designed to exclude the wealthy. If my hon. friend has followed the discussions in England he will have observed that the Chaplin sys-

tem provides for deserving poor, and that a man shall not benefit who receives more than 10s. a week. Any man acquainted with labour conditions in England knows that 75 per cent of the day wage earners receive the sum of 10s. a week, and by such a system would be entirely excluded. The principle of determining upon 10s. a week by the Chaplin scheme is to bring the claims of the poor man down to a minimum. I think the present British government will bring such a scheme into existence. But at the present time the labour organization and the co-operative societies are not supporting the Chaplin system, but they are supporting a universal scheme. Let me remind my hon. friend that General Booth's scheme was a universal scheme, because he wished that the fund should be raised by a system of national taxation bearing upon the rich as well as upon the poor, and he sought to oppose the inclusion of rich men in its benefits. In my opinion the only logical scheme that can be operated successfully, and with the least possible expense in the supervision, is a universal system.

I intend to support the resolution of my hon. friend. I think that no system can be brought into existence that will be successful which has not been previously thoroughly investigated, therefore I think his motion for a committee should be supported. I would like to ask the government to appoint a royal commission to look into the whole question and to determine what system is best adapted to this country. Every country has its own system adapted to its own peculiar conditions. I would like this government to take a strong hold of this question and appoint a royal commission as they did in England 25 years ago, and consider it in connection with industrial conditions in this country. I think the discussion in the Senate last session on the Annuity Bill was not very sensible, in some respects. I never could see what an annuity system has to do with an old age pension scheme. There is nothing in common between the two things. An annuity system is a provision whereby the industrious and fortunate workingman can invest a small sum with the government and feel absolutely sure that he will get it back again with good interest. In reading the speeches of some hon. gentlemen in the Senate I was surprised at some of the language used. For instance, I notice that Senator McMullen used these words :

It is too early in the day in Canada to introduce an old age pension Bill. Men who are industrious, and apply themselves honestly to the performance of their duty, in whatever sphere they labour, can earn a reasonable sum to support them and lay up something for a rainy day.

Again :

We should rather encourage people to provide for themselves. If they fail to make provision for their old age and cannot look to their friends for help, in nine cases out of every ten counties in the country there are poorhouses.

Again :

If they have made good use of their opportunities, not one out of every hundred of them would find any necessity to go to the poorhouse.

Now in regard to that statement, I think in Canada our industrial classes are in just as good a position as in any country in the world but none of them are what they should be ; at the same time, even taking Canada at its best, I want to say that seventy-five per cent of the wage earners of Canada, those with families to support and who wish to live in a comfortable manner and enjoy the modern advantages, are not able, up to the age of 65, to earn sufficient to keep them the rest of their lives. Under the present industrial conditions it is impossible, I say, for the man who desires to live as he ought to live, at the age of 65 to have saved enough to enable him to live the remainder of his days. I have investigated this question sufficiently to know whereof I speak, and I think I can prove this statement if I were given an opportunity. Now that being the case, it is an indisputable argument in favour of pensions to these individuals. That is the position I take on this matter. Let me say this also, that prosperity in Canada to-day does not mean as much to the individual workers as some people would imagine. What is more essential to them than any thing else in our present industrial conditions, is steady employment. There is an enormous demand for manufactured articles, such as has not existed for many years. But I say that the actual value of the wages earned to-day by the average worker is not greater than it was fifteen or twenty years ago. If the manufacturers have had to raise the wages of their workingmen we must remember that they have recouped themselves by taking it out of the consumers.

The workingman gets more money put into has hands but his money is not of the same value. He does not live on the cash. He lives on what the money gets and the real value of his wage is the purchasing power that is put into his hands at the end of the month. I contend that the real financial condition of the labourer in Canada to-day, when it is presented from the financial standpoint, from the standpoint of not being able to lay away at the end of the month in anticipation of what he may need when he gets to be 60 or 65 years of age, is not sufficient to support him in old age. I will support the resolution of my hon. friend and I see no reason why the government should not accept the proposition to make an inquiry because this is a question which is bound to be forced on this parliament sooner or later. When every country in

the world and when the British parliament, after ten years of investigation into this matter, have decided upon a scheme of old age pensions we may make up our mind that every government will be compelled, by public opinion, to consider this question and that it will have to make some kind of provision. This committee will be able to collect evidence and data that will help the House or the government to come to a conclusion as to the applicability of the system to the conditions of this country. I have very much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the resolution.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Pringle) has shown commendable diligence and consistency in bringing this question to the attention of the House—undoubtedly one of the most important questions which now agitate public opinion in all civilized countries. If the hon. gentleman will permit me to say so, if he will accept it from me, I may say that I offer him my very hearty congratulations upon the manner in which he has brought this subject to the attention of the House. His speech has been clear, concise, full of information and a better presentment could not have been offered to the House. My hon. friend stated in his opening remarks that, last year, when he brought the same subject before us, I spoke sympathetically upon it. He quoted at the same time an interview which had been attributed to myself. I have not seen or heard anything of the statement which I am supposed to have made to a delegation which waited upon me a few days ago from the Trades and Labour Congress, and which, as quoted by the hon. gentleman was the very reverse of sympathetic. He stated that he took every interview with a grain of salt. I think he might go a little further than a grain on this occasion and take it with a full salt cellar. What I said may be gathered from the spirit of the remarks that I made last year. I did not hesitate to say to the representatives of the Trades and Labour Congress that, as expressing the views of the government on this question, I saw in it very serious difficulties, but, that, in so far as I was concerned, I was disposed, though not convinced, to approach the subject with an absolutely open mind. That is the spirit in which the government, which I now represent, approaches this question. I cannot say that we are convinced but I certainly can say that we are disposed to approach this subject with a very open mind. Undoubtedly there exists at the present time in all civilized countries a growing conviction that those who have reached old age without having been able to accumulate anything for themselves should receive some compensation which would carry them on to the end of their lives for the work and labour which they have given in their mature years to the community. All nations, all communities, I think, recognize the principle of providing for those who have not been able to provide for themselves. This principle is acted upon in different communities and in different manners but almost universally in the same manner in this respect that such help is given in a niggardly manner and in a manner which carries with it some amount of contumely. The object of my hon. friend, and those who favour his proposal, is that this relief should be given to those who have not been able to provide for themselves and that it should be given not as a charity, not in a way that would carry contumely with it, but in a manner which would preserve the self-respect and which would simply be given as a compensation and not as an alm. My hon. friend, however, will agree with me that this subject is one which is not free from difficulties. The very discussion which we had to-day shows that there is a very large scope for difference of opinion. My hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) who, upon this subject, I think, always speaks with authority, says that he is in favour of a project which I do not think would carry with it unanimous favour. He thinks that any scheme of this kind should be universal, that the law should provide for a pension not only for those who have not been able to provide for themselves but also that every man, whether he should be a millionaire or not, might come to the government and ask for a pension, which should be provided for everybody. For my part I would not be prepared to favour such a scheme as that. My own personal opinion would be rather that the law should come to the rescue of those who have not been able, through different circumstances, quite independently of their own efforts to accumulate enough for their old age. It seems to me at all events that this is a scheme which would carry more weight than the other, but I am also aware that this opinion is not universal, that there are those, who, like my hon. friend from Nanaimo, think that the law should make no exception whatever but that it should provide that when a man has reached the age of 65, without at all looking at his own condition, he may come and ask for the bounty of the state. There is another difficulty, and one that has always impressed me very seriously, and it is this: Should there be a contribution to this fund from the intended participants? As I understood the remarks of my hon. friend from Cornwall and Stormont his opinion is that there should be no contribution, that when a man had reached a certain age, if he had not been able to accumulate anything, he should be entitled to a pension even though he had not contributed anything to the fund. That

is a way of looking at it which certainly has much to commend it, but it is a view which cannot be free from the objection that it might impair thrift, that it might be an incentive to slovenliness and want of diligence, and, for my part, I say frankly I think I have heard no serious answer to this objection except this one which was repeated to the House a minute ago by my hon. friend from Nanaimo and that is, that with the present scale of wages it will not be possible for any man, obliged to earn his living—a workingman, whether in factories, on public works, or otherwise—to lay by anything which would enable him to contribute to this fund. In other words, the statement is made now by my hon. friend from Nanaimo that a labourer who receives $1.50 a day is not able to provide for the comforts of life, to live in respectability and, at the same time, lay by such a sum as will enable him to contribute to this fund. These considerations show that there is reason for inquiry and for very diligent inquiry and without committing ourselves to the scheme, the government are disposed to accept the motion of my hon. friend and provide for the appointment of a committee whose business and duty it would be to look into this case and all such considerations. If such a committee is appointed it should be the very best the House could afford, and even though the session should be protracted it will tax the energy of that committee to the utmost to accumulate all the information which must be accumulated before any satisfactory conclusion can be reached. We have already, what I may say a wealth of information, but nevertheless it has taken the British parliament very many years before it was able to come to a conclusion. The committee will also have the benefit of the discussion which will take place in the Imperial House of Commons upon the Bill of the Chancellor of the Exchequer providing for a scheme similar to that which my hon. friend (Mr. Pringle) has in contemplation. I have only to add that the government will agree to the motion.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am glad my hon. friend (Mr. Pringle) has been able to prevail on the government to grant the committee which he asked for last year, and which with so much persistence and skill he has pressed on the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He did not move for it last year so far as I remember.

Mr. FOSTER. He had his motion on the Order Paper, and laid the foundation for the result which we now have. There is no doubt that the scheme which has been propounded by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pringle) appeals to our sympathy. The deserving poor, in fact the poor whether they are deserving or not, command our sympathy, and I do not think this country or any other progressive country has ever been wanting in the application of that accordant help which proceeds from sympathy. The private charities of this and every other Christian country have been generously poured forth for the poor, and municipal and other benefactions, insurance societies and benefit societies are proof of the practical desire and practical effort to give effect to that great wide sympathetic feeling which all Christians possess. The question of its being made a purpose of the state to aid the poor is of later development. In different countries the state has been asked to take care of its constituents, thus reversing the primal idea that the people for their own personal and corporate advantage organized originally to protect the state. I quite agree with the idea that there are difficulties in the way of the state raising the money, and difficulties in the way of wisely distributing it when the money has been raised. I quite sympathize with the view of the member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) —and I think he is perfectly right on the broad logical ground—that you meet a very difficult question when you come to decide who should be the receipents of the contributions raised by the state. The Prime Minister spoke of it as the 'bounty' of the state, but that may be a little objectionable because when you come to look upon it in that light it is no longer the right of the individual to demand this ; it is simply an application by the state of the charitable aid hitherto carried on by individuals or benevolent societies. I think it is logically sound to-day, that every unit of the state should contribute according to his ability, and that if there is to be a state fund for the poor every unit of the population needing aid should have the right to participate. It is a difficult problem financially to solve, as to how such a large amount of money shall be raised, and I think it is that idea which has chiefly tended towards the different schemes for minimizing as far as possible the number of recipients and limiting the age, in order that the financial burden on the contributors may be lightened. There is no doubt that the fact of such a fund being in prospect will leave certain effects upon those who are in anticipation of being benefited thereby. The common argument is that it would have a tendency to destroy the spirit of saving and thrift in the people, just as the younger son of a rich father feels that it is not necessary for him to labour as there will be sufficient coming to him to keep him out of want. It is argued that if there be a fund contributed by the state for persons beyond a certain age, the tendency will be on the part of some to look forward to that fund and to spend more or to earn less or to save less. I think that effect would certainly follow amongst a

certain number of peculiarly constituted minds, and that will have to be provided against, but I do not believe that such a result would be very large or very general. I think the spirit of work and of earning, and of spending and of thrift, is so active in the human mind that it will remove the defects which objectors along this line urge. I do not believe it will be found in practice that such an argument would prove of very much weight.

Now as to the particular age limit at which the poor shall be helped, that must apparently be absolutely arbitrary. At the age of 65 one man may be a sturdy mechanic able to provide for himself and those depending on him, while another at the age of 55 may be absolutely incapable of doing so, and may be actually more deserving of a share from the state fund than the other one. If you are going to make a discriminative body and to give discriminative contributions out of a fund, it is perfectly right that circumstances should be taken into account perhaps more than the mere matter of age. There are various other considerations. If it is to be an aid to the deserving then it would follow almost that no age limit should be provided, but that if those who deserve the aid of the state and who have contributed by their labour towards their own support and that of their families, (which is really for the benefit of the state) should by circumstances over which they are powerless be unable to buy their food and clothing, they would get aid from the state. The claim of such a man would be just as good and just as valid as it would be if he had been able up to seventy years of age to take care of himself and those who depend upon him, and then came to be in want. Thus you find, when you put the matter on a discriminating basis, and ask through what channels the assistance should pass and to what classes it should be distributed, that you have no more right to fix an age limit than to fix any other arbitrary limit, but that you ought to put the aid on the broad ground of whether it is deserved and necessary or not.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have only to add one or two practical suggestions which have occurred to me. I have watched with great interest the development of this question in other countries, especially in the older countries of Europe and in the Australian colonies and New Zealand ; but I had not come to the conclusion that in a country like Canada there was as yet a necessity for the introduction of what we might call old age pensions. It would therefore be necessary that the committee should do its work thoroughly; and the question which troubles me now is whether a committee appointed when the session is three months advanced could do its work thoroughly unless in some way power was given it to continue the work through another session. Members of the committee, of course, will have the other duties of the session to attend to, other committees and other legislative work, and such an inquiry as this requires a great deal of attention, a great deal of care and a considerable time.

Personally—and probably it is the same with other members of the House—I am anxious not so much to have a report as to systems in vogue in other countries, as that is available in the form of literature either in the exhaustive reports of commissions and committees or the reports of the actual workings of these systems; I would prefer to see only a summary of what is a matter of history. The point where my information is lacking is as to the conditions in Canada itself. The amount of real poverty which is being relieved through individual effort and provincial and municipal legislative machinery of all kinds ; the poverty which presses to such an extent as to make it necessary for us to enact legislation in the Dominion parliament with regard to old age pensions. There is already large, wide and effective machinery at work in our country for the relief of poverty. The insurance societies are in a great measure societies to provide against the disabilties of old age, particularly with reference to families dependent on those who have to make their living from day to day by their labour. There is a great number of benevolent societies formed more particularly with reference to the very same call and aleviating the same kind of suffering. These are widespread and very effective. Then there are the greater charities of the provincial legislatures and the municipalities, and these also are doing large work. Added to these are the still larger, in some respect, charities of the individual, distributed everywhere in this country, which contribute a very substantial amount each year. Whether such a scheme could be evolved which would collect, to as great an extent as possible, the energies which are now developed in all these different ways and make a system which, aided by the Dominion government and contributed to, in effort as well as in funds, by the provincial and municipal authorities, would systematize the present system of charities and benefits and put the whole on a basis which would be far more effective and yet removed from the line of charity, which is distasteful to many, and the exercise of which, even in its best form, has an influence which is not at all times and in all cases productive of the best for its recipients, can only be determined after the fullest inquiry, and therefore it is with reference to the condi-

tions in Canada and the means at present in vogue for their relief that I would like to see information gathered. But it is in this line, when the legislator comes to look for it, that he finds the least information gathered. We have no system of collecting this information and putting it in a position where we may have it for use when a question like this comes up, so that the appointment of a committee, I hope, will result in attention being given very particularly to gathering information along that line. To my mind, that would be the most effective means of reaching a wise conclusion. I congratulate my hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) on the reception his motion has received. I myself would like to have seen a thorough discussion of it. Several gentlemen have stated that this is the most important question which has ever come before parliament; but if its importance be attested by the interest which is shown in it, I am afraid we shall have to pass a different verdict. I would like to have seen a thorough discussion of this matter, so that conflicting views, if there be any, might be offered to the attention of the House, and in the clash of views and the contribution of men thinking in different ways, we might arrive at more well-founded conclusions than we can from a discussion which, although well carried on by the mover and seconder, has not been participated in generally by the House. My sympathies are always with those who are in need and who are worthy and deserving. I am not fully convinced that in Canada we need at present undertake a system of old age pensions. But I am looking for information, and would be sorry indeed if the appointment and the work of this committee will not give us that much needed information, especially with reference to our own country and its conditions in the way of charities, which we need before we come to legislate on so important a question.

Mr. ALEXANDER JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I quite well realize that it may not be very desirable to prolong this discussion to much greater length, nor perhaps is it necessary that the discussion at this stage should be carried on more fully, although I appreciate that a fuller discussion might be of great interest to the House and the country. I rise merely to say that, so far as I am concerned, I attach very much importance indeed to the subject brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle), and to the remarks of those who have spoken in approval of his resolution. There are many things that might be considered in this connection. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Foster) has suggested that while there is much information which a committee of this House could gather on this question, there is probably a good deal which a committee of this House cannot collect. I realize that it may be difficult for a committee to gather all the information that would be desirable before a system of state pensions can be undertaken. It is for that reason that, while I approve heartily of the proposition to appoint a committee of the House, I would endorse the larger scheme mooted by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) when he suggested that this question might well be the subject for a Royal Commission to investigate. In order to collect all the information necessary before undertaking this new departure, it will be requisite to ascertain the views of the people in the various centres of this country. By coming in contact with the people themselves who are thinking along these lines to-day to a greater extent probably than ever before, there will be much to be learned, and this cannot be done by a committee of this House. However, very much useful information can be gathered by it which will help members and the electors generally to reach a sound conclusion, and I do hope that when the committee is appointed—as I am satisfied it will be, after the announcement of the First Minister—it will get to work earnestly and seriously, and that in the end some scheme may be devised which will prove satisfactory to the people. I am content to simply endorse what has been said regarding the desirability of Canada doing as much as lies in her power to provide for worthy people who, in their old age, are not as well off as some of their more fortunate brethren. Few subjects can better engage our attention than that which has been brought up this evening by the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle).

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P.E.I.). The subject before the House is of far-reaching importance, but not one regarding which this House, or the country, should commit itself too hastily. Great thought and care are required in its consideration, and I am in entire accord with the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) when he says that every information possible should be gathered by the committee, and that to this end power should be given that committee to acquire all the information necessary before a subject of this importance can be solved. The mover of this resolution is to be congratulated on the material he has brought before the House and the manner in which he has delivered his argument in favour of his resolution. He has pointed out the different schemes existing in other countries and has presented the whole case in a very concise and clear form. Whether this country is ripe for a system of old age pensions or annuities is a matter for very serious consideration. A great many young men are coming into this country at the present time who, with those who are native born, it seems to me,

present a situation in which there is no very urgent need for a scheme of this kind to be put forward. Possibly there are other considerations, of course, that might lead us to take another view. Other countries have adopted systems of old age pensions or annuities, for instance, New Zealand, New South Wales and Victoria, where those who are ultimately to benefit by pensions contribute nothing of themselves. In Germany on the other hand pensioners and government make joint contributions, the contributions being fixed on the side of the pensioners, the maximum that they receive ultimately being also fixed on the part of the government. In Germany, under the contributory system, there are some 16,000,000 persons insured, and when each one of them arrives at the age of 70 years he is provided for during the rest of his life. The burden of the state is about £2 10s. per annum for each person who reaches the age of 70 years, or become incapacitated for work. England also has a system of annuities; she has an outstanding value of some £14,000,000 in annuities at the present time. Canada has insurance companies which provide annuities; the banks and railways have their pension schemes, and the civil service also has its pension scheme. In England to-day a Bill is now ready for presentation along the line of the contributory system for the benefit of the aged and the incapacitated. So you can see that the principle is not a new one. There are a great many volumes in the library upon this question. It seems to me highly desirable, as the mover has pointed out, that each country should have regard to its own peculiar conditions in the working out of a scheme that will suit them. The trend of public opinion at present is in favour of the government taking hold of public utilities, but on the other hand we also observe a trend of public opinion in favour of the government exercising a paternal care over aged persons and in the infirm, at least in many countries. No doubt 50 or 100 years ago a scheme of this kind would almost have been revolutionary, and if we go back only a few years ago, it would have been thought of as a piece of rank socialism. But the trend of public opinion is changing from year to year, and we find that in one form or another the idea of pensioning aged persons is occupying a good deal of attention at the present time. It seems to me that what we want to aim at is to reach the poorer classes and the deserving aged. In England and in the crowded European centres, these words that have been quoted from Hood:

> Rattle his bones over the stones,
> He's only a pauper whom nobody owns.

might very well be written over the graves of a great number, but I do not think it can be said of many in this country. We have not here at present, nor are we likely to have for a great many years to come, that hand to hand struggle for existence that we find in a great many cities like London, Paris and other cities of the continent. About four out of every five paupers in England are receiving assistance either on account of age or infirmity. I do not think we have a state of affairs anything like that in North America.

Now it has been said that schemes of this kind do not tend to thrift on the part of the people who benefit by annuities or from old age pensions when they reach the age limit. But it seems to me that they should have the very opposite effect, that they are likely to encourage thrift. I think that has been the effect of insurance companies. From my own experience I have observed that when a man takes out an insurance policy, if he has only a moderate salary, it makes him frugal and thrifty, because he is desirous of providing for the payment of his premium that he may get the benefit of the insurance when the time of need arrives. It seems to me, therefore, without committing myself to any definite scheme, that we require to get information. I think a contributory system would be the most reasonable and would conduce most to the interest of the public and of the pensioners themselves. One great advantage I think is that it would enable the wage earners by easy payments to lay up for a rainy day and make provision for their old age. A safe scheme which is administered by the government or by a commission would inspire confidence, and those who entered into it would feel that when they reached old age they were not going to be swindled out of their savings. We can also see how this system would be beneficial to the state, in as much as it would relieve the public funds to a considerable extent of the present charge for poorhouses, and in England at the present time vast sums of money are spent in workhouses and other charities, and a pension scheme would tend to draw away from the workhouses and other charities a great number of men who are at present dependent upon them for their existence. I would just call attention to the fact that in the report of the Royal Commission of Australia in 1907 they make this statement with regard to the question of thrift:

> The question as to whether thrift is encouraged by old age pensions has been inquired into by your commission, and they have arrived at the conclusion that the fact of a necessitous person being entitled to a pension of 10s. a week at the age of 65 will not have any appreciable influence on the saving habit at an earlier age.

In Denmark a commission reported in 1903:

I found in Denmark that the people who had most right to speak with authority on the subject maintain that the law has not acted in a way detrimental to thrift. The inspector general of the sick relief funds holds that they are more thrifty—'never so eager to insure against sickness as now.'

The question is whether we should of necessity anticipate the conditions that we find prevalent in the older countries of Europe. Perhaps it may be wise to do so but it seems to me that we are far from the necessity of plunging into a scheme of this kind at least without most thorough investigation. It seems to me that we have largely in our own control the destinies of the people of this country, and by a wise and gracious policy we may hope to postpone the evil day that we hear about in other countries, particularly in the countries of Europe, for many years to come. I therefore see no particular breakers ahead in regard to Canada. On the continent and in England we find many people in a state of poverty, people who are reduced by accident, people who are beyond middle age, who have made financial failures and who are too old to commence again. Those, of course, have to be provided for in the large centres and we have to provide for them here too, but in an active country like Canada we do not have the same proportion or anything like it that will be found in the older and more settled countries. Possibly now it may be time when our nation is young and vigorous to move in this matter and to make it pleasant at middle age to look forward to old age with serenity. It is something to be prepared for the future, it is something to achieve wisely and this can only be done by a thorough investigation into the subject. Perhaps we may find after the committee has performed its labours that an expenditure of public money is necessary and justifiable. It would be pleasant indeed to be able to say to our aged poor, as one writer has expressed it:

Thy thoughts and feelings shall not die,
Nor leave thee when gray hairs are nigh
A melancholy slave;
But an old age serene and bright,
As lovely as a Lapland night,
Shall lead thee to thy grave.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, I am very heartily in sympathy with the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Pringle) in bringing this matter before the House with the view of having a very careful inquiry. This is one of the great questions of the modern world, and even those who may not be willing to go as far at once as some in this House have indicated their desire to go will agree in the conclusion that it is a proper subject for careful consideration and inquiry. I suppose from the nature of my office I am obliged to be somewhat mercenary and to give some thought to the question of the dollar. That is natural to a minister of finance. Already the question has proved a very serious one to Mr. Asquith, the very able Chancellor of the Exchequer, who, while accepting the principle that at some time the question must be dealt with, has confessed that the great difficulty is in the inquiry where the money is to come from. We want to avoid opposing the movement at all, but merely that we may look carefully at it I venture to take a glimpse for a moment at a question of the utmost importance which has not received any attention at all in the discussion up to the present moment. In a very hurried computation from the census returns—which we may take as being substantially correct—I find that according to the last decennial census of 1901, we have in Canada about 270,000 people of the age of 65 and upwards. I take 65 as the age at which people who are advising the adoption of this scheme suggest that it should begin. Some men, as was well stated by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), are vigorous at 60 or 65 while others are feeble and would have need of any scheme which might be devised, but I take 65 for the purpose of the present consideration as a fair age to adopt. Reference has been made to the very modest sums which it is proposed to grant from time to time by way of pensions in European countries. I think it would be admitted at once that what might be a decent means—shall I say of livelihood ?—no, a decent means of existence in Europe would probably not be a decent means of existence under the conditions in which we live in Canada, where the standard of living for most of the people, and for the labouring classes certainly, is somewhat higher, and where many commodities are somewhat more expensive than in European countries. I think it would not be too much to say that if we were to adopt a pension system in Canada about $3 a week or $150 a year is about as low a figure as we could reasonably give. I think that anything less than that would hardly give a respectable man in Canada a means of decent existence in the evening of life. If I am correct in my estimate that there are 270,000 people above the age of 65 in Canada, and if it is right to admit at a rough calculation that about $150 per year is as low a pension as one would care to offer if we want to make a man comfortable at all in his declining years, we find that to apply that system generally to all persons above the age of 65 years would cost us, on the basis of the population of the last census, $40,000,000 per annum. As our total taxation only a few years ago was about $40,000,000 and as it is, roughly speaking, about sixty-five or sixty-eight millions, I suppose at the present time, it will be seen that the proposition from the financial point of view is a very grave and serious one. Of course it may

be said, and the argument of some hon. gentlemen is on that line, that all of these would not need it and that all of these would not receive it. Without coming to a conclusion upon the point, which is a very important one, I am inclined to think that there is much force in the contention of my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) that if the pension system is a good one it should be universal. The moment you separate people and say that assistance has to be given to one man because he is poor and destitute and must not be given to another man because he is not poor and destitute, that moment you put upon it the stamp of charity which is so repulsive and objectionable to a great many people. If it is a matter of right then it belongs to every person who has reached this age in Canada. The moment you make a distinction and say that one man shall receive it because he is poor and that another shall not you are creating a discrimination which is likely to stamp the movement with a form of charity that its advocates desire to avoid. I only make these observations in taking a passing glimpse at the financial question. Under the conditions that you have here, if the age limit starts at 70 instead of 65 and if you reduce the amount from $150 down to perhaps $100, or make any such change as you will, still you will find that you are adding an enormous charge to the obligations of the country. I do not say that the great purpose that the advocates of the movement have in view would not justify it, but I think that, even with the passing glimpse, that is all we are taking at the present time, it is well to realize that the carrying out of this movement would involve an enormous addition to the taxation of the country, and all who consider it will have to keep that in mind and take the position that so good a purpose would justify even so large an increase in taxation.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY — BRANCH LINES—EXTENSION TO GREAT LAKES.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland) moved :

Resolved, that in the opinion of this House it is desirable in furtherance of the transportation interests of this Dominion that the sphere of influence of the Intercolonial Railway, as a government-operated railway, should be widened and extended, by securing by lease or otherwise, such of the branch lines of railway now connecting with the Intercolonial, as will serve as direct and profitable feeders to the traffic of said railway, and by providing for the extension of the government operation of said railway to industrial centres of western Canada, and to a point or points on the great lakes of Canada, either by the construction of an extension to the same to such points, or by securing such running rights over existing lines thereto, as will enable the Intercolonial Railway to extend its transportation facilities westwardly, with a view of stimulating and promoting internal and interprovincial traffic, and facilitating the import and export trade of the Dominion, through Canadian channels.

He said : I am sure that no apology is necessary on my part when I invite the consideration of the members of this House to a question of such great importance to the people of this country as that which is involved in the motion which I have the honour to move. The Intercolonial Railway has been the subject of discussion in this country from a date twenty-five years preceding confederation down to the present moment. It has been discussed in parliament, perhaps, every session in the interim and it has been frequently and constantly commented upon by the press and people of Canada. A discussion of my motion need not necessarily take us into that disputed arena wherein you have on the one side those who advocate the operation and control of public utilities by government and on the other side those who uphold the control of those utilities by private corporations. I look upon that question as one that cannot be settled from any theorical standpoint ; I think it can only be determined by realizing that conditions must always govern. We have in this country illustrations of government ownership, and also illustrations of private ownership and operation. I realize that when the Intercolonial Railway was first initiated, it would have been impossible to undertake such a great work at that time by any other means than that of government construction and government operation. I realize also that the Canadian Pacific Railway has proved of immense advantage to the people of this country, and that it was a wise thing on the part of parliament and government to entrust to the hands of a private company the carrying out of that great scheme. The early history of the isolated provinces is such that it would have been impossible for them to have undertaken public works and to have built railways by any other means than those which were at the time adopted. It is true that in the wealthier and more populous provinces of Ontario and Quebec they were able to entrust the construction of public works and railways to private corporations, but they did that under conditions which were peculiar to themselves and not shared in by the other provinces. When the province of Nova Scotia constructed its line of railway from Halifax to Windsor, Nova Scotia ; and from Windsor Junction to Pictou, it was confronted with conditions which demanded that the government should boldly and courageously undertake the work. When the European and North American Railway was construct-

ed between St. John and Point Duchene, in New Brunswick, the conditions demanded that the government should carry out the project. And while there is very much to be said in favour of the construction of railways by private corporations and of public utilities being owned by private corporations, there is a great deal to be said also in favour of government undertaking to grapple with these great public works. We all realize that there are epochs in the history of the empire when it would have been impossible for the imperial government to grapple with great schemes by any means other than of entrusting their accomplishment to private corporations. There are three great corporations in the history of the empire, through whose instrumentality the whole colouring of the map of the world has been changed. There was first the East India Company which having been granted certain powers by government started out with the selfish idea of looking after its own interests, but these interests soon became the interests of the empire. Then there was the Hudson Bay Company which had for its first aim and object the advancement of private interests, but which, by reason of the powers it was entrusted with and by reason of its operations made for England, on the American continent, the great territory which is now known as the Dominion of Canada. And in later years, the third of these private corporations, the South African Company, which in its initiation had only the incentive of private gain, become the parent of British Dominion in that realm.

As we all know, the Intercolonial Railway was undertaken by reason of the compact of confederation. Without the construction of the Intercolonial Railway by the government of Canada there would not have been any confederation. All who read the ante-confederation debates in the parliament of the united provinces of upper and lower Canada will find underlying all the speeches of the fathers of confederation at that date, the clear acknowledgment that unless the Intercolonial were built by the government there could not and would not have been any confederation. We all know that one great and distinguished man, the late Hon. George Brown, stated that if it were necessary to pay the price for a confederated British North America, he would be willing to construct six intercolonials instead of the one which was asked for.

It may be that any one who has studied the Intercolonial as it has been my privilege to do, will realize, as I realize, that a great many mistakes were made. It was acknowledged at the very outset that the Intercolonial was to be, not a commercial undertaking, but an undertaking by the government for the benefit of all Canada, for the promotion of the interchange of trade and people between the provinces by the sea and the inland provinces of Canada. This mission of the Intercolonial, I am sure, has been measurably fulfilled ; and perhaps we do not all realize just the amount of good the Intercolonial has done for the people of Canada. I have many times from my place in this House called attention to the historical features of that railway ; I have called attention to the good it has done, I have pointed out that the freight rates and passenger rates were placed so low with a view to the accomplishment of its mission, that we could not expect any great financial returns from the operation of the road, whether that operation should be carried on by government or by corporation. I think it was my privilege to demonstrate to this House beyond the shadow of questioning that if the rates of the Intercolonial during the past few years had been measurably near the rates charged by the great private railway corporations of Canada, instead of having any deficits we should have had yearly large surpluses, In fact, I have had the calculataion made, showing that for the year 1907, instead of a balancing of the accounts practically—a very small surplus—there would have been on the credit side of the account not less than $2,500,000 ; and if that had gone on from the time of confederation, with favourable traffic, there would not have been a single year in the history of the Intercolonial which would have shown any deficit ; but, on the contrary, there would have been year by year a balance on the credit side of the account. Of course, as a result of that, I have perhaps been looked upon as an enthusiast with respect to the Intercolonial Railway, as one who had the courage to say that it was the great national asset of Canada. I have indeed ventured to prophesy that the day would come when the Intercolonial would stand in such a position before the people of Canada that they would recognize that no other undertaking of the government of Canada has ever been as profitable to them ; and I repeat the prophecy, Sir. Although our eyes for the last few years have been turned westward, although we have gloried in the fact that we have a magnificent western heritage—and we have —although we have prided ourselves on our prairies and the wealth of those prairies, although we have realized that the Pacific slope is rich in all natural resources, presenting a splendid present and promising a greater future, although we have been looking that way, our eyes have been so closed to the east that we have failed to realize what we have at our doors down by the Atlantic coast.

Do we from the maritime provinces realize the wealth of resources which we have there ? Do we take sufficient stock of the

possibilities and the potentialities of our great fisheries ? It is true that our seas have been teeming with fish ; it is true that within the past twenty years it has been known to many members of this House that the fish were so plentiful as to be valueless —that they were simply scooped from the sea and left to waste and decay on the land. But do we realize that all that is changing—that that which was considered a few years ago to be of no value is to-day considered to be of immense value ? I can remember when there was no such thing as a trade in clams in the maritime provinces ; but to-day immense wealth is flowing into Canada simply from the business of clams. We have valued the oyster, but we are valuing it very much more to-day because of its scarcity. We have valued the lobster, but to-day we place a very much higher estimate upon its value by reason of its scarcity. The real extent of our wealth in fisheries is only beginning to dawn upon us. The maritime provinces and the central provinces of this Dominion have not been recognized as they should have been recognized and as I believe they will be recognized during the next ten years. We have had splendid immigration schemes ; we have spent I might almost say millions of money in directing the eyes of Europe to Canada ; but to what part of Canada ? To the west and only to the west. The maritime provinces escape attention. Go into the government offices in London and ask any question with respect to Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick or even Quebec and Ontario, and how little informatiton you will get. A stranger going there and asking with respect to the future of this country and the prospects for immigrants gets what answer ? Not a word with respect to eastern Canada, but all with respect to western Canada. I am simply endeavouring to show that we ourselves do not realize just what we have in the east ; but I believe the time is coming, and quickly coming, when the people of this Dominion will realize that there are other sections of Canada than the west which should be fostered and encouraged with respect to immigration, and with respect to their upbuilding and advancement.

The Intercolonial, it is true, is associated with the history of the maritime provinces in so far as they are part of this Dominion. That railway was constructed in fulfilment of an agreement which was incorporated in the terms of confederation, and I admit that that agreement covered only the building of a railway from Rivière du Loup, in the province of Quebec, to Truro, in the province of Nova Scotia. I grant you that Canada, having done that, has fulfilled, to the letter at least, all that was agreed upon under the terms of confederation. That railway was constructed, but from time to time at each session of parliament, from 1868 down to the present day, parliament has taken a wider view of the Intercolonial Railway and its interests, its requirements and the good it was doing. It has been recognized that it was desirable, having that asset—the original railway from Rivière du Loup to Truro—to perfect it, to make it of greater advantage, to improve the railway itself and to make it more useful to the country which it traverses. I would not discuss this question from the point of view of good to any one section of Canada, but from the standpoint of the good that will accrue and that has accrued to all Canada. The Intercolonial was demanded by the maritime provinces at the time of confederation, and for that reason it has been looked upon as a work simply for the benefit of the maritime provinces. Not so, Mr. Speaker. It has been, it is true, of value and advantage to those provinces, but it has been of equal value and equal advantage to the people of those western provinces. I have time and again pointed out that the markets which have been secured by the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec on the shores of Nova Scotia and in the lumber woods of New Brunswick were the best markets that the manufacturers and merchants in those upper provinces found anywhere. I have demonstrated, I think beyond all question, that the Intercolonial Railway has been the instrument which has enabled the manufacturers of Ontario and of Quebec to secure those markets, and that without that railway they never would have been able to secure, certainly as quickly as they did, these very valuable and profitable markets. Ontario has made money out of the manufacturing interests, and the benefits from the operation of the railway have been shared equally in the west and in the east.

Perhaps I am too enthusiastic, too ardent in my advocacy of the Intercolonial Railway and in setting forth the good which it has accomplished for all these provinces. We have been told that the Greeks, unscrupulously or otherwise, confused together excitement, enthusiasm and divinity. When their priestess at Delphi became excited she was said to be inspired, to be divine—and they were right; there is a touch of divinity in all human enthusiasm. It alone can command and make possible the impossible. I would not say that there was any divinity about the enthusiasm which I have with regard to the Intercolonial Railway, but I do say that there has been a prejudice against the Intercolonial Railway, and a misapprehension as to the work it has done for Canada ; and if I could be inspired with any enthusiasm so as to awaken, in the minds of the people of Ontario particularly, a recognition of the good that the Intercolonial Railway has done, I would feel that while there was no divinity in that

enthusiasm, in the accomplishment of it there would be something divine.

There is in parliament always a hesitancy in questions dealing with a great national asset like the Intercolonial Railway. The proposition that I will make to-night is to my mind purely and simply a business proposition. The fact that the Intercolonial Railway is owned and operated by the government of Canada is no reason why it should not be dealt with as a business proposition or why there should be hesitancy in dealing with it. If that railway were owned by a private corporation, would there be lack of courage in dealing with it, in putting it in such a condition that it would meet the requirements of the country served by it with respect to its trade and traffic, would there be any timidity in respect to the improvements that were required to be made in order to perfect it as a railway? If private corporations would not lack courage with respect to this matter, surely the government of Canada, with such a splendid asset and with such splendid possibilities, should not show a want of courage in dealing with it, in improving it, in making it what it was designed to be, in the spirit if not in the letter, at the time of confederation. Do you, sir, apprehend that when the delegates met in Quebec in 1864 and agreed upon the construction of a railway from Truro to Rivière du Loup, they felt that there the work of Canada would end? Why was it that such an agreement was entered into? Was it not for the purpose of the expansion of trade and the interchange of trade between the east and west? And if it were desirable to reach Truro, is it not still more desirable that they should reach the shores of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and thus touch the markets along those shores? The Intercolonial Railway runs through the centre of New Brunswick and practically through the centre of Nova Scotia. On either side there are these large and prosperous settlements not touched by the Intercolonial Railway, and do you not think it was the spirit of the agreement that that railway was destined to reach these prosperous settlements? We know that in the early settlement of the provinces down there, as in the early settlements of Ontario and Quebec, the people settled along the shores and their means of transportation were entirely by water. Along the rivers and the shores of the bays, and indeed along the shores of the Atlantic, only could be found the early settlements of these provinces. Those settlements still exist, and it seems to me desirable that they should be brought in touch with the other settlements of Canada, and that it is just as important that this should be done as to have these settlements along the line of the Intercolonial Railway brought in touch with the great centres of trade in other sections of Canada.

I have stated that this was simply a business proposition which I have to make to this House, and it is a business proposition which has been recognized, from time to time, from the early seventies down to the present. The Intercolonial Railway stopped at Truro, but the Canadian government wisely thought that it should extend to Cape Breton and to Sydney, and so they purchased an extension of the Intercolonial Railway. They further thought it wise that the Intercolonial Railway should not stop at Rivière du Loup but should reach the old city of Quebec, and so they purchased from the Grand Trunk Railway that portion of its line between Rivière du Loup and Lévis. They subsequently, in order to make their railway more efficient, constructed what is known as the St. Charles branch, and at a later day they constructed a line of railway to connect the Intercolonial Railway at Oxford Junction in Nova Scotia with the town of Pictou, known as the short line. Then later, they constructed, as a branch and feeder of the Intercolonial Railway, a line from Derby Junction to Blackville in the county of Northumberland, N.S.—a line that was known as the Indian town branch. They subsequently built what is known as the Dalhousie branch. All these were subsequent to the construction of the initial railway. Then later on they purchased the Drummond County Railway and brought the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal and afterwards they purchased the Canada Eastern. Sir Charles Tupper in 1883, when Minister of Railways, brought a resolution before this House favouring the construction of what is known as the Baie des Chaleurs Railway running from Metapedia along the shores of the Baie des Chaleurs through the county of Bonaventure; and if any one will take the trouble to refer to the 'Hansard' of 1884, he will find the following:

> Moved by Sir Charles Tupper, for a branch of the Intercolonial Railway from Metapedia eastward towards Paspebiac, twenty miles in the province of New Brunswick, a sum not exceeding on the whole $300,000.

That is to say, recognizing the importance of bringing these outlying sections in close touch with the Intercolonial Railway and thereby in close touch with the markets of the west, he invited parliament to vote $300,000 for building a branch at that point, or a sum equal to $15,000 per mile; and during the same session, proposals were made with respect to the Indian town branch and other proposals with respect to the Dalhousie branch; and if any one will turn to 'Hansard' of 1883, he will find on pages 1252 to 1283 references to these proposals. In 1884, in the second volume of 'Hansard,' on pages 1445 and 1479 and so on, reference is made to the construction

of these branch lines. For what purpose were they constructed ? For the purpose, as Sir Charles then pointed out, of providing feeders for the government railway, in order to gather in the traffic of the outlying districts and making the Intercolonial Railway a more perfect road, to the greater advantage of the people of Canada. The principle recognized by parliament at that time has been recognized, almost every year since, down to the present moment. It is therefore no new principle which I am submitting and no new departure in the policy of Canada in dealing with our national railway.

I have said that this is a business proposition. I have gone so far as to say that if the Intercolonial Railway were owned by a private corporation, every branch line, every feeder touching that line of railway at any point, would be absorbed by the trunk line. What justification have I for making that statement ? I have the history of the great railway corporations of Canada. Go through the west ; and wherever you see a branch line touching the Canadian Pacific Railway and inquire who operates and controls it, you will find that the Canadian Pacific Railway does, under a lease, as a feeder to its trunk line. Go through Ontario and wherever you find a branch line of railway touching the Grand Trunk and you ask who operates or controls it, the answer almost invariably is that the Grand Trunk Railway has it under lease. I assume that these astute railway magnates, these men who are in the business for all that there is in it, are not securing control and operation of these roads merely as a past time, but they are doing it as a business proposition, for the advancement of the interest of their respective companies. I venture this assertion, that if there had been granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway by the government of Canada the rights which they ask in connection with the Intercolonial, that is to say, their request being that they should have a joint user of the Intercolonial from St. John to Halifax, and from Truro on to Sydney, a joint user whereby they would be able to compete with the Intercolonial itself for its intermediate or local traffic, both passenger and freight, if they had secured the privilege which they sought—and they were justified in securing it, I have no quarrel with them because from a business standpoint they desired these privileges, they were within their rights in attempting to secure them—but I do say that if these privileges had been granted, or if they ever are granted, the Canadian Pacific Railway will secure in a night almost every branch line touching the Intercolonial between Halifax and St. John, or at any other point along the line of the Intercolonial from which they have secured these rights. The Intercolonial, if such rights had been granted, or if they ever are granted, would awaken to the fact that the traffic which comes over the coal roads from the coal mines to the Intercolonial, and traverses the Intercolonial to points of destination, the traffic which comes over the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island road, over the Moncton and Buctouche, over the coal railways in the province of New Brunswick and serving as a feeder of the Intercolonial, the Canadian Pacific Railway would gather up all that traffic and leave the Intercolonial denuded not only of the passenger traffic coming from these outlying sections, but deprived as well of any advantage of the traffic which comes in such volume to-day over its respective lines. Now it may be said that this proposition goes to the point of securing for government operation these lines of railway which to-day are in operation and are affording to the Intercolonial traffic in just as great volume as would be afforded to the Intercolonial if it obtained control and operated them itself. Now, Sir, I dispute that proposition. I make the assertion that if these branch lines were operated and controlled by the government, there would be a very great increase in the volume of traffic. I make the assertion that no man to-day can establish an industry on any of the branch lines in the maritime provinces, or in the province of Quebec, connecting with the Intercolonial, in competition with a like industry along the trunk line.

Mr. LEFURGEY. They cannot do it in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. EMMERSON. It will be recognized by every business man that the cost of transportation is a very material factor in the cost of placing the manufactured product in the market. It will be recognized that any one who has to transport his material over two lines of railway will find his transportation charges increased by some 15 or 20 per cent over those of the man in the same business situated on the trunk line of railway.

Now I have been speaking of these branch lines, speaking of them in the abstract. Sir, every one of these branch lines has cost this country a very large sum of money. They have not only cost the Dominion of Canada large sums, but each of the provinces have contributed of their resources in large measure to aid the construction of these roads. The following table will show exactly what they have cost the Dominion and the respective provinces.

PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Name of Road.	Connecting Point.	Mileage.	Dominion Aid.		Province.	Provincial Aid.		Municipal Aid.		Subscription to Shares.
			Granted.	Paid up.		Granted.	Paid up.	Granted.	Paid up.	
			$ cts.	$ cts.		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Quebec and Lake St. John.	Quebec.	246·40	1,454,695 00	1,160,471 50	Quebec.	2,533,000 00	2,368,816 88	12,000 00	12,000 00	450,000 00
Quebec Central	Harlaka Junction.	222·00	398,342 00	348,342 00	"	1,076,123 14	1,076,123 14	103,000 00	103,000 00	
					Quebec.	362,250 00	362,250 00			
Temiscouata	River du Loup	113·00	645,950 00	645,950 00	N. B.	66,000 00	66,000 00	25,000 00	25,000 00	
Atlantic and Lake Superior	Metapedia	100·00	766,490 84	766,490 84	Quebec.	1,415,000 00	840,000 00	40,500 00		

PROVINCE OF NEW BRUNSWICK.

Caraquet and Gulf Shore	Gloucester Jct	68·00 16·78	224,000 00	224,000 00	N. B.	180,000 00	180,000 00			
Kent, Northern, St. Louis and Richibucto.	Kent Jct	27·00 7·00	53,699 20	53,699 20	"	41,950 00	41,950 00			
Beersville Coal & Rly. Co.	Adamsville	8·63	*58,334 27	58,334 27	"	135,000 00	135,000 00			
Moncton & Buctouche	Moncton	32·00	22,400 00	22,400 00	"	21,000 00	21,000 00			
Salisbury & Harvey	Salisbury	50·00	20,736 00	20,736 00	"	16,200 00	16,200 00			
Elgin & Havelock	Petitcodiac	28·00	102,400 00	101,600 00	"	96,000 00	94,500 00	70,000 00	70,000 00	
N. B. Coal & Rly. Co.	Norton.	58·00	*29,665 45	29,391 01	"	455,000 00	455,000 00	13,000 00	13,000 00	
Hampton & St. Martins.	Hampton	30·00	*82,652 82	82,652 82	"	107,500 00	107,500 00			
N. B. Southern	St. John	82·50	190,400 00	190,400 00	"	139,000 00	139,000 00			
N. B. & P. E. I. Railway.	Sackville	36·00	*83,612 54	83,612 54	"	145,600 00	145,600 00	3,000 00	3,000 00	
Albert, Southern & Harvey Branch.		19·00			"	413,000 00	413,000 00			
			113,440 00	113,440 00	"	99,708·90	99,708 90			
			50,460 00	50,460 00	"	48,680 00	48,680 00			
			5,553 57	5,553 57	"	9,000 00	9,000 00			
				1,036,279 41			1,906,138 90		86,000 00	

Not in Operation.

International of N. B.	Campbellton	29·00	178,408 07	178,408 07	"	75,000 00	75,000 00	5,000 00	5,000 00	
St. John Valley & River du Loup.	Fredericton.	6·00								

The International of New Brunswick and the St. John Valley and Riviere du Loup are not in operation and, therefore, do not come within the purview of this discussion. I have forgotten to mention the line of railway connecting the Canada Eastern with the village of Stanley in York county. I think the distance is some six miles. That was aided by the Dominion government to the extent of $3,200 per mile and by the province to the same extent and it is very easy to calculate the totals from these details. In these figures I have been speaking of the cash subsidies apart from the contributions that were made by the Dominion government in the way of old rails. A system grew up in the early seventies whereby these branch lines of railway received by way of aid contributions of old rails that were taken up from the Intercolonial Railway and the value of these rails is not included in the sums which I have mentioned. The following table will show the branch railways in the province of Nova Scotia, their connecting point, their mileage, the aid granted by the Dominion, the aid granted by the province and the aid granted by the municipalities.

PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA

Name of Road.	Connecting Point.	Mileage.	Dominion Aid.		Provincial Aid.		Municipal Aid.	
			Granted.	Paid Up.	Granted.	Paid Up	Granted.	Paid Up.
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Canada Coal and Railway Company	Maccan	12·00	37,500 00	37,500 00	35,200 00	35,200 00	.....	.....
Cumberland Railway and Coal Company	Springhill Junction	32·00	44,800 00	39,850 00	184,450 00	173,650 00	.....	.....
Dominion Atlantic	Truro	57·87	367,168 00	367,168 00	185,600 00	183,510 40	36,000 00	36,000 00
"	Windsor Junction	188·09						
"	"	32·33	1,738,169 00	1,738,169 00	723,997 45	723,997 45	177,685 00	177,685 00
Windsor Branch G.C.R.	"	369·21	1,442,843 20	1,442,843 20	252,499 33	156,499 33	15,338 93	15,338 93
Halifax and Southwestern	Halifax	12·50	40,000 00	39,840 00	40,000 00	40,000 00	4,000 00	4,000 00
Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company	Ferrona Junction	31·00	192,000 00	182,400 00	96,000 00	91,400 00	10,000 00	10,000 00
Cape Breton	Pt. Tupper	65·50	627,000 00	368,545 97	272,000 00	233,000 00	100,000 00	50,000 00
Inverness Railway and Coal Company	"	52·74	89,600 00	87,808 00	87,808 00	82,000 00	....	....
Sydney and Louisburg	Sydney							
			....	4,304,124 20	....	1,719,257 18	....	293,023 93

The Canada Coal and Railway Company's line connects Maccan, in Cumberland, with what is known as the Joggins mine, on the Bay of Fundy; it runs through several valuable coal mines, amongst others the Strathcona mine, the Minudie mine and another mine which, in my young days, used to be called the 'hard scrabble.'

Mr. LOGAN. It is now called the Fundy mine.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, it has a more dignified name now. The Springhill Railway runs from Springhill junction past the Springhill mine, and thence on to Parrsboro' and along the shores of Minas Basin. The other railways also run through areas rich in natural resources and run through excellent traffic producing territory.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I might point out to the hon. gentleman that he has omitted the contribution paid by the province of Prince Edward Island, which is over $3,000,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. $3,144,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not included the Prince Edward Island Railway lines, but I have no doubt my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) will attend to that.

Mr. LEFURGEY. You should have a tunnel to connect the railway system.

Mr. EMMERSON. There have been very large sums of money expended in Prince Edward Island for the construction of railways; I think some $7,000,000 was expended in the construction of railways in that province, and they have railways in every direction.

Mr. A. MARTIN (P.E.I.). Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that $7,000,000 was expended by this government for railway construction in Prince Edward Island?

Mr. EMMERSON. I understand that to be the total expended on the island.

Mr. A. MARTIN (P.E.I.). The total expended by whom?

Mr. EMMERSON. The total expended by the Dominion or, if originally expended by the province, repaid by the Dominion.

Mr. A. MARTIN (P.E.I.). The hon. gentleman should not make such a statement as that; it is not correct.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the figures before me, and my statement is subject to correction. I have no wish at all to misrepresent the amount expended by the Dominion in Prince Edward Island, but there is no doubt that a very large amount has been expended, and that a great many branch lines of railway have been constructed there. However, that is altogether aside from my argument, and I have no wish at all to introduce it. It is not connected with the discussion before the House, for the reason that the lines of railway on Prince Edward Island were constructed as part of the government system of railways, whereas I am dealing with railways that were constructed by private corporations who received aid from the Dominion and provincial governments respectively. Outside that question I do not intend to travel. Now, the total aid given to these railways by the Dominion, the provinces and the municipalities amounts to $12,050,514.46, as the following summary statement will show:

—	Dominion Aid Paid Up.	Provincial Aid Paid Up.	Municipal Aid Paid Up.
	$ cts	$ cts.	$ cts.
Province, New Brunswick	1,036,279 41	1,906,138 90	86,000 00
" Nova Scotia	4,304,124 20	1,710,257 18	293,023 93
" Quebec	1,412,440 84	1,268,250 00	25,000
Total	6,752,844 45	4,893,646 08	404,023 93
Grand Total			12,050,514 46

It is well for us to look this matter squarely in the face. Canada undertook to construct the Intercolonial Railway. I do not think it was ever intended by the fathers of confederation that the provinces should aid in any degree whatever in the construction of local lines of railway within these provinces. But there was a departure. I do not know exactly when it occurred, but occur it did, and the several provinces aided the construction of branch lines of railway to serve the communities outlying from the main line so as to meet the legitimate desire of these outlying communities to have railway facilities. Too often perhaps they did not realize just what was before them, and in many instances perhaps there were lines of railway constructed that were not actual necessities; yet who can say that the people concerned should

be deprived of railway accommodation? What was the modus operandi? Those who were promoting such lines would go perhaps first to the provincial government and say: We want this line of railway, and we want you to aid it; if you will, perhaps the Dominion will. They secure a promise from the provincial authorities, and then they come to Ottawa and say to the Ottawa authorities: The province is willing to aid this line of railway; we want your assistance. In this way they secured assistance from both governments. Sometimes they came first to the Ottawa government, and secondarily went to the provincial government, or they went first to the provincial government and then to the Dominion government, just as it seemed to be most propitious for them. The lines of railway were constructed; in many instances the bonds were sold at a very low rate. In many instances, I believe, not much more was realized than would actually construct the road. But the construction of a railway and setting it in operation is one thing, and the continuance of it is quite a different thing. Every one realizes that the great railway systems of this country are compelled to come to parliament year after year seeking authority to issue additional debentures, from the proceeds of which they shall make those betterments which are so absolutely necessary. The completion of a railway is not its completion for all time. The wear and tear and the changes constantly going on necessitates a large expenditure on capital account; for it is impossible to expect a railway, out of its earnings, to make those betterments, to improve its rolling stock or even to continue it as it was at its first completion. These railways could not secure betterments; they could not obtain credit; they had exhausted their sources of credit, with the result that many of them are to-day in such a position that they cannot be advantageously operated. They are not the good to the communities they were intended to be, and I am sure that the parliament of Canada, after granting the aid which they did to these respective railways, contemplated that the communities which they were intended to serve would have proper railway facilities, and by means of them would experience an impulse to their industrial and agricultural life. The result is that to-day we have along the line of the Intercolonial very many railways which are affording that accommodation to the people which they should, and Canada, having invested so largely in these railways, should certainly consider how best it can aid them and the communities which they serve.

I do not, however, maintain my argument in favour of the passage of the resolution which I will move, upon the ground that it is simply for the aid of these particular communities. I think I shall be able to show that it will be of advantage to the Intercolonial itself and that it will not entail any burden on the taxpayer of Canada. As I have stated, if the Intercolonial were owned by a private corporation, they would absorb every branch railway along the line of the Intercolonial, perhaps every one of the lines which I have mentioned in the statement which I have placed before the House. I have reason to think that would be done, because that has been done elsewhere; it is done without increasing the burden of debt upon the corporations concerned, and it could be done in this instance without adding one dollar to the debt of Canada or adding in any way to the burdens of the people of Canada. I know that there is not a community touched by any one of these lines of railway along the line of the Intercolonial that is not susceptible of very great development. I believe that there is no section tapped by any of these branch lines that is not capable of greater and still greater development if it were afforded proper railway or transportation facilities. If this motion involved an addition to the public debt of Canada I could very well understand why people, especially in Ontario, would hesitate before stamping it with their approval. But it does not do anything of the kind; it does not mean that. They would say, perhaps: We invested a large sum of money in the Intercolonial, what have been the returns? They have been nil; there have been deficits, and it is hard work to make the accounts balance. True in one sense and untrue in another, because, as I have stated, the records of the Intercolonial do not show the true conditions with respect to that railway. The very low, the ruinously low rates have made the bookkeeping of the Intercolonial show a balance against the Intercolonial itself, but if you could gather together those additional roads and draw from the pockets of the people the money they have saved in utilizing them as means of transportation you would have a sum of money that would certainly represent the payment of interest on the expenditure and a very good balance to the good. People talk about the Canadian Pacific Railway as a great dividend payer. True it is, but the Canadian Pacific Railway has been a dividend payer because its patrons have had to contribute those dividends. The Intercolonial has not been a dividend payer because the parliament and the respective governments of Canada have felt that it was more in the interest of the Dominion that there should be a cementing together of the widely separated provinces and that there should be a diversion of trade from the eastern states of the American republic to the Canadian provinces, as they were called in the early days. That diversion took place by reason of low rates; the markets were given to the Canadian manufacturer and the Intercolon-

ial by its low rates has contributed to that development of the trade of the other provinces, but for the same reason it has not shown as high a balance to its credit as it would otherwise have shown.

What should be done under these circumstances? Should we not do as the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway have done, absorb the branch lines by way of leasehold? It is one thing to purchase, and if you have the money perhaps it would be wise to do that, but the methods pursued by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, business methods I assume, were to acquire the branch lines by way of leasehold, in some instances paying an amount sufficient to meet the interest on a fair valuation of the railways acquired, or in other instances undertaking to operate the branch lines of railway in conjunction with the trunk lines, giving to the respective branch lines a percentage of the gross earnings. A good illustration of that is seen in New Brunswick, where a branch line constructed from Perth Centre on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Plaster Rock up the Tobique valley, a distance of 28 miles. This railway had been built by private enterprise aided by government subsidies, and the builders undertook to run it. They operated it for a time but not with satisfaction to the people of the rich Tobique valley. The Canadian Pacific Railway offered to take the road on a long term lease, giving a percentage of the gross earnings and undertaking to operate it as part of their system. This arrangement was carried out and it has been one of the most successful ventures, not merely for the Canadian Pacific Railway but for the Tobique Valley Railway Company. This transaction in no sense involves an addition to the capital expenditure of the Canadian Pacific Railway but it afforded them additional traffic for their trunk line, gave satisfaction to the people along the line of the Tobique Valley and afforded a good revenue to the builders of the railway. This could be done to advantage with respect to every one of those lines of railway which I have mentioned. How important it is for the Intercolonial Railway to have control of the territory which may be said to be within its sphere, and to control for instance the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway, a line that brings the Intercolonial Railway nearest to the Prince Edward Island Railway on the island of Prince Edward Island. How important it is that the Intercolonial Railway should control and operate every one of those so-called coal railways. They get their largest freight traffic from those districts. Coal traffic of the Intercolonial Railway is a very important factor in its earnings, and the outlying districts traversed by these respective branch line railways are important contributors to the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway. It seems to me to be a business proposition that the Intercolonial Railway should secure these branch lines upon the basis of the terms which I have mentioned. They can, I believe, be so secured, and their operation under one management would avoid those separate business charges which are incident to the separate operation of the respective railways. Under these circumstances it would appear to me to be wise business indeed to follow the course outlined in the motion now under consideration.

Mr. BLAIN. What has been the history of the branch lines that the hon. gentleman proposes this government should purchase?

Mr. EMMERSON. Where the management has been businesslike, they have in every instance paid their expenses with something to the good.

Mr. BLAIN. Are they doing that now?

Mr. EMMERSON. I can give one particular instance, the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway, a railway that pays its interest on the bonds and a fair dividend on its common stock. The same is true with respect to the Kent-Northern. There are other railways that have not been successful. One of the most important in eastern Canada, traversing a country that is perhaps the richest of any section in that part of Canada, the Albert Railway, was not a success, and the reason it was not a success, as I understand it, was that having been built quite a number of years ago the promoters issued a very large amount of bonds and floated them on the British market. The bond issue was out of proportion to the value of the road and they could not by any possibility meet the interest charges, with the result that the bondholders foreclosed. The railway was purchased by another syndicate; I do not know them, but as I understand the situation they have been certainly in receipt of a revenue greater than their expenditure and in addition to that they have set aside each year quite a large amount by way of betterment.

I think I am speaking within the mark when I make those statements, although I am not personally familiar with the inner transaction connected with the railways. They are all in this position that they serve communities which are susceptible of immense development. By reason of the two lines of railway or three in some instances, by reason of the two or three freights it is impossible to encourage industrial establishment in that section. Manufacturing is stifled; even the industrial establishments that only furnish natural products are suppressed. Why? Because they have not transportation facilities at a minimum rate. If these were afforded, if freight rates were given

on a basis of mileage over one railway, there would, I believe, be established in the counties of Albert, Kings, Queens and Gloucester, manufacturing industries, and there would be developments in the fishing and lumber and other interests that do not exist to-day. The operation of these branch lines of railway by the Intercolonial Railway, with the one charge for business management, would open the doors to these respective communities, and make possible the investment of capital to develop their natural resources. Who will tell me there is a richer section anywhere in Canada than the county of Albert with its plaster quarries, its possibilities with respect to oil and coal and fisheries and stone quarries, all of which are languishing for the lack of railway facilities. Furnish these facilities and energy and capital will flow into this country. The same is true of every section. Take the county of Gloucester, no man can travel through that rich and magnificent country, from Bathurst to Shippegan and Tracadie, without being conscious that it is one of the richest sections of our province—rich in its agricultural and other natural resources, stone quarries and fisheries, all of which are pregnant with immense possibilities. That railway, if it were connected with the Intercolonial Railway, would bring in capital and energy, and the Intercolonial Railway would reap a reflex benefit. Canada, as a whole, would certainly feel the impetus and receive the benefit. It would afford better markets for those who manufacture in this section and enable its people to engage in natural industries and bring their products to market, thus contributing to the welfare of that section and contributing to the same extent to the welfare of other sections of the Dominion.

What I am saying with respect to these two counties is true with respect to the others. What I say with respect to the one railway is true with respect to all these railways—perhaps not to all in the same degree, but they are not measurably separated from each other. Some have greater advantages, but all of them, as a business proposition, justify the Intercolonial Railway in moving forward to absorb them as feeders to the trunk line. I believe it was intended by the fathers of confederation that the Intercolonial Railway should gather up the traffic of the maritime provinces and bring it to the west and likewise gather up the manufactured products of the western provinces and distribute them to the east. Measurably the Intercolonial Railway has fulfilled its mission in that regard, but it will do so to a very much greater extent if we move along in the direction indicated by the motion I shall in a moment move.

Some reference was made to Prince Edward Island, and I made a statement regarding that province. Inclusive of government expenditure, prior to confederation, there has been expended in the construction of Prince Edward Island railways $7,307,364.86, of which $3,114,735.11 was expended prior to confederation.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Prince Edward Island). Would the hon. gentleman allow me? He has made the statement that $7,000,000 were expended and then he modified it by saying that $3,114,000 was expended prior to confederation. It was $3,144,000, but he did not say by which government that money was expended.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said before confederation. But what difference does it make whether that expenditure was made before or since confederation?

Mr. A. MARTIN (Prince Edward Island). By whom was it made?

Mr. EMMERSON. I care not by whom. I am not discussing party politics, I am not discussing this government or that government, but a question that appertains to the Intercolonial Railway. I am discussing a business proposition, regardless of party politics, regardless of government, or of individuals. The amount of money expended on railways in Prince Edward Island was upwards of $7,000,000. It was not expended by way of subsidies, but was direct expenditure by the government of the day, on government owned roads, operated by government, and in no sense, comes within the jurisdiction of the motion now under consideration.

I do not think I need detain the House any further. I have perhaps wearied the House already. I have dealt with the absorption of branch lines. I have always felt that the Intercolonial Railway had not properly fulfilled its mission because we had not placed it in a position to do its work efficiently and effectively. I have always thought that the Intercolonial Railway should be extended further west to the great lakes, and I believe that the time is coming near when we shall be in a position to do this. A year or two ago, when there was a Bill of some importance before this parliament and I had the honour of presiding over the Department of Railways, there was incorporated in certain legislation a provision whereby the Intercolonial Railway would have certain running rights over the line of railway from Coteau Junction to Parry Sound. But I do not think that that covers the whole ground. It seems to me that there are two very strong features to be recognized and they are these. If the Intercolonial Railway is to carry out what was hoped of it, it must touch the centres of trade in Ontario. It must be brought in touch with the industrial centres of Ontario, the nerve centres of trade, and I believe that as a means of stimulat-

ing trade, and building up commerce, of securing the carriage of Canadian traffic over Canadian soil to Canadian seaports and out on to the ocean, it is important, and indeed important, that the Intercolonial should be placed in a position whereby it could do that, and that it should be extended from Montreal west, brought in touch with Toronto and other important trade centres, brought in touch with one or more ports on the great lakes, when it would carry out the object to which I have referred, and would secure that traffic for Canadian routes over Canadian soil and out upon the ocean through Canadian seaports.

Sir, it seems to me that if we have any faith in the future of this country there will be work for many railways before many years. The immense products of the west must find an egress through the ports of the Atlantic, and we cannot provide facilities sufficiently fast or sufficiently perfect to do that trade as it should be done. The great cry to-day, and the great cry has been, that the railways already in existence have not furnished facilities equal to the requirements of trade. It is not for me to say just where and to just what ports this railway should go upon the lakes, but I do hold that the Intercolonial should reach some port or ports on the great inland waters of Canada, so that it can be brought in touch by water communication with the great outflow of grain that must come down from Manitoba to Port Arthur and Fort William; and that in conjunction therewith, connected with the extension to the great lakes, there shall be connection given with Toronto and with other centres where traffic can be given to the Intercolonial to take east, and where traffic can be brought from the east to the very national centre of our commerce and our trade.

Now, Sir, I do not think that I am too optimistic when I say that the day will come, and it is not so far distant, when Canada will move forward along these lines. I do not know what this government will do, I do not know what the intentions of this government may be as regards this matter; but I do know that there will rise up a government in Canada some day, and I hope before I have passed away, that will carry out these ideas, that will make the Intercolonial a national work in the truest sense of the word, that will make the Intercolonial not merely a railway to be referred to as the plaything of the maritime provinces, but as a national undertaking to carry out the aims and objects set forth in the confederation debates, fulfilling the prophecies that were made at the time. George Brown and Sir John Macdonald visited Halifax and St. John in 1864, after having come from the conference at Charlottetown. What were their views with respect to the future of the railway to be constructed as an Intercolonial ? I need only refer hon. members of this House to those splendid speeches, to those splendid prophecies ; and if there is one thing I would like to say, it is to pay my tribute of respect to Sir Charles Tupper because he had a prophetic vision of the future of the Intercolonial and as to the good that it would do. I have never been associated with the party with which he was allied, but his splendid courage and his prophetic vision have always challenged my admiration. I believe that there is to-day in Canada a courage and a fortitude that will bear us along in the same direction, and will impel us to carry out what was intended to be carried out by confederation, making the Intercolonial a truly national work, a work that will not merely serve this section or that section, but will serve all sections in Canada, and contribute to the splendid growth of the country in which we take so much pride. Courage and confidence are quite as important factors in the lives of nations as they are in the lives of individuals. God hates a coward, either in men, or in nations, or in parliaments, I say it with all respect. It seems to me that we stand on the threshold of splendid possibilities, that we stand face to face with a duty to move forward, and moving forward we certainly must contribute to the growth and the advancement of every province in the Dominion. We have set no bounds as a people to our possibilities in trade and in general development. In Canada to-day we are actuated by a spirit of aggressiveness. I think this is true not merely of individuals, but it is true of parties, it is true of nations; and with that spirit of aggressiveness actuating us I am sure that we will not prove timid when we find ourselves face to face with these great undertakings.

I listened the other day with pleasure to the debate on the so-called Georgian bay canal. I was glad to note the spirit of optimism, the spirt of confidence, if you will, the spirit of faith, in the future of this country. If we ourselves have not this faith, if we are not actuated by this confidence, surely there are none others who can be. The man who would hesitate in the face of great undertakings that mean the expansion of trade, because, forsooth, he thinks that there are some timid ones in his constituency, is not worthy to represent his constituency. We are here as leaders, not as followers, nor as time servers and opportunists; we are here for the purpose of marking and blazing out the trail wherein others may follow. I think that if we were to-night to mark out the trail a way for Canada to go in connection with this project, and with other projects that are in the public mind, we certainly will be given credit for a confidence and a faith in the country that are justified by actualities and by the possibilities that are before us. The Canadian of to-day looks out over the Dominion with a

wider vision, and sees avenues of enterprise open of which he never dreamed in years gone by. That is true. Once admit it and with those avenues open, with this wider vision, with these greater possibilities, and with a country in which we have faith, let us not hesitate, even in the face of some risk to take the important step which I here propose. Certainly, in the motion which I now move, there is no element of risk; there is on the contrary an element of business—of good business—and an element which will receive, as it merits, the approval of the people of every province of the Dominion. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to move the motion which stands in my name. This will be seconded by my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Telford).

Mr. W. P. TELFORD (North Grey). Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion, and in doing so I think I can come to the conclusion that it is quite unnecessary that I should add a single sentence to the splendid presentation of the case by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson). He has exhausted the subject. It is true that I might go on for a short time with the discussion of the subject, but it would only be a repetition of what has been so well said by my hon. friend and I do not think it would be a profitable way of spending the time of the House although it is frequently done. I might say, however, that coming from a port on the Georgian bay, we regard the Intercolonial Railway as a matter of great importance to the Georgian bay ports. We are delighted with the prospect of getting this connection because it would give us the best competitor and the best controller of rates that we could possibly have and incidentally it would enable us to do away with the necessity of calling in the services of the Railway Commission. In regard to freights over this line, there may be some misapprehension. If the House, in its wisdom, should see fit to give us a branch to Owen Sound I think I can safely say that we would provide one-third of the traffic that the line would carry. At the present time Owen Sound is badly handicapped by the hills in the neighbourhood. A locomotive can only take a limited number of cars out of town, whereas, by the proposed route running by Meaford and Collingwood, a locomotive would be able to take out forty cars. That makes all the difference in the world. At present we will only get 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 bushels of grain at our elevators during the season. If one locomotive were able to take forty cars out of town I am satisfied that we would get grain by tens of millions of bushels because we have all the facilities for handling grain in the cheapest and best manner possible. At the present moment we have $3,500,000 worth of vessels lying at the wharfs. We have the best harbour on the Georgian bay, the easiest of access and the latest open in the fall. The biggest steel vessel that we have in the harbour to-day came in on Christmas Day of last year. Then, another thing that would assist in providing traffic for the proposed line is the fact that as soon as the branch line of the Transcontinental Railway to Port Arthur is completed and connection is made between that port and Winnipeg the stream of traffic that would come down over that route would tax every line, the Intercolonial Railway included, to its utmost capacity. I might also add that the traffic coming through the Sault canal is greater than the combined traffic of the port of London and the Suez canal and greater still than the combined traffic of Liverpool and the Suez canal. Just as Canada is able to provide facilities for taking care of that traffic more and more of it is bound to find its way to the Atlantic through the ports of the Georgian bay. I am optimistic enough to believe that in the next twelve months one-third of the total export trade from the American continent will come through these Georgian bay ports and yet larger proportion when the Georgian bay canal is finished, and that not only our Great Northwest but Duluth and even Chicago will be tributary to that mighty stream of traffic, for it is a fact, although a trite one, that trade follows the line of least resistance.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this great question has been most exhaustively dealt with by my hon. friend from. Westmoreland (Mr Emmerson). I regret to-night that when this, the second most important question dealt with this session, is up for consideration we have so few of the members of the House present, particularly so few members of the opposition, because, after all, this is largely a question upon——

Mr. FOWLER. There are more members of the opposition proportionately than on your side.

Mr. LOGAN. I was counting the number during the debate and found fourteen members of the opposition present.

Mr. J. D. REID. There are only twenty-two on the other side.

Mr. LOGAN. There were fifty or sixty on this side.

Mr. J. D. REID. Only 22.

Mr. LOGAN. I think the government side does not need as much conversion as the opposition and therefore I regret all the more that more members of the opposition are not here. This, Mr. Speaker, is a most important debate ; it is an important debate to all parts of Canada and particularly to the maritime provinces. I am afraid that when we talk of the Intercolonial Railway, we are apt in this House to think that we

are talking of something that only appertains to the maritime provinces, forgetting the fact that the Intercolonial Railway, through the regulation of freight tariffs, is of very great benefit to the great province of Ontario, and to the province of Quebec, and also that it traverses the province of Quebec and in that way is another benefit to that province. My hon. friend from Westmoreland has proposed in his resolution that the Intercolonial shall be extended westward. I hope to live, Mr. Speaker—and I hope not to have to live long—to see the Intercolonial Railway traversing the province of Ontario. If for no other reason on earth I hope the Intercolonial will traverse the province of Ontario so that the people of that great province may realize that the Intercolonial is not a provincial railway but a Canadian railway, and that it is their duty to regard it as such and to encourage it to the best of their ability.

My hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) has pointed out that the weak part of the Intercolonial Railway, as a revenue producer, lies in its defective system of branch lines. We who live by the sea and know the conditions do not need arguments to convince us of this, but it may be well to point out to those who are not familiar with the maritime provinces, that the railways which should naturally be tributary to the Intercolonial are really feeders for competing lines of railway. I venture to say that three-quarters of the freight which comes from the so-called feeders of the Intercolonial destined for points in western Ontario leaves the Intercolonial at the first junction point and gives the Canadian Pacific Railway the benefit of the long haul west. I know, as a matter of fact, that in connection with several of these smaller railways the freight is not routed via the Intercolonial, but via St. John and the Canadian Pacific Railway to the west. There are many reasons for this, and one is that the Canadian Pacific Railway can offer inducements to agents and give them special commissions for obtaining special freight which the government cannot offer. As a matter of fact, I know that on one particular branch railway in the maritime provinces it is almost impossible for one to secure a ticket by the Intercolonial for Montreal in the face of the insistence that you should travel by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I say, therefore, that these railways which are tributary to the Intercolonial in the maritime provinces are not feeders of the Intercolonial, but are feeders of its competitors. The Intercolonial Railway does not get the traffic from these branch lines that it should get, and it never will get that traffic until they are controlled by the Intercolonial.

I do not think, Sir, that the country would entertain a proposition to acquire these branch lines on the basis of what they have cost, for it would take a great many million dollars to do that. But I do think the people of Canada will endorse a policy under which these branch lines will be leased for a reasonable rental based upon the present net earnings of the roads and the probable future earnings under government operation. My hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) is not asking to add to the debt of the country; as I understand it, his chief argument is that the government should take these branch lines under lease and operate them as part of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. LOGAN. These railways are not at the present time so equipped as to induce freight being shipped over them, or to take care of it should it be given to them. Take one of these lines, say twenty miles in length, and its equipment will probably be one or two broken down locomotives. The traffic of the roads does not warrant the reduction of grades to a modern standard, and they are probably able to haul only three or four cars in a train, which necessarily means expensive operation, and to meet which they charge exorbitant freight rates. In this respect, I might mention that while some of these lines are under the control of the Railway Commission, others have provincial charters and are not. There is no uniformity in the freight rates on these branch railways; in many cases they charge whatever they can squeeze out of the public who ship freight over them. In some cases where they have an industry located on their railway which they favour, they endeavour to crush out other industries of a similar character. In my own constituency there is a branch line running from Maccan, on the Intercolonial, to Joggins. It is owned by the same people who own the Joggins coal mine. On that line of railway are located several other coal mines, some of which the hon. member (Mr. Emmerson) has named. The complaint is being made continuously that this railway is operated in the interest of the mine belonging to those who own the railway, and that the railroad is operated in a manner not beneficial to the other mines. In this particular instance it would seem to me to be the special duty of the government of Canada to take over that railway and to give equal rights to all the great coal producing industries in the district. Again in my constituency, another railway, thirty-two miles in length, runs from Springhill to Parrsboro', and complaints are continuously made of the rates charged on that road. It is said that other coal mines cannot be opened up along that road, because the capitalists say: What is the good of our opening up a coal mine if we have to depend on a railway which is operated in the interests of a rival mine? It is stated that

the people who ship freight along that railway are charged much in excess of the ordinary rates. It can be well understood that the people of Parrsboro' are seriously handicapped, because when they send freight to Halifax or St. John by rail they are obliged to consign over two different roads.

Then, as to the rolling stock on branch railways, in some cases the entire equipment consists of a few locomotives. The cars used on some of them are rented from the Intercolonial, so that if a farmer desires to ship, for instance, hay, it is almost impossible for him to get a car, and he can only procure one by the grace of the officials. The passenger accommodation on several of these branch lines is inferior, because the heavy fixed charges on their bonded indebtedness prevents them from acquiring and maintaining modern passenger coaches.

I would ask hon. gentleman to remember that I do not come here to-night as a beggar, and neither does my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) come here begging the people of Canada to take over these roads for charity's sake. He declares, and I endorse his statement, that this will be a good investment for both sides. It will be good for the small roads, and it will pay the Intercolonial to take them over and give better facilities and accommodation to the people who depend on them.

Mr. EMMERSON. We could put our old rails and old rolling stock on these lines.

Mr. LOGAN. If we operated these lines under lease we would secure for the Intercolonial all the freight which comes from them destined for western points. At the present time the smaller locomotives on the Intercolonial are being replaced by those of a more powerful type; the lighter rails on the main line are being replaced by 80-pound rails, and thus the small locomotives and the 57-pound and 70-pound rails which are taken off the main line would be put on these branch lines and would be quite sufficient for the purpose.

Mr. EMMERSON. There are thousands of tons of these lighter rails available.

Mr. LOGAN. My hon. friend, the ex-Minister of Railways, tells us that there are thousands of tons of these rails available, and as they could be used on the branch lines that would greatly reduce the cost of putting them in first-class condition. Speaking for my own constituency, we are desirous that the government of Canada should take up this question seriously. Is it to be said, Mr. Speaker, because we got the Intercolonial Railway at confederation that for all time we have to be satisfied with a road that does not acquire branches or extend its lines? If that is to be said, then we are not being well served. I have not the slightest doubt that if the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway owned the Intercolonial Railway they would acquire every one of these branch lines and make them feeders to their general system, and would build other branch lines in other parts of the maritime provinces. My hon. friend has spoken of the future of the maritime provinces. He has referred to the fact that our eyes have of late been diverted to the golden fields of the west. It is time that the people of the maritime provinces looked about them and considered what is to be their future. Is the time coming when we shall have a small representation in this House because of the growing up of the west? Have we a country of which we have reason to be ashamed? Have we not one of the most valuable parts of the Dominion, rich in minerals, in fisheries, in lumber, in agriculture, in all the great potentialities that go to make a nation, and are we to be satisfied with our present railway accommodation? I do not believe it. With my hon. friend I believe that the government which grapples with this question with courage, recognizing the great future that awaits the maritime provinces, will commend itself to the best judgment not only to the people of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, but of the people of the whole Dominion of Canada. If it is necessary in order to build up our country that we should acquire branch lines, we ought to acquire them; if it is necessary in order to build up our country that we should build new lines, we ought to build them.

Mr. Speaker, I humbly submit that this question is one that interests us all as Canadians. Just as we in the maritime provinces are interested in building up the great Northwest, in assisting to build railroads through the Rocky mountains and to the Pacific coast, so may I ask the people of western Canada to be willing to assist us in the maritime provinces to have better railway facilities which will make those provinces blossom and bloom as the rose, and destroy for ever any feeling that may lurk in the hearts of our people that it would have been better for them if they had never come into confederation.

This resolution is along the right lines. We should acquire these branch lines, and we should extend the Intercolonial Railway into the western provinces and thus add one more link to the great chain of Canadian confederation. By building the Intercolonial into the province of Ontario we may hope to increase the interest of the people of that province in our national railway as a part of our transcontinental system. A few days ago I gave my humble support to the project of the Georgian bay canal, because I believed that it was along the right lines of Canadian policy. The whole future of this country depends on the

development of this Canadian idea. If we are satisfied to let our goods come through American ports, if we are satisfied to let the Canadian spirit die, then we are not worthy to become a great country, as I believe we are destined to be. The building of the Georgian bay canal means a greater interchange of products between the provinces of Canada, another great link in our transportation system from the west to the east. With the same thought in my heart that I had in regard to the Georgian bay canal, I commend to the consideration of this House and the country the extension of the Intercolonial Railway and the acquisition of the branch lines in the maritime provinces and in Quebec as feeders thereto.

Mr. GEORGE W. FOWLER (Kings, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, I wish, in the first place, to congratulate the hon. mover of this resolution upon the very fair and impartial manner in which he has presented it to the House. I also wish to congratulate him upon the magnificent peroration with which he closed his speech. I wish particularly to congratulate him upon that, from the fact that it contained a reference to that great statesman—Sir Charles Tupper—a reference of a most laudatory and commendatory character. The statesmanship of Sir Charles Tupper is now admitted by all, whether they be opponents or friends. No man in his active political life has received so much abuse as has that veteran statesman, but at last the people of this country, without regard to political affiliation, are beginning to understand the master mind of that great statesman, and I am glad that my hon. friend from Westmoreland has made here to-night the public profession of his faith in the statesmanship of Sir Charles Tupper.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have always spoken of him as I have spoken to-night, although I have not agreed with him in his policy.

Mr. FOWLER. All the more reason why the hon. member should be commended for the statement he has made. The matter we are discussing to-night is one of very great importance, not only in the maritime provinces but to the Dominion at large. For my own part, I am strongly in favour of the resolution—in favour of both parts of it—both that which relates to the acquisition of branch lines and that which relates to the extension of the Intercolonial westward through the province of Ontario, and for my part to the Pacific coast. I believe that trunk lines should always own their branch lines. No great railway has become a dividend payer without owning its branch lines; that is the history of railways throughout the world. On that ground alone, I think this proposition should meet with the favour of this House. Mr. Speaker, as the hour is late, with your permission, I will move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 4, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE SALE OF RAILWAY PASSENGER TICKETS.

Mr. J. D. REID moved the first reading of Bill (No. 90) to amend the Passenger Tickets Act. He said: This Bill consists of two clauses, which are as follows:—

The Passenger Tickets Act, chapter 38 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, is amended by inserting the following section immediately after section 7:

7a. Every railway company to which this Act applies shall at all its ticket offices, offer for sale first-class mileage tickets in books of five hundred and one thousand miles each, at a rate not exceeding two cents per mile; and every such book, or coupon therefrom, shall be accepted by the conductor on any passenger train of the company when presented by the person specified in the book in payment of his transportation.

7b. If the holder of a ticket over the line of any railway company inadvertently gets on the train of another railway company, starting from the same station and running to the same place, his ticket shall be valid on the said train, and the company accepting it shall be entitled to recover the cost thereof from the company by which it was sold.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY — DISPOSAL OF NORTHWEST TIMBER LIMITS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding: 'That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply,' and the proposed amendment of Mr. Lake thereto.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). Mr. Speaker, the debate upon the amendment to supply proposed by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) has presented some remarkable features. It must be apparent to the members of the House that hon. members on the government side in speaking on this subject have not given to the subject the careful consideration which its importance deserves. They have rather ignored the vital subjects involved in the resolution and have travelled in by-paths and endeavoured to divert the attention of the House and the judgment of the country into other

channels, into bygone days, anywhere away from the subject of this motion. I desire to adhere closely to the subject-matter of the motion so ably introduced by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), ably seconded by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), and supported by my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley). The resolution reads :

In the opinion of this House a committee of nine members should be appointed to investigate, inquire into and consider all matters connected with or relating to the alienation, granting, rental, leasing or other disposal by lease, license or otherwise, since the first day of July, 1908, of any timber lands, or timber berths forming part of the public lands of Canada, or of rights to the same, or to the timber thereon, and to report upon the matters aforesaid to this House, with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses on oath or affirmation.

What is the object of introducing a motion of that kind? The reasons given by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) are of a very cogent nature and the subject is of very grave importance to the people of Canada. The importance of preserving the public domain of Canada cannot be exaggerated. If, as has been alleged, through recklessness, through dishonest tendering, through scheming and collusion by members close to the ministry and other politicians, those who are, to use a vulgarism, 'in the know,' the policy of conservation of the public domain in the west has been departed from, surely it is a matter deserving the earnest consideration of the House and the granting of the proposal of my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake). The reasons advanced in support of this motion are not founded upon suspicion or upon mere rumour, as has been suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite, but upon facts which have been made apparent to this House and which have aroused the interests of the people of this country as nothing else has done for a long time past. The arguments in support of the motion have been ably presented to the House and I need not repeat them.

I shall content myself with setting forth what I believe should be the principles which should guide this government in dealing with the timber areas of Canada, which are of such vast importance to the present and future of the western country. First, in deciding upon the disposition of timber areas, regard should be had to the relative value of the limits, the quantity of the timber, its present and its future accessibility. These should be the first principles to which the government should have regard in dealing with these matters. Secondly, the administration should then decide whether it is desirable or necessary to dispose of the timber at all, that is, necessary in the interest of the people, because it must be manifest that to dispose of timber worth hundreds of thousands of dollars for a few hundred dollars, when, as we are told, the small amount of purchase money realized is not necessary to carry on the government, is not necessary for revenue purposes, is little short of the greatest extravagance which can be charged against any administration. Therefore it must be apparent that it is dangerous policy recklessly to dispose of large areas of territory where little value can be obtained for them. Then the administration should take the greatest precaution to protect the country from collusive and dishonest tendering in the disposal of timber areas. If regard be had for these principles then we can work out a policy which will conserve the resources of this country in respect of timber. In determining on a timber policy for this country, it would be destructive to the preservation of timber areas to offer them for sale in accessible or partly accessible places. That is a self-evident proposition. Where, as has been the case for many years past, and is to-day, timber areas are far removed from settlement, it is impossible to get for them a value anything like what that timber will possess when railways are built and the country is opened up, and there is an immediate demand for timber. Therefore, a proposition which can be safely laid down along the lines of the speeches of hon. gentlemen who have preceded me in supporting this motion, is that the premature disposition of timber limits means inadequate returns to the public for those limits.

It is not alone in Canada that interest has been taken in the timber resources of this country and in the policy that has been pursued, or rather I should say the lack of policy that has characterized the disposition of those areas. Last summer this country was visited by a gentleman from England, Mr. Keir Hardie, a member of the British House of Commons, who, on August 6, in Victoria, British Columbia, being interviewed, made this statement with regard to the situation as he saw it :

The condition of the workers in Canada is as far as I can see, about the limit of subsistence. Income and expenditure about balance, and it is my opeinion that the condition of the worker will become worse. The next generation will find a struggle for existence just as keen here as it is now in the old country, and I attribute this condition mainly to the present insane policy of allowing the public lands to be given to or acquired by speculators.

Now those are the words of a gentleman who is a careful observer of what he saw in Canada, and he has given to the country his views in a concrete form. His view is the principle involved in the motion now before this House. The timber at present in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatche-

wan is to a large extent removed from present means of accessibility, and if we consider what the prospects of the future are, if the present wanton distribution of timber areas amongst speculators is allowed to continue, you have to contemplate a state of things which does not augur well for the future prosperity of the Canadian people. We want to see these timber areas preserved, we want to see them dealt with in a manner which will benefit not only the Canada of to-day but the teeming millions that will inhabit that region fifty or a hundred years from now. We want to see a policy so administered that our children and our children's children will not be robbed of their rightful heritage. We are trustees of the people's possessions, and we should so handle them, we should so conserve the property of the people that generations in future will not rise up and condemn us for having been recreant to the trust which was reposed in us as public men, and will not heap anathema maranatha upon our names.

A great many instances have been put forward before this House showing a disposition of timber areas on the part of this government, unreasonable, unnecessary and extravagant, let alone a dishonest disposition. I am not going to elaborate upon what has been said, but I will shortly draw attention to a few cases which may interest this House. In the fall of 1900 limit 920 was put up at the request of one E. H. Moore, of Prince Albert. That limit was 50 square miles in extent, situated on the Carrot river. There were only two bids for that property, one was by a man named P. D. Tyreman for $512, another by Samuel Sanderson for $550 and the area was awarded to the highest bidder. Now this was subsequently acquired by Herman Finger of Port Arthur. Herman Finger then bid upon limit 1267 which was in reality the second choice of limit 902. This limit contained 34 square miles and Herman Finger bid $5,000 for the second choice of a limit which was sold in 1900, the previous year, for $550, or $11 per square mile. The result of that was that another bid, that of one McCracken, who, it was supposed, was representing one W. Anderson, came in for $6,870. McCracken was the fortunate purchaser. But, let us see the difference. In 1900 limit 970 was sold for $550 and two years afterwards the second choice of that same limit was put up and the sum of $8,670 was realized for it. That again shows that the more accessible the timber areas become the greater the value to this country if it is advisable to sell them at all.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the area of selection ?

Mr. BOYCE. There were seventy-five townships and there was a selection of four blocks out of that area. The average bonus for 1267 works out to $320 per mile as against $11 per mile. On May 18, 1906, tenders were opened for limit 1265 containing fourteen miles. Herman Finger of Port Arthur offered for this limit through C. R. Smith of Wisconsin the modest sum of $200, but McCracken offered $3,584 and got the limit. Again Finger applied for limit 1275, an area of forty miles. It was apparent that by this time he had realized that this timber was of very great value and he bid the sum of $15,000, a large bid, comparatively speaking, as compared with previous bids. But, there was a gentleman named W. Anderson, and we shall have something further to say about him later on—his name has already been referred to by my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames)—and Anderson evidently had such a very close estimate of the value of this timber that by a bid of $15,050 he was able to secure the limit. I am not suggesting that there was anything dishonest in Mr. Anderson's bid of that amount but to a man of ordinary business understanding it does, Mr. Speaker, appear to be somewhat peculiar, somewhat significant and possibly a cause for some slight suspicion that where, after the bidding had gone up not exceeding $6,870 where Mr. Anderson had participated in the bidding and Mr. Finger had been an active competitor, that where Mr. Finger bid $15,000, or over $7,000 better, 100 per cent more, Anderson was still able to top his bid by the little sum of $50. For berth No. 1237 Mr. Anderson only bid $550 for five square miles. I am informed that Finger then desired to purchase berths Nos. 1237, 1267 and 1275 and his offer for these limits was the sum of $65,000. He offered this sum to Anderson, who at that time owned these limits either himself or jointly with others, or merged in a corporation. The cost of these limits—$550, $8,670 and $15,050 respectively—was $24,270, so that there was a substantial profit to Mr. Anderson if he was desiring to make a good return upon his money. But, Sir, that offer was refused. Limit 1274 was offered for sale and it will be seen how the bidding increased when I tell you that R. E. McCracken bid $7,735, Murphy and Stewart $9,005, and Finger $10,000 and got the limit. It contained twelve blocks of thirty-five square miles. For berth 965, one Thomas Mackie, I believe at that time a member of this House, on tendering for five blocks of twenty-five square miles, the time of tendering being only forty-five days, was able to secure the limit for $1,510. Berth 921 containing fifty square miles of ten blocks, was bought by Herman Finger for $550. Herman Finger bid for and tried to get berths 1265, 1267, 1274, 1275, but got only 1274 at $10,000.

On the question of these bonuses I have this to say along the lines of the principle which I will endeavour to make clear that

premature disposal means inadequate returns, and that the opening of the western country vastly and enormously increases the value of these timber limits. This is proved to a demonstration and the hon. members of this House who have been interested in these timber limits, the owners of them who bought them, know that what I say is true. Take, for instance those timber limits which were tributary to the Canadian Northern railway through the Dauphin country. The Canadian Northern was under construction during 1900. By 1901 it had reached a place called Erwood, in 1904 it had reached Milfort and in 1905 it was into Prince Albert. Each mile of construction of that line necessarily opened up and made more valuable the timber which was tributary thereto and those who could appreciate the effect of the opening up of the country by that railway must necessarily have known how the value of these timber limits would increase. In 1901 the average bonus paid in the Dauphin country for timber limits was $125 per mile.

In 1903, as railway construction progressed, as the country became settled and as the demand for timber became greater the average bonus paid for timber was $325 per square mile. In 1905 there had been such a demand for timber limits in that country and the government had been so lavish in offering them for sale that as I understand there was only one good timber limit left and that went to the Red Deer Lumber Company at a bonus at the rate of $718 per square mile. You therefore have the fact that the bonus increased enormously with the opening up of the country. But, had these limits been conserved, were these timber areas in possession of the government, I venture to assert the bonus would average at the present time $1,000 per square mile, which emphasises the principle that accessibility creates the value of the timber and increases the bonus. In 1903 the average bonus along the Prince Albert line of the Canadian Northern Railway was $325 per square mile due to the opening up of that country by a railway. Other railway lines were then under construction, many others were rejected and it must have been within the ken of the gentlemen administering the affairs of the Interior Department that with the construction of these railways mile by mile into areas previously inaccessible the ratio of increase in the value of lumber would be very great indeed. But, were those who administered the affairs of the department guided by any wise policy founded on ordinary honest judgment ? No. Take the fact that during that year in accessible areas which would be subsequently opened up by railways but which were then not so opened up, in areas where there was no demand for timber, where it would be a great expense to get out the timber at that time, the government disposed of limits No. 1107 on Cedar lake at $550 per square mile; limit No. 1108 on Moose lake at $75 per square mile; limit No. 1171 on Cormorant lake at $3 per square mile; and limits on the Smoky river at $10 per square mile. Since that time these limits have become accessible and their value has very greatly increased to the speculators who bought them, and who knew perfectly well when they tendered for them and when the government allowed them to tender for them that they would be increased enormously in value within a very short time. It is not a wild estimate to make that if these same limits were to-day owned by the government of Canada $500 per square mile would not be an outrageous price for them, and the difference would go into the treasury of this country for the benefit of the people of the country. On the northern Saskatchewan above Edmonton we have the fact that in November, 1902, limit No. 1031 containing 118 miles was put up and $31,575 or an average bonus of $167 per square mile was realized for it. One would naturally say this was a fair value but that is a question which depends entirely upon the accessibility of the limit and the demand for the lumber on it. In December, 1903, on branches of the Saskatchewan higher up, and in regard to limits which were not so accessible and which were in fact almost inaccessible, we find limit No. 1118 containing 100 square miles disposed of for a bonus of $500; limit No. 1119 containing 20 square miles disposed of for a bonus of $600; limit No. 1097 containing 20 square miles disposed of for a bonus of $1,000; limit 1098, containing 40 square miles, disposed of for a bonus of $2,500, or a total of 180 square miles of timber disposed of for $4,600 or an average of $25.50 per square mile. Now, Sir, I assert that the timber contained in those last four limits was equally as valuable as the timber which was sold for $31,757. It was not the intrinsic value of the timber itself which brought the higher price; it was the proximity of the timber to the market and the demand for it by settlers which fixed the enhanced price. If those four lots which I have last mentioned were held by the government to-day the immense increase in their value would have enured to the benefit of the people of Canada, and it would have gone, not to the speculator, not to the gentleman who is watching railway maps and railway Bills and who is possibly a promoter of railway companies and who buys a limit with the idea that when the railway is constructed the timber would be of immense value; the increment of value I say would not have gone to him but it would go to the people of Canada to whom it belongs. It has been pointed out by the hon. member for St. Antoine the purchases of limits may be divided into three classes : 1, what might be called operative holdings, those which were

actually used for lumber operations and the lumber on which was absolutely necessary for the settlers; 2, reserved limits or semi-speculative limits which would include such areas as might ordinarily be expected to be required having reasonable regard for the future demand under existing conditions, and 3, purely speculative purchases, being limits purchased with the idea that their value would considerably increase and that the increment of value would go to the speculator and not to the people of the country.

Under the first heading we find that berth No. 571a, containing 23¾ miles, berth No. 986, containing 50 square miles, and berth No. 1120, containing 15 square miles, or a total of 94 square miles, which are estimated to contain over 100,000,000 feet of standing timber after a great deal has been cut off, would be worth on an average $2,100 per mile. Under the second heading, the semi-speculative holdings or reserve limits, we have a large number. Berth No. 814, acquired in 1898, 15 square miles, at a bonus of $1,500; berth No. 992, acquired in 1901, 40 square miles, at a bonus of $1,502—I wonder who bid the $1,501; berth No. 1000, 5 square miles, at a bonus of $625; berth No. 1001, 6 square miles, at a bonus of $1,003; berth No. 1002, also acquired in 1902, 4 square miles, at a bonus of $640; in 1903, berth No. 1047, 50 square miles, at a bonus of $15,000; berth No. 1054, one square mile, at a bonus of $100; berth No. 1073, 20 square miles, at a bonus of $2,700. These make a total of 141 square miles, which were disposed of for $23,470. I am told, Sir, and I give my information to the House for what it is worth—hon. gentlemen opposite who are more capable of judging of the value of these limits than I am will correct me if I am wrong—that a very conservative valuation of these limits to-day puts them as worth $300,000, and the hon. gentleman who holds them would not be well advised to sell them at that figure. The next class is the speculative limits, and we find that in 1903 berth No. 1046 on the Pembina river, 40 square miles, was sold for $3,500; berth No. 1068, also on the Pembina river, 5¼ square miles, was sold for $400; berth No. 1093, on the Macleod river, on the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, 12 square miles, was sold for $1,500; berth No. 1094, on the same river, 27 square miles, was sold for $2,500; berth No. 1099, on the Athabaska river, on the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific 44 square miles, was sold for $6,500; berth No. 1191, on the Pembina river, 50 square miles, was sold for $1,075; berth No. 1192, on the Pembina river, 50 square miles, was sold for $5,500; making a total of 228 square miles at a bonus of $20,975, or an average of $92 per square mile. For the operative holdings we find that the hon. gentleman paid $2,100 per square mile on the average; that is, for timber that was actually necessary. For the second class, reserved limits, we find that he paid on the average about $170 per square mile. For the speculative holdings we find that he paid $92 per square mile. It is easy to see the difference between these three classifications. The first class were limits which were necessary, which were in operation. The second class were semi-speculative, from which very much less per square mile was realized. The third class were purely speculative, the value of which to-day might be enormously increased, and for these very much less per square mile was realized, demonstrating beyond a doubt that the policy of the government has been entirely and extravagantly wrong in allowing speculative sales to be made of timber on these areas.

The next essential of a policy of dealing with timber areas is probity in administering the policy of the government as it stands. If the policy of the government was wrong, if it did not bring to the people of this country the revenues that it might have been expected to bring, if it was extravagant and non-conservative, if it did not look sufficiently to the conservation of the timber areas for the future of Canada, yet if it was honestly administered, there would be a great deal to say with regard to the administration that was carrying out that policy. But, Sir, if added to the extravagance of the policy, a policy which would dissipate the resources of this country, you have absolute dishonesty, collusion and trickery mixed up in the administration of that policy, then you have a state of things which is deplorable, and which would justify the Canadian people in rising in their might and condemning it as a whole. Charges have been made and very cogent reasons advanced by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) in support of the motion which he has made. My hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) has ably amplified those reasons with other reasons and facts, which have been brought home so closely that I have yet to hear a reasonable argument offered against them. We have been told that areas have been given away under conditions which have prohibited competition.

What is the object of tendering at all, if there is to be no competition allowed? And there cannot possibly be competition when the time between the sending out of the advertisements and the receipt of tenders is utterly inadequate to give opportunity, except to those who are on the inside, to examine and estimate the value of the limits offered for sale. That condition of things is not denied by the government or their friends. Very grave charges have been made and made repeatedly in this House implicating members of the government and some of their supporters, and we have had no reply to these charges. We have had

no defense made by the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). I cannot say that I blame him for refraining from speaking. He was not in office when these things were done, and I do not suppose there is any one who knows more about the dishonesty of these transactions than does the hon. minister. No wonder therefore he remains silent and prefers to let those who consummated or winked at these transactions make what explanation they can. But there is an hon. gentleman opposite more active and more interested in the debate than is the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). That hon. gentleman has been very assiduous in his attendance during this debate and the debate which preceded it and which caused the government to at last bring down the original papers demanded. This House has been more than usually honoured with the presence of the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). That hon. gentleman has taken a keen interest in this discussion. He has been going from one side of the House to the other, gathering up the threads of the debate. I wonder whether he will be able to give any reasonable explanation in reply to the charge brought against the government of so handling the timber limits of the northwest as to benefit their particular friends.

On the 13th of January last application was made by the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) for certain original papers. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) opposed the motion and so did the right hon. the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and they called upon their followers to vote it down. In his speech in reply to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the right hon. gentleman said that such a motion was unprecedented. Yet I find that in the year 1906 this House, without discussion, agreed to a motion for the production of original tenders for timber berths from the Department of the Interior. And I find that, when those original tenders were not brought down, a discussion took place in May of the same year in this House. I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman was here or not, but the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) said he would bring the papers down. Whether he ever did so or not, I do not know, but I wish to point out the extraordinary contradiction between the House agreeing, without discussion, to order certain original tenders and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) then promising to bring them down and the statement of the right hon. gentleman in this House when he called on his followers to vote down a motion for original papers on the ground that such a motion was unprecedented. In 1906, 'Hansard', volume 1, page 73, March 28th, you will find among the motions agreed to without discussion a motion for a return :

Showing the original tenders received by the Department of the Interior in connection with the leasing of timber berths Nos. 1158, 1175, 1192, 1219, 1231 and 1232, during 1904-5; with copies of all correspondence in reference thereto, had with the Minister of the Interior, the department itself, or any officer thereof; and the various transfers, if any, made of the leases after they were granted to the successful tenderers, giving name of transferee and date of transfer, in each case. —Mr. Foster.

Again, in the same year, page 3578 of 'Hansard,' we find my hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) saying :

While we are talking on this question, there is one matter which I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). On the 28th March, Mr. Foster moved for a return asking for certain original tenders.

And a discussion taking place as to whether the order of the House had been complied with finally the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) said :

There is no difficulty whatever. If the hon. gentleman insists, he shall have the original documents.

That statement was clear enough. The minister had no hesitation in promising the documents, if the hon. gentleman insisted on having them. How are we to account for the change that has come over the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and the right hon. the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) since then ? When the motion for the original papers in question came up on the 13th of January, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) read a letter from his deputy, dated a month before the motion was argued. The last paragraph of this letter reads :

With regard to these papers, therefore, I would strongly urge that any attempt to compel the department to produce the same should be resisted.

And the right hon. gentleman supported that by saying that the motion was unprecedented and contrary to the rules of parliament. He did not say that in 1906, he did not say that when his minister said that the papers could be brought down, and the 'Hansard' of 1906 shows that the right hon. gentleman was in the House when the discussion took place. What was the reason for this strange change of position? Why does the Minister of the Interior in one year say : You shall have the original documents ; and then with regard to these particular documents say : You shall not have them ; my deputy says that no matter what reasons you urge you shall not have access to these original documents. So the farce goes on. The right hon. gentleman called upon his majority to vote down the motion. I note with interest that upon the vote the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), although he was not present and did not vote, was paired, which indicated that had he been present he would have

voted to suppress the document. My hon. friend shakes his head.

Mr. TURRIFF. I do not remember ever being paired in my life on a vote ; possibly I was.

Mr. BOYCE. I must refer to 'Hansard' to show my hon. friend that I am right.

Mr. TURRIFF. Possibly you are right ; I do not remember.

Mr. BOYCE. I know my hon. friend will accept my word for it. I might also say that the hon. members for Dauphin, Humboldt and Brandon were neither paired nor voted.

On the 21st of January this year a motion was made by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), to which the right hon. gentleman acceded ; and on January 23 my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) moved with regard to those documents that

> Subject to such considerations of public policy as can be validly urged in any case, members of parliament have the right to have access to all the records of the government and to all the archives.

The very words of the Prime Minister of this country in debate in this House upon that very subject, at page 1685 of 'Hansard' of January 21, 1908. It was voted down, and I notice that my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) was then in the House and voted against that resolution, and the hon. members for Dauphin and Brandon voted in the same way.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will note that he is rather referring to a past debate than confining his remarks to the amendment under discussion.

Mr. BOYCE. I may have offended in some little respects ; it has been done by other hon. gentlemen in this House without any comment, Mr. Speaker ; and I would crave the indulgence of the House just for a few minutes.

It will be seen that the difficulty in obtaining these documents was not one of a very serious character, so far as any constitutional question was concerned. Eventually the documents were brought down and laid upon the table of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member should take notice of the fact that he is really referring to a past debate, and not debating the amendment under discussion.

Mr. BOYCE. I was referring to the fact that certain papers had been brought down by the right hon. gentleman and were now before the House ; and upon these original documents being produced, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) made certain statements in the House and made a motion for an inquiry. The hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) advanced very strong and cogent reasons why the inquiry should be made. Some of those reasons seemed to touch some hon. members on the other side on the raw, because I noticed that immediately after the hon. gentleman had sat down, after being subjected to frequent interruptions, the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) indulged in a violent speech.

Mr. TURRIFF. Oh.

Mr. BOYCE. I shall not offend again by referring to a debate of the present session. The hon. gentleman commences his speech by suggesting that charges should be made, and that the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) or the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) should take what the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) conceived to be the manly course and make charges. I have both listened to and read the speeches of the hon. members for Qu-'Appelle (Mr. Lake) and for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames), and I must confess that if the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) wants charges he has enough of them in those speeches to last a lifetime —and possibly it may take him a lifetime to get rid of some of them. But why does the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) take to himself these charges ? There were no charges against him; there were no charges against any member of this House; I do not know that his name was mentioned, except as an official of the Department of the Interior. Then why is he so sensitive? What was done when he was Commissioner of Lands in the Department of the Interior? Is he going to claim in this House privileges as a member of parliament for himself when he was a public official employed by this country? My hon. friend shakes his head as if he does not claim that privilege ; but he did so, or else I fail to understand the English language. What my hon. friend said is :

> I stand here representing the department——

Mr. TURRIFF. Read on.

Mr. BOYCE (reading) :

> —at that time.

Mr. TURRIFF. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOYCE. That is as a member of parliament representing an official of the department at the time that the scandalous transactions took place. He continued :

> If there was anything wrong in the action of the department I am the man who was responsible, and if he thinks there has been anything wrong on my part or on the part of the department in connection with these tenders, I declare in the most emphatic and flat-footed manner possible that it is absolutely false, and I now challenge the hon. gentleman or any other hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House to take the manly course for once, to stop insinuating and to rise in his place and to make a charge.

Bearing in mind the fact that in the course of the speech introducing this motion the hon. member for Qu'Appelle stated, and supported his statement from 'Hansard,' that the hon. gentleman occupying the office of Commissioner of Dominion Lands in the Department of the Interior was the gentleman who alone, behind a closed door, in his office in that department, was responsible for the opening of these tenders. It was charged inferentially that there was dishonesty in opening the tenders, it was charged that a spurious tender, which upon its face was not an honest tender, had been put in; it was charged that the tender for $1,000 and another tender for $7,000 had been straddled, so to speak; and those coming under the exclusive domain of the hon. member for Assiniboia when he was Commissioner of Dominion Lands, does he think that his words uttered here will exonerate him from suspicion, and that the course he has taken to shield himself will relieve him from the grave reflections upon his administration as an official of the Department of the Interior? All he says is, Stop making insinuations, come out and make a charge. Make a charge, against whom? When I want to make a charge against an official of the Department of the Interior, have I got to formulate a specific complaint, and does the fact that the hon. gentleman now holds a seat in parliament as a representative of the people exonerate him from any blame which would be visited upon him otherwise as an official of the department? Why is the hon. gentleman so supersensitive about this transaction? Why does he say, Stop insinuating? The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) did not insinuate, he made distinct charges, he referred to original papers, he had himself seen those papers, they came under his direct notice, I have seen them and many hon. gentlemen around me have seen them, and I say that any man possessing a pair of eyes in his head and a brain capable of reasoning, can only come to the conclusion that has been come to by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle and the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), and which they gave to this House, namely, that one of these tenders at least was a spurious and improper tender. Did the man who opened these tenders know it? The man who opened these tenders is sitting in this House as the member for East Assiniboia, he saw those tenders, as other hon. gentlemen have seen them, their physical appearance has not changed, and could he not have seen that the handwriting of two of the tenders was the same? Could he not—oh, the hon. gentleman nods his head, he could see that one hand had written the two tenders. Could he not see that one of those tenders had been left blank as to the amount, and it was filled up with a sum seven times greater than the original tender, that they were both put into similar envelopes by the same hand, and by the same solicitor? Did he notice that and if he did notice those things as an official of the Department of the Interior, and if they were so absolutely, suspicious, does he not think that it is due to this House that a better explanation should be given than he has given?—namely, that hon. gentlemen on this side are merely throwing a taunt across the floor of the House, are merely making insinuations, and that he was absolutely without fault? We say that these original documents contain upon their face evidence of such a character as to demand from the government an investigation. My hon. friend from East Assiniboia is a man of keen business perceptions, and I doubt not that if he did his duty he scrutinized these tenders. I ask him if he did notice anything in them at that time which excited his suspicion, and if he did, did he consult his minister, did he consult the deputy minister, did he consult anybody with regard to these tenders? Or did he simply let them go in for what they were worth, and award the land to the bidder who put in what must have appeared to him, if he used his eyes and his intelligence, as a spurious, or at any rate, a highly suspicious tender? Now did he do that, or was he so wilfully blind that he would not see, and did not care to see, that the $7,000 tender was in a different ink and had been filled in very recently, and very recently blotted, though it was in the same handwriting as the tender for $1,000? Did these features of the tenders present themselves to the hon. gentleman when he was Commissioner of Dominion Lands?

I say therefore it is due to this House that the hon. gentleman should explain his conduct, and I say that he has not acquitted himself as we had a right to expect under these circumstances. Let us now see what the speeches of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley), and the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. McCarthy), bring against the hon. member for East Assiniboia with regard to his acts as Commissioner of Dominion Lands. The charge involved a grave malfeasance of office on the part of the hon. gentleman. All these hon. gentlemen, in their speeches, made upon their responsibility as members of this House, have cast upon him grave suspicion of, firstly, having entered into collusion with those bidders, secondly, of being privy to spurious tenders, so apparent on their face, thirdly, of permitting a blank tender to be put in and filled up in his department, and fourthly, permitting these tenders to be fraudulently filled up in his department.

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) is doing just what I complained of

before, he is insinuating, and I ask him to make his charges. I want to say again that it was not my business to act as a detective in regard to those tenders. I opened the tenders as they came to me, they came to me as sealed tenders, and I have nothing to do with the question of whether one tender or half a dozen tenders were written in the same handwriting. I do not remember at this date—this was three or four years ago—whether I noticed it or not. I opened these tenders as they came to me, I opened them in a perfectly straight and honest manner ; and any insinuations the hon. member may make that I was in collusion with any one who put in tenders, or if they were blank tenders that they were filled up after they came to me, I say is absolutely false, and I ask him again to make his charges.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman is getting unnecessarily warm. He seems to have misconceived his position. I repeat that the speeches of those hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in support of this motion, have cast upon him a grave suspicion, and no matter how vehemently he may deny their statements, until he clears the suspicion, or until the right hon. gentleman grants a commission and the suspicion is cleared up by incontrovertible evidence, he must continue to lie under that suspicion in the minds of everybody in this country.

The hon. gentleman may speak about not being a detective but I tell you, Sir, that there was a gentleman in the province of Ontario who, just before the landslide that overwhelmed the Liberal party in 1905, told the people of Algoma on the public platform that he was not a policeman. That gentleman had brought to his notice a political crime of great enormity and he took exactly the same course that the hon. gentleman, when he was commissioner of Dominion lands took, namely, that of shrugging his shoulders and saying : What have I to do with it ? I am not a policeman. This hon. gentleman seemed to think that 'detective' would be the proper word and he said that he was not a detective. I charge the hon. gentleman, and I say without fear of contradiction, as a proposition, that, as Dominion lands commissioner, as an official discharging a public duty to this country, concerning the rights of the people to the public domain, it was his first duty to be a detective, to be a policeman and to guard the interests of the people. If there was, in his judgment, anything in the tenders which was calculated to arouse suspicion, why did he not refer it to his minister ? If he did not refer it to his minister, he did not do his duty as a commissioner of Dominion lands. He admits now that he did not do his duty when he says that he was not a detective ; that is he did not detect the spurious nature of these tenders. He has said everything to justify the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in granting just exactly what is asked. The hon. gentleman, speaking as an official of the past in the Department of the Interior, he has said enough to make it imperative, in order to clear himself and to clear those associated with him in the department, his deputy minister, Mr. J. A. Smart, and his minister, the Hon. Clifford Sifton, from any implication of this nature, that the government must yield to the demand of this motion and grant the commission that is asked for. What does the hon. gentleman say ? Without any further explanation of these grave charges which have been brought against him he simply says : Bring along your charges ; stop insinuating ; I am not guilty. But, what further does he say ? In the first place he speaks as a past commissioner of Dominion lands and then, as the hon. member for Assiniboia, he starts into an elaborate attack upon the party on this side of the House in regard to its method of dealing with timber limits. I am not going to touch upon that. The hon. gentleman need not be afraid that I am going to prolong my remarks, but I simply state that it evidenced the desire on the part of the hon. gentleman to get away from an unpleasant subject as quickly as possible and to get into something that would be more palatable to him. With the documents in the shape that they are, with the transactions of the department in regard to dealing with the public domain laid bare to the light of day and with the hon. member for Assiniboia rising in his place and admitting enough to make this motion imperative, will the right hon. First Minister acquiesce in our demand and grant an inquiry ? Will the right hon. gentleman be courageous enough, honest enough to be bold and bold enough to be honest, in the language of the premier of Ontario, to grant an investigation, to let the light of day into the Department of the Interior, to turn up these particular tenders and to see whether there has been a gang plundering the public domain by spurious methods and whether there has been a combination which has proven subversive of the interests of the country ? Will the right hon. gentleman rise to that height ? Will he throw wide open the door and grant this commission, or will he stand in front of the door, as he endeavoured to stand when we demanded these original documents which throw such a flood of light upon this question, and block the way that the people demand shall be made clear. Will he stand in the way still and obstruct an investigation, raise technicalities and difficulties of a parliamentary or constitutional nature from his point of view, or will he yield to what he must know is the feeling of an aroused people ? Will he realize that to do that any further would be to sacrifice the highest interests

of the people, their right to an investigation, their right to an honest government, their right to an honest administration of the departments of the government and their right to know if there are dishonest men in these departments or if the departments of the government are being operated by a gang of political thugs and thieves. Scandals, in regard to the Department of the Interior have penetrated beyond the confines of Canada. They have been often enough ventilated in this House and they have been often enough brought to the attention of the right hon. gentleman, but with very little sympathy from him. These scandals have become so enormous that they have gone across the ocean. They have got to England and here is what the London 'Economist' says as late as November 9 last. Speaking of the right hon. gentleman and speaking of him as Prime Minister the 'Economist' says :

> The worst his opponents can allege is that he has been remiss in not ordering an inquiry into the Interior Department and not dismissing those about him who make a vulgar display of riches, acquired no one knows how, unless by official malversation on a grand scale.

That is what Englishmen are saying today in regard to the right hon. gentleman's position. Will he continue to remain under that insinuation ? It is a dark blot upon the right hon. gentleman's career and it is a darker blot upon the name of Canada that such things should be permitted.

There were several remarks made in this debate all to the same effect and all tending to divert attention from the motion which is before you, Mr. Speaker, and which you will be called upon shortly to put to the House. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) made a speech on Friday night and I am sorry that the hon. gentleman was very specious in his argument in regard to what was involved in this motion. I grieve to say that the hon. gentleman referred to the charges which had been made on the floor of this House, charges so grave and charges so abundantly proven, prima facie by the documents themselves, as rumours, spoke about Mrs. Grundy and said that my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) owed the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) an apology. An apology, forsooth—an apology to the hon. member for Daphin, who undoubtedly has profited very considerably by his transactions in these timber limits. But let me say to my hon. friend from South Grey that if the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House confined themselves to rumours we might ask a great many questions in regard to the rumours that we hear. We hear rumours in regard to what has taken place in connection with the Department of the Interior. We hear rumours of men sitting in this House forming themselves into corporations, and we hear rumours that timber limits acquired by Mr. A. W. Fraser and others get somehow into the hands or under the names of these corporations in a very mysterious manner. We hear rumours of gentlemen being concerned in the North Atlantic Trading Company. We hear rumours that if the light of inquiry is cast upon that company there will be suicides. I wonder if there would be suicides if any one were curious enough to insist upon all the books and all the papers of the Imperial Pulp Company and the Spruce Lumber Company being produced before a special committee of this House. Perhaps there have been already moral suicides, but I wonder if political or other suicides would follow that event. I wonder whether my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) ever heard of the rumour that when Mr. Smart was deputy minister of the Interior he burned certain documents rather than have them brought before a committee for investigation. I wonder if the hon. gentleman knows that when Mr. Smart was deputy minister of the Interior and while he was commissioner of Dominion lands, Mr. Smart swore that he burned certain documents relating to the North Atlantic Trading company.

Mr. MILLER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) whether Mr. Smart ever declared at any time or in any place that he had ever burned any single public document relating to the North Atlantic Trading Company.

Mr. BOYCE. I will answer your question. Mr. Smart on his oath stated that there were certain letter books which contained letters referring to the North Atlantic Trading Company which were public property and that he burned them.

Mr. MILER. I would like to ask another question, and that is whether if the hon. gentleman was present he does not remember that Mr. Smart distinctly said that anything he had burned was absolutely not a public document in any way relating to public matters, but was private correspondence.

Mr. BOYCE. I cannot agree with my hon. friend in that.

Mr. MILLER. I remember that quite distinctly.

Mr. BOYCE. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman in that statement, but possibly the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) as he himself stated in his speech the other night, is suffering from a disordered digestion. Anyway, why if Mr. Smart burned his private letter book, should he feel that such an explanation as that was due to a committee of this House. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen on the other side have given not a single reasonable cogent explanation of this transaction. The methods under this gov-

ernment by which the public lands of this country have been gotten hold of by fraudulent tenders and by collusion have been shown, and yet not a man on the other side of the House has offered the slightest explanation, reasonable or unreasonable, except that they ask us to believe the hypothesis that Mr. Fraser went to the bank with a blank tender, and that when he was at the bank he may have filled in this tender with the amount at the same time filling up the cheque as the ink on the tender and on the cheque is the same. But did the hon. member for East Assiniboia take any trouble to advance that as a theory on his own behalf ? Oh, no, the hon. gentleman from Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre) puts that forward merely as a supposition. But, there sits the man who can give the explanation if he wants to ; there sits the man who is charged with the duty of giving the explanation and he remains silent. He gives no explanation as to the kernel and the crux of the whole case, but he is content to hurl taunts of derision with regard to the manner, forsooth, in which this motion is presented. Well, Sir, I have only this to say : That this country will no longer tolerate obstruction by the government into inquiry as to these matters ; that the eyes of the country are upon the right hon. the Prime Minister to-day, and that if he calls upon his followers to vote this motion down he will at the same time call on the people of Canada to vote want of confidence in him. The right hon. gentleman has gone to the limit of endurance in these matters, and I suggest to him with the respect which is due to him from me and from any other member of this House, that he dare not any longer obstruct the will of the majority of the people of this country. The men of this country, honest, God-fearing Canadians who want to see honest administration and who will not endorse crookedness, collusion and robbery, will insist and do insist that these matters shall be cleared up and that the light of day shall be let in on these transactions. It is only by such a course that the right hon. gentleman can satisfy the country. I know whereof I speak, I am not speaking wildly. I know that the people of this country are aroused and that they insist upon inquiry. They have viewed with a great deal of suspicion the attitude of the right hon. gentleman in obstructing the production of the original papers and that suspicion has been confirmed by what the papers were seen to contain when they were brought down. There must be an inquiry. We must have the timber of this country preserved for the people of the country to-day and for the people who will inhabit the country in the future. Timber is a most important asset of that western country. We have the land, we have other resources, but if we have not timber in that country its absence will entail great expense upon the settlers. And when the settler in the future comes to find that the natural timber resources of the country have been squandered during these years, he will be reminded of the good old British maxim : 'What we have we'll hold,' and he will feel that the Liberal government of to-day in their policy of disposing of these timber limits, changed that good old British maxim so as to conform with the modern Liberal doctrine : 'What we had we've sold.'

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). There is one expression used by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) with which the House will agree, and that is, that this discussion has become a farce. I don't think there is anything in parliament to compare with it and there is probably nothing on the records to compare with it except the celebrated case of Bardwell vs. Pickwick.

Mr. BENNETT. This case won't last as long as that.

Mr. OLIVER. We have had the benefit of the opinions of our friends on the other side for a matter of two days debate. The government has been attacked in its policy and its administration and the country has been informed that under that policy and administration its resources have been squandered and its treasury has been robbed. Would it be out of place to say that our friends on the other side have assumed a policy to exist which has not existed in connection with the administration of the timber resources of this country for a matter of twenty-five years ? They have assumed that the timber resources of the country are administered by the government under a policy of revenue from the sale of standing timber.

Now, our friends opposite know, as everybody who gives any attention to the matter must know, that for a period of twenty-five years under the late administration and under the present administration, the policy of that government and of this government, in administering the timber of the country, has been to secure the development of a lumbering industry, and not to secure a price for the standing timber. It is true, the late government did, in 1879, embody in the Dominion Lands Act a provision which contemplated dealing with the timber resources of the country from the standpoint of a revenue from the sale of standing timber. That Act provided in good fair terms, for the setting apart of timber lands, for the sale of the timber in competition, for the payment of a bonus, and generally contemplated regulations looking to a revenue to be derived from the sale of the timber resources of the country. That was the policy that prevailed at that time in eastern Canada, and I presume that the

government thought that what was good in eastern Canada must necessarily be good in western Canada ; so the policy of eastern Canada was adopted by them for western Canada. But the conditions were different. The conditions prevailing in western Canada at the time that Act was passed resembled the conditions which prevailed in eastern Canada many years before, to which the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) and the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) alluded during their remarks. There was need of securing the investment of capital in the lumbering industry in order that the standing timber might be turned into lumber for the use of the people of the country at a reasonable price. They found that the policy which was a sound and good policy under the conditions prevailing in eastern Canada was not a sound and good policy in the conditions prevailing in western Canada ; and we find that in 1881 they abandoned the attempt to raise a revenue from the sale of standing timber, becoming satisfied that that was not a practicable policy. I will take the liberty of reading just what they say in the regulations of May 18, 1881 :

With a view to encouraging settlement by cheapening the cost of building material, the government reserves the right to grant from time to time leases or licenses, as the case may be, under and in accordance with the provisions in that behalf from time to time of the Dominion Lands Act, to cut merchantable timber on any lands owned by it; and settlement upon or sale of lands within the territory covered by such license shall, for the time being, be subject to the operation of such leases or licenses.

In the regulations of November 11, 1881, the following conditions are made : that the licensee shall pay a ground rent of $5 per square mile ; that the licensee shall also pay a royalty of 5 per cent on the sale of all products of the berth ; that where two or more parties apply for a license for the same timber limit, their competitive tender shall be invited, and the one offering the highest sum in addition to the annual ground rent shall be granted the berth ; and that there shall be a renewal of the license for a year in case the licensee has fully complied with the conditions, and no portion of the berth is required for settlement or other public purposes. That is to say, the government found that the policy of undertaking to derive a revenue from the sale of the standing timber did not conduce to the welfare and progress and settlement of the country, and they abandoned it and deliberately adopted the principle—to quote the words of our hon. friends opposite—of 'handing over as a free gift' valuable areas of timber to those who would operate those areas and turn the timber into lumber for the benefit of the people, so that it could be bought by settlers.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. BRISTOL. What provision did they make that the persons to whom they handed them would operate them ?

Mr. OLIVER. They provided that the license should contain a requirement that a mill should be operated before a certain date.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. How long ?

Mr. OLIVER. Within a year after the date fixed in the license.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. For how long a time in the year ?

Mr. OLIVER. For six months, and it was to have a capacity of ten thousand feet a day. The policy has been the same under the late government and under this government. It has been altered in detail, but the principle has remained the same.

Mr. BRISTOL. When was the provision made with regard to the mill dispensed with ?

Mr. OLIVER. The regulation as regards the mill remains practically the same today as it was then. There was a slight change made, however, the mill instead of being required to be erected within one year after year the license was given, to be erected within one year after notice was given.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. Has notice been given yet ?

Mr. OLIVER. Notices have been given. What I want to point out is that in policy and in principle the same conditions of dealing with timber have prevailed for twenty-five years. And those conditions were found to be necessary by our hon. friends opposite. They had to abandon of their own motion the position they first took, that the standing timber should be a source of revenue to the country.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. How many of the holders of the timber limits in question have been notified to put up a mill ?

Mr. OLIVER. I wish, Mr. Speaker, to make a consecutive statement without prejudice, at this stage of my remarks, at any rate, so that we may get a fair understanding of the merits of the case. But my hon. friend has interjected a question, and I can only say to him, if I speak the truth, that the provision in regard to the erection of a mill within a year from the issue of the license, was absolutely ignored by the government which he supported.

That provision was never enforced, so far as I am aware, and later on it was changed by this government. Instead of allowing it to remain as a dead letter in the license, we had it changed so that the licensee would be required to erect a mill one year after he received notice.

Mr. AVERY. What date was that changed ?

Mr. HAGGART. Was there any condition in the license providing that any quantity of lumber should be sawn at all ?

Mr. OLIVER. The present licenses provide, if I recollect rightly, that on notice being given a mill must be erected and a certain quantity of lumber sawn. That condition has remained in the license, in one form or another, from 1881 to the present and is still there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman says that the condition as to the operation of a sawmill was not in force. I am not very familiar with the facts but I gather from this and previous debates, during previous sessions as well, that a very large area—I think about 29,000 square miles—which was granted by the Conservative administration between 1878 and 1896, was in the end almost completely given up by reason of the enforcement of these conditions. If not, for what reason were they given up ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is difficult, in making a statement such as I desire to put before the House, to give the facts without casting reflection when questions are asked. But since my hon. friend has asked the question, I suppose I shall have to answer. I hold here a number of copies of leases which were issued. Among them is a lease to my hon. friend for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). The order in council was granted on February 3rd, 1883.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the order in council over there ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman kindly read it ?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly :

Certified copy of a report of a committee of the hon. the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on February 3, 1883.

On a memorandum dated January 24, 1883, from the Minister of the Interior, submitting an application from Mr. J. G. H. Bergeron, of Montreal, for a yearly license to cut timber on a berth as shown on the annexed sketch, and coloured in pink, of 50 square miles, more or less, on the west side of Dauphin river, in the province of Manitoba, more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the discharge of Lake Dauphin into the Dauphin river; thence due west six miles; thence due north eight and one-third miles; thence due east six miles; more or less, to the river; thence southerly along the river to the place of beginning.

The minister recommends that the license be granted, on the terms and under the conditions of the regulations approved by order in council of November 11, 1881, subject to any prior grant or reserve, and upon the survey of the berth being made within one year under instructions.

The committee advise that a license be granted as recommended.

That order in council stood until the 23rd of October, 1888,—for a period of five years—and there never was a mill erected.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there ever a license issued ?

Mr. OLIVER. There never was.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. As my hon. friends have drawn attention to this feature of the license, it will be as well to put before the House some of the facts, because they have some bearing on the contention so frequently made by hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to a case considered by this House not very long ago. My hon. friend says there was no license issued in this case. True, there was none, and in the large majority of cases there was no license issued ; but in this case as in others, very evident acts of ownership were exercised. For instance I have here a certified copy of the report of council dated 15th of December, 1882, being an application from D. Tisdale for a yearly license, to cut timber on a berth 50 miles square.

Mr. FOSTER. That follows the same order.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the hon. gentleman tell the House, how many applications altogether were made and how many licenses were granted and how many were actually worked ?

Mr. OLIVER. I shall have to reply as I proceed.

Mr. AVERY. I asked what date that regulation was changed and should like an answer.

Mr. OLIVER. I have the date here but cannot on the moment put my hand on it and I don't wish to delay the House while I am searching for it. The date is one we can easily find out by other means. As regards these orders in council, acts of ownership were exercised under them.

Mr. D. Tisdale applied on October 31, 1882, for a berth of 50 square miles in townships 24 and 25, range 23, and township 25, range 22, west of the first meridian. This berth, No. 126, was granted by order in council of December 15, 1882. Mr. Tisdale did not make any payment in connection with this berth.

On August 27, 1883, Mr. Tisdale applied for another berth of 50 square miles in townships 23 and 24, range 26, west of the first meridian, but was advised that as he already had a berth of 50 square miles he could not be granted additional territory. On November 16, 1883, he requested cancellation of berth granted him as there was not any timber thereon, and asked for a berth of 50 square miles on the south shore of Lake Minnietakie. This berth,

No. 349, was granted in lieu of berth No. 136 by order in council of December 6, 1883. On March 2, 1885, Mr. Tisdale requested cancellation of berths as the timber thereon did not justify the expense of the survey. The berth was cancelled by order in council of May 29, 1885.

There is no question that this order in council did set apart the timber on that area for the exclusive use and benefit of D. Tisdale and there is no doubt that he did exercise the rights of a proprietor upon that area as against any other citizen of Canada, with the consent of the government of that day. I am not charging any thing improper but am pointing out the fact that Mr. Tisdale did exercise the right of ownership in that land in as much as he traded it off for another more convenient.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He surrendered it.

Mr. OLIVER. On condition that he got another in place of it. My hon. friend may call it what he likes but it looks like a trade to me. He could not trade any thing he did not own and the ownership was recognized.

I am not suggesting that there was the slightest impropriety in this. The government was anxious to have people with money go in and develop the timber resources of the country and they made this offer, which for the moment, I am assuming was a wide open offer. Mr. Tisdale came forward, he was granted a berth; it did not suit him and he got it exchanged for another. As time rolled on he found it was not a practicable proposition and he gave it up. There was nothing improper in that so far as I can see, if it is considered from the standpoint which I claim it should properly be considered from, the standpoint of the desirability of interesting capital in the development of the timber resources of the country of that day. I do not wish to say this in any offensive sense but I wish to show hon. gentlemen opposite how their argument, the argument they have twisted and turned and repeated, applies in this and the 450 other cases, practically of the same nature during the Conservative adminstration. Mr. Tisdale held a right on this timber berth for a matter of three years. He never paid any rent upon it, and at no time had he been fortunate enough to be able to sell that right, which he had to sell; if he could have sold it he would have been entitled to claim his license and operations might have been carried on.

Mr. FOSTER. If he fulfilled his conditions.

Mr. OLIVER. He fulfilled no conditions during the continuance of this period of three years.

Mr. FOSTER. Therefore he cut not a single stick of timber.

Mr. OLIVER. None whatever, he did nothing; but he held the right and he might have sold that right at any time during that period of three years had he found a buyer. He had something to sell, he paid no rent during that time, he did not operate. This is exactly the case of the celebrated Galway Horse and Cattle lease which my hon. friends have blazoned all through this country as being a most corrupt or incompetent transaction, a case of corruption on the part of the gentlemen interested or of incompetence on my part. I say there was nothing improper from my point of view in this transaction and nothing improper in the fact that H. P. Brown held his right under his order in council until he was able to claim that right and exercise it. If it was wrong for H. P. Brown or his assignee the Galway Horse and Cattle Company, surely my hon. friend cannot say it was not just as wrong in the 450 cases which they assisted in administering under these regulations and orders in council.

Mr. LALOR. Could not the government refuse to grant a license in that particular instance because the conditions had not been complied with?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly they could.

Mr. LALOR. How does the property belong to the gentleman who got the order in council and held it for three years? It was subject to the approval of the government at any time.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not responsible if my hon. friend does not understand. A man is given a right with all the authority of this government, with this parliament behind it, and, having that right until it is cancelled by the same authority that issued it, he surely has something to sell or to hold. These men all have something to hold or to sell and so had H. P. Brown, the first lessee of the tract later held by the Galway Horse and Cattle Company.

I do not know whether it is desirable to give any more instances. If my hon. friends are not prepared to admit that these orders in council enabled the people who received them to exercise the rights of ownership, I can give them more instances that will certainly prove that rights of ownership were exercised with the cognizance of authority of the government of the day, backed by parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend speaks about rights of ownership being exercised. Has he any other instances, except the one he has brought forward in the case of the Tisdale order? I mean any other instances of other rights of ownership than what he calls the right of ownership as explained in that way.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is rather too intricate for me at this particular stage of the discussion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister speaks of what I would call a surrender as an act of ownership; has he any other acts of ownership except of that character ?

Mr. FOSTER. That is the point.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know exactly what my hon. friends would call acts of ownership. If they question the fact of the exchange of one piece of land for another, being an act of ownership, I cannot tell what they would consider an act of ownership and therefore cannot tell them what such acts there were. If we can agree on the meaning of the expression 'act of ownership' I can give particulars.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was assuming for the time being that that was an act of ownership, although I might dispute it afterwards. I want to know if there were any others of a different character.

Mr. OLIVER. There were others of a different character.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What were they ?

Mr. OLIVER. There were of course the cases in which the name of my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) appears, in which the acts of ownership were the actual operation of the limit, which of course was a perfectly proper transaction with which no fault could be found.

Mr. FOSTER. But a license issued in that case.

Mr. OLIVER. A license issued but the license did not issue to my hon. friend. I have a little memorandum here in regard to the matter which perhaps it would be interesting to read :

Berths 25 and 25a, 25 square miles each, were applied for on March 3, 1881, by E. P. Leacock, on behalf of himself and Messrs. Shields, Haggart and MacLaren, and was granted by order in council of May 23, 1882, to Messrs. Shields, Haggart, MacLaren and McNicol. The first license we have any record of was issued to A. Ferguson on June 29, 1884. It appears that Mr. Ferguson acquired these limits under a decree of the Court of Queen's Bench in Equity, wherein Mr. John Shields and others were plaintiffs, and Mr. Peter MacLaren and others were defendants.

That is to say, my hon. friend's interest in these berths was of such a nature that it formed the subject of a suit at law; there was a decision of the courts and the berths were awarded to another man before the license was issued; as a matter of fact the berths were operated from 1882 to 1884.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Were any rents paid before the decree of the court ?

Mr. OLIVER. No rents were paid but the berths were operated under a permit paying 50 cents a thousand in lieu of royalty; so that there is ample evidence there that the ownership of the firm of Shields, Haggart, McLaren and McNichol was recognized before the courts before a license was issued by that government.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will agree with me that this was a different case from the other. The right of ownership there was because a permit had been granted by the Crown to operate.

Mr. OLIVER. It may be different, but I think my hon. friend will have to settle any question there may be in this connection with those who are more learned in the law than myself. My proposition was stated in the beginning. I beg to repeat that the right granted under the several orders in council was a tangible and supposedly valuable right, and that the value was understood and recognized even by the court.

Mr. FOSTER. When the permit was granted.

Mr. OLIVER. Was recognized in the court. Whether the permit was granted or not, I am not prepared to say.

Mr. FOSTER. In that case I understood the hon. gentleman to say the permit was granted.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Can he give us any instance out of the whole bunch in which such a right operated unless the permit had been granted ?

Mr. OLIVER. If the House will pardon me, I would like to say that the permit, as I understand, has nothing whatever to do with the case. The permit was granted to Mr. Ferguson, and not to the gentleman in whose favour the order in council was passed.

Mr. FOSTER. In what year ?

Mr. OLIVER. The license was issued to Mr. Ferguson on the 29th of January, 1894.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister stated that the limit was operated from 1882.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Ferguson operated the limit under permit. Mr. Ferguson does not appear in the transaction, so far as the records here are concerned, until he got a judgment in the courts when he became actual owner of the berth. He had already been operating it under a permit. I do not know under whose judgment, but it had nothing whatever to do with the rights of Shields, Haggart, MacLaren and Nichol. They had a right that was dealt with by the court, and that went to Ferguson. The fact that Ferguson was operating under a different right during that same time, showed that the permit had nothing to do with the rights of these gentlemen. I think, Mr. Speaker, that point has been thoroughly established, and I do not wish to bring the

matter up at this particular stage of the argument. But it is thoroughly established that the government in that day, as well as the government of to-day, was dealing with the question of the administration of the timber with a view to development and not to revenue. I cannot emphasize that point more strongly than it is emphasized by the facts already placed before the House, unless hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to admit the allegation of improper dealing, which they have alleged against this side of the House, returned to them three hundred or four hundred fold. Either their principle was that they were dealing with the timber with a view to development rather than revenue, or they have put on record one of the most outrageous pieces of jobbery that ever this country saw. Now what was the policy that has been followed right along ? It has been well said that lumber is one of the first necessities in the settlement of that country. In order that there may be lumber there must be capital invested, and the larger the capital invested the cheaper the lumber can be produced. That is an elementary proposition that every one will agree to. Now from 1881 until the 19th of December, 1887, the practice of the old government, and of this government, was first come first served. The man first applying for the timber, it was his for the taking, unless there was more than one man who wanted it, and then the question of which should have it was decided by competition. It is upon that principle, the administration of that principle, that our friends on the oither side have built up this stupendous charge of jobbery, of corruption and waste of natural resources that we have heard from them during the last few days.

Now what has been the success of the efforts made in regard to the development of that country in this respect? In 1881 there was a total lumber cut—giving only round figures—of 13,000,000 feet, and lumber sales of 12,000,000 feet. In 1896, the lumber cut was 34,000,000 feet, and the sales 32,000,000 feet. These figures refer to Manitoba and the Northwest and the railway belt in British Columbia. That was less than a three fold increase in sixteen years. The policy and purpose of the administration then was to get the lumber cut, and as a result of that policy and administration they were successful in nearly trebling the cut in sixteen years. For the nine months ending March 31, 1907, the lumber cut was 141,000,000 feet, and the lumber sales 128,000,000 feet. That is to say, taking nine months instead of a year, there was a four fold increase under the administration of this government in ten years, as against a less than three fold increase under the adminstration of our friends opposite in sixteen years. Now both governments were striving for the same thing .to get the lumber cut, to get it on the market so that settlers could buy and use it. While I have nothing to say at this stage of the discussion in condemnation of the policy of the late government in that connection, I must point out the policy in both cases being the same, the enormously greater success of this government, in achieving development that these records show.

In regard to the number of mills, there were 55 in 1896, and 89 in 1907. It may be interesting to know where the increase of mills took place. In the Winnipeg district there were 29 mills in 1896, and 29 in 1907 ; in Edmonton, 2 in 1896, and 16 in 1907 ; in Calgary, 10 in 1896, and 13 in 1907 ; in Prince Albert, 3 in 1896, and 6 in 1907 ; in Westminster, 11 in 1896, and and 25 in 1907. I think it is fair to say that having succeeded to the extent this government has succeeded in .securing the development of the lumber industry, and having secured that development by the alienation of a total of something less than 8,000 square miles of timber, their administration stands in a much more favourable light than the administration of their predecessors, who, with the alienation of some 30,000 square miles of timber, only succeeded in getting a lumber cut of 34,000,000 feet in the year 1896.

Now a word as to the plight in which the people of Winnipeg are left by the immense alienation of timber by this government, and the even more terrible plight of the people of Saskatchewan and Alberta. Our friends opposite have mourned over the fearful results that will come to these people because of the stupendous alienation of timber. They would have the country believe that the timber is all alienated, or practically so. What was the alienation of 30,000 square miles which they provided for under their administration ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That was prairie land.

Mr. OLIVER. It was prairie. Does my hon. friend insist upon standing on that position ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. On what ?

Mr. OLIVER. Surely my hon. friend will not say that the government which he followed during those years passed out order in council after order in council alienating prairie land under the supposition that it was timber.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Sure.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, that is an awful charge. I would not like to make that charge against my hon. friend. Were they buncoing their friends or were they holding up the farm lands of the country under the pretence that they were timber limits? What were they doing? My hon. friend must surely admit that the government that he followed must have had some elements of honesty towards its followers and to-

wards the country, and if there were then in the country 30,000 square miles of timber to be alienated and there have now been alienated some 8,000 square miles, there is a balance of more than three times as much remaining to be alienated of timber land that these hon. gentlemen said was timber land and in all probability was timber land.

Mr. BRISTOL. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that these 30,000 square miles of timber limits have been alienated or did some of them revert back to the government later on?

Mr. OLIVER. It has been said many times that these timber lands had reverted back to the government.

Mr. AMES. And have been regranted over and over again.

Mr. OLIVER. And have been regranted. I do not think it is really profitable to bring in these matters, but seeing that my hon. friend has brought them in I might take the opportunity to repeat that the timber limit which the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) got as a free gift on the 21st December, 1882, upon which he paid one year's ground rent, over which he had the right to exercise proprietorship for a period of six years, which he then gave up as being of no value, and which was of no value, is a part of the very limit that my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) has estimated to be worth I think half a million dollars. Is there not some explanation to be made by our friends on the other side of the House in this connection? They have revelled in stupendous figures as to the value of timber limits. They have given out to the country that this government has robbed the people of hundreds of thousands of millions of dollars, that they have absolutely prevented the people of Winnipeg and of the prairies from getting timber because it is in the hands of some of these speculators, and of people who own mills even. The timber has been alienated, but it has not run away. It is there on the ground yet just as it was before, and it is not worth anything to any one unless and until it is turned into lumber. The timber is there to be used by the people of Winnipeg, to be used by the people of the prairies whether it is in the hands of this terrible Imperial Pulp Company or in the hands of this terrible man Fraser, or in whoever else's hands it may be, and Mr. Fraser and the Imperial Pulp Company, or whoever else there may be, can only get their money out of it by manufacturing the lumber and selling it at market prices to the people who need it. Men who have invested their money in these timber limits have to follow their money with their mills or their money is dead and dormant.

Mr. FOSTER. That applies only to the ultimate investment.

Mr. OLIVER. To the ultimate investment. There may be speculative transactions intervening, but there is no value in that timber until it becomes lumber and is put upon the market to be used by the consumer and the only value is the value that the consumer is willing and able to pay for the lumber.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The only value to the public, but what about the value to the happy beneficiary?

Mr. OLIVER. Now, my hon. friend was a supporter of the government of 1882. He believed that the government had a sound policy in regard to the west. He supported that government in granting 450 separate and different areas of timber to private parties on exactly the same principle and with the very same idea that these limits are being granted to-day—so that these private parties may turn that timber into lumber in order to make it available to the settlers. The declaration of policy set out by the government of that time I have read already.

In regard to the stupendous values, the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, gives $500,000 as the value of the Cedar lake limit. Does my hon. friend who gave that value know that at the present time and under present conditions a timber limit on Cedar lake is of no more actual value as a working proposition, in so far as my poor judgment goes, than if it were in the moon? It is of no more value to-day than it was when the hon. member for Argenteuil acquired an interest there. It is just as near Winnipeg today as it was then. Lumber was dearer in Winnipeg then than it is to-day. It was not worth anything then and it is not worth anything more as a working proposition now. It has a speculative value and my hon. friend has regaled this House and has attempted to spread throughout the country the idea that this government is robbing the country of that speculative value. I do not know that it is necessary to emphasise that statement; it is so utterly absurd that I am sure that even my hon. friend will be able to see it himself. There were during the past year or two town lots in Winnipeg, in Regina, in Saskatoon, in Edmonton and other places in the Northwest; perhaps my hon. friend acquired an interest in some of these town lots when he was up there. They had a speculative value running into millions and millions and millions, because they were being bought and sold on the market in those days. They had a value which is as legitimate a value as my hon. friend has put on the Cedar lake limit.

Mr. AMES. I only put that value on the Cedar lake limit because the agent of the company put that value upon it.

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely, just the same as the real estate man to whom my hon. friend went for prices put a value on suburban lots in Saskatoon. He was given a price and my hon. friend perhaps was able to take advantage of the opportunity to do something in Saskatoon suburban lots.

Mr. AMES. I only wish that I had got some of them.

Mr. OLIVER. Did the hon. gentleman get some?

Mr. AMES. No, I wish I had.

Mr. OLIVER. If he had and if he had held them until now I think he would have wished that he had none.

Mr. FOSTER. You must not run down Saskatoon.

Mr. OLIVER. We are not running down Saskatoon, but every man must see that there has been a speculative boom in suburban lots in the Northwest that had no legitimate foundation and that the speculative value of these outside lots has gone absolutely to nothing.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They are farm lands.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, and they were diverted from the legitimate purpose of farm lands. I had the privilege of making a in British Columbia a few years ago when trip through the Boundary Creek country that country was being developed and when a number of mines were being operated to a certain extent. I had the pleasure of meeting my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross) at that time. There were millions of dollars being invested in that country in speculative values; there were hundreds of thousands if not millions of dollars invested in actual operation of mines; but there was not a dollar being produced from minerals in all that country and there could not be until a railroad was built. And yet the country was booming, mines were thought to be worth all kinds of money and everybody was a millionaire. I had the pleasure of travelling with a gentleman well known in Canada, Mr. George Ham, and Mr. Ham remarked that it was the pleasantest country he had ever seen and that the people were the happiest because while in other countries there might be some people who were poor, in that country he met no one who was not a millionaire except one man, and he was a billionaire. The wealth of the people was as plain as daylight; every man of them could prove it to you with pencil and paper; there was no argument about it any more than there was about my hon. friend's statement with regard to the timber limits; every man there told you; I have a claim that is so many feet long and so many feet wide, it runs so many dollars to the ton and there are so many tons, and the difference between the cost of production and the product is so much, it is my mine, it is worth a million. And all that in face of the fact that perhaps the man could not pay for his next meal. And to-day although that country has been developed and although ore is being produced and although there are millions of dollars coming out of it you could buy ninety-nine-one hundredths of those claims to-day for anything you like to give them. Perhaps my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) knows more about that than I do.

Mr. FOSTER. I will furnish you with one or two.

Mr. OLIVER. Then I hope the hon. gentemlan will enlighten his hon. friend from St. Antoine on the fallacy and impropriety of the argument he has put forward in regard to the speculative values of timber limits. If these speculative values are there, how is it that every man on this side of the House allied with the government and having the back door entry that gentlemen opposite think exists, are not all millionaires.

Mr. FOSTER. There are a few very smart fellows who won't let the others in.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend says there are a few smart ones who will not let the others in. Well, there are smart men on the other side of the House, and let me point out this to my hon. friend: it has not been alleged, and if alleged it cannot be proven, that under the system of tendering for timber limits which has prevailed since the year 1896, a gentleman who sits on the other side of the House did not have just as good a chance to put his money into a speculative timber venture as a gentleman who sits on this side of the House. There may be general allegations on that point, but the facts are here to prove that there was no restriction in the past which confined the purchase of timber limits to a member on this side of the House.

Mr. AMES. I wish you would let us examine a few witnesses on that point.

Mr. OLIVER. There is nothing to hinder my hon. friend getting the information. In fact he no doubt has the information in the myriad of returns which have been brought down; he knows who are the tenderers on timber limits; he knows that friends of his friends are successful tenderers as well as unsuccessful.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not think so.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend must not excuse his lack of enterprise on that ground I say that the principle of dealing with these timber limits is that they should be developed, that lumber should be cut upon them, that in order that they should be developed it was necessary that they should get into private hands, and that they were free to the first comer for twenty-five years.

The first man who applied for a timber berth got it unless somebody else bid more than he did in the competition.

Now, according to the records of my hon. friends, there have been 8,000 miles alienated and there remain some 20,000 miles to aienate. Why have these gentlemen opposite not been up and doing; why have they not asked that timber be put up to public tender and taken their chances on getting it? It is because they know that the arguments advanced by the hon member (Mr. Ames) have absolutely no foundation in fact; not any more foundation in fact than the values of these suburban lots in the cities of the Northwest or of these Boundary Creek mining claims of which I have spoken. These gentlemen know that, or if they did not know it they certainly have been acting with more disregard to their own interests than any set of men can justify themselves in doing. They might have been up and out and after these limits, but they knew the limits did not have the value they placed upon them. They knew that between the acquirement of a timber limit and the earning of a dividend from the actual sawmill operation, there is a tremendous gap which has to be bridged by the application of capital, energy, intelligence and business sagacity. It is not every man who acquires a timber limit, nor is it every man who builds a mill who is able to arrive at the point of successful management of a lumber business. My hon. friend (Mr. Ames) has said that there is 40 per cent of the timber which has been alienated for purely speculative purposes. I say it is a good thing that there is not more than that, and that under all the circumstances it is possible to show that 60 per cent of all alienations are either now under operation or are in the way of coming under operation.

Mr. AMES. I said at least 40 per cent, and as 75 per cent of the limits are not being operated it lies somewhere between 40 per cent and 75 per cent.

Mr. OLIVER. Very well, let my hon. friend have it any way he pleases. The point is that we have secured a cut of 141,000,000 feet of lumber in nine months, and to-day lumber is stacked up in the yard of every sawmill in the two western provinces and in the railway belt of British Columbia beyond the present requirements of the people of the country.

Now, my hon. friend in his argument of sympathy for the people who have been robbed of their rights, accuses this government of having a wasteful policy and a corrupt administration—perhaps he does not lay so much stress upon the corrupt administration as he does upon the wasteful policy. He says that the government has not paid any proper regard to the conservation of these timber resources. I say that so far as the evidence has gone, the fact that we have secured a cut of such an enormous amount of lumber with such a small alienation of land as compared with anything that has been done before, is evidence on that point. But that is not all. It is now two years since the policy of setting apart forest reserves was entered upon by this government, and under that policy there is now held in reservation in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia 5,391¾ square miles of forest reserves, nearly as much as the total alienation of timber during the years of this government's administration. And besides that we have special control of certain park reservations—the Rocky Mountain Park, 4,500 square miles; Yoho Park, 828½ square miles, Mountain Park 5,000 square miles, and Jasper Park 5,000 square miles; a total of 10,904½ square miles. We have the 5,391 square miles set apart for the reservation and recreation of the forest and the 10,904 square miles in what may be called pleasure parks, where we have special arrangements for the protection of timber. It is estimated by the gentleman who was in charge of the forestry branch of the Department of the Interior for the last year, a gentleman who has been alluded to by my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) as being a reliable and honourable man, that we have in the west and in the railway belt 150,000 square miles of timbered lands, that is, lands containing valuable merchantable timber, or a total of 96,000,000 acres.

Mr. AMES. He does not say merchantable timber.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is under a wrong impression. He may not use the word merchantable, but the effect of his statement is that there is that large area of merchantable timber.

Mr. AMES. No, the effect is that there is that large area covered with timber, but his statement is not that it is merchantable.

Mr. OLIVER. His statement is that there is five times that area covered with timber, but there is that area of what he considers merchantable or valuable timber. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that this government has anything to be ashamed of, but has everything to be proud of, in its administration of the timber lands of this country, judged by the purpose for which the lands are being administered. If we are working to one standard and are judged by another, naturally we must have the worst of the argument; but we deny the right of our opponents to judge us by other standards than those to which we are working, and to which our predecessors worked. Applying to both governments the same standard, our administration shows far and away ahead of theirs.

There is a point to which I wish to allude in this connection to emphasize the fallacious character of the arguments put forward by our friends on the other side. They have been particularly strong on the idea that there was not a fair opportunity given to people to tender on timber limits, and that as a consequence the country lost enormous sums of money. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron), in following this line of argument—in which I presume he was instructed by my hon. friend from St. Antoine—instanced three cases in a locality in which he was specially interested, and with which he was specially familiar. I am fairly familiar with that locality myself. These are the facts placed before the House by the hon. member for Alberta. Berth 1157, thirty and one-half square miles, five miles south of Coleman, on the Crow's Nest branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway; tenders opened April 6, 1904; there were two tenders; the applicant for the berth did not get it; he was not the successful tenderer. Berth 1114, eighteen and one-quarter square miles, in the same locality within a few miles of the railroad; tenders opened December 30, 1903; there were three tenders—McDonald $2,327, McGuire $275, Sharp $51.50. The applicant was not successful. Berth 1115, seventeen square miles, in the same locality, quite close to the railroad; tenders opened December 30, 1903; there were three tenders—Frith $1,275, McGuire $255, Sharp $51.50. The applicant, Frith, was successful in this case. These three berths are estimated by the hon. member for Alberta to be of the value of $325,000. These tenders, as I have pointed out, were opened in December, 1903, and in April, 1904. There is no question of the sufficiency of the thirty or forty or fifty days notice given within a stone's throw of a daily railway train. The berths were in close touch with large lumbering operations, both east and west. Some of the largest operators in the country being within twenty or thirty miles of them, and all on the same line of railway. If these limits are worth $325,000, I want to know what my hon. friend from Alberta was doing when they were up for sale. Surely my hon. friend was not so wealthy that he would allow an opportunity of profiting to the extent of a quarter of a million dollars to pass by for the sake of a paltry $500 or $1,300, or $2,000. Did my hon. friend believe that there was any such value in these limits? Does any member on the other side of the House believe that there was any such value in them? The men who operated lumber mills in the immediate locality, who certainly are not philanthropists, as those of us who know anything about the operations of the lumber combine investigation of last session will admit; and is it to be supposed for an instant that these gentlemen would have allowed a chance like that to pass by? There is no question that they must have had notice, and had ample time to examine the berths, and must have been absolutely familiar with the conditions existing in those cases, and yet they allowed them to pass for the sake of $2,000 in one case, a little over $1,300 in another, and a paltry $500 in another. My hon. friend from Alberta rang the changes in this House on the same story as that told by the hon. member for St. Antoine in regard to the Cedar lake limit, that the berths were put up too late in the season, and that the public had not a chance to inform themselves regarding them; but it is absolutely impossible to make the conditions conform to the story. This shows clearly that the facts have nothing to do with my hon. friend's argument. Facts are things he has no use for. I find here that a gentleman named McGuire put in a tender for berth 1114 and also berth 1115. I happen to know Mr. McGuire and I know that he is a practical lumberman and an enterprising man, and that he has as quick an eye for a dollar as any member of this House, not excepting the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). Well, Mr. McGuire estimated the value of berth 1114 at $275. That is what it was worth to him. He estimated berth 1115 at $255. And he lives right there at Pincher Creek, within a few miles of these limits, and there can be no doubt that he knew what was in them. There can be no suspicion of collusion with regard to these tenders because here is a tender for $2,327 as against the next highest for $275, and a tender for $1,275 as against another for $225. Yet the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) went through exactly the same hysterics over what he called the improper conduct of the Interior Department in letting these berths as the member for St. Antoine did in the case of the Cedar lake limits.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. OLIVER. I will take the liberty of saying at this stage of the discussion that I think I have been successful in establishing by the facts I have been able to place before the House, in the remarks I made before six o'clock, that the administration of the timber policy of this government has been an unqualified success, judged by the proper standard, that is, as a means of securing the investment of capital in the lumber industry, the manufacture of lumber and the distribution of that lumber which was the object of the policy of this government as of their predecessors. The allegation is that although the administration has been a success it has been corrupt in its methods, that is that there has been partiality, partisanship and impropriety of transactions and dealings in connection with

timber limits in the department. Upon this point I am not in as good a position to speak as in regard to the general question of the results of the administration and of the policy, but I hold in my hand a statement of the berths awarded since 1896, and while I shall not trouble the House by reading it at length, I shall pick out a few typical cases of the awards of berths as illustrations of the general administration of the timber limits :

Berth No.	Tenders opened.	Area.	No. of tenderers	Range of tender price.
	1907.	sq. m.		$
1393.	Oct. 16..	10	7	400 to 6,550
1388.....	Sept. 18..	3·25	5	307 " 8,100
1387.....	Oct. 16..	12	4	400 " 2,106
1363	July 24..	12	4	372 " 1,000

I do not know that I need quote further examples as evidence that there was absolute competition, that there was sufficient notice given to secure that competition and that ample prices were secured.

Mr. OWEN. Were those berths sold to the highest bidder ?

Mr. OLIVER. They were sold to the highest bidder. Would my hon. friend care to have the figures ? I will say further that this list contains all the tenders for berths awarded since 1896 and in all cases the berths were awarded to the highest bidder. It will be observed that the people who desired to acquire these leases placed widely differing values upon the berths, in many cases the highest tender being ten times as great as the lowest. When there are such differences of opinion between the people who desire to become interested in these berths the House would hardly be warranted in accepting unquestioned the estimates of value placed on timber limits by the hon. member for St. Antoine Division (Mr. Ames) or any of our hon. friends opposite.

Another point that is made evident by this list of tenders is that it was not a case of awarding berths to political favourites ; it was a question of open competition and the man who put in the highest bid, accompanied by the necessary cheque, got the berth. One illustration will serve. Our friends opposite have made particular mention of berth No. 1046. This is a berth of very large area, 250 square miles, situated north of Prince Albert. Two tenders were put in for this berth. One tender was for $2,510 by Mutchenbaker Bros. and the other for $5,000 by William Cowan, of Prince Albert. William Cowan is not a member of the Leberal party or a supporter of this government. He was mayor of Prince Albert for one or two years and was a Conservative candidate against the present Judge Lamont in the provincial elections of 1905.

Mr. AMES. Is that limit not now in the hands of the Big River Lumber Company?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. AMES. Can the minister tell me who were Mr. Cowan's associates?

Mr. OLIVER. I have no idea in the world, and it does not make any difference. Mr. Cowan put in the highest tender for this limit and he got it, and he was not a friend of this government, so far as I am aware. What Mr. Cowan did with it after he got it is entirely his own business.

Mr. AMES. Would the minister make inquiries from the department and ascertain whether other tenderers did not ask that the time should be extended in order that other bids might be made in respect of that particular limit?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think I will, because it has not anything to do with this case. The point I want to make, and which my hon. friend wants to avoid, is that in the case of a limit which our hon. friends opposite declared to be especially valuable, and have instanced as one of the cases in which there was an improper if not a corrupt transactiaon on the part of this government, it was one of their own friends who got it. I want to say that Mr. Cowan got it properly; Mr. Cowan is an operating mill man on a large scale in the city of Prince Albert. There is a reason why Mr. Cowan, having got that limit, should not hold it. He tendered for it as a honest man and he got it. Now what has my hon. friend to say to that ?

Mr. AMES. Will the minister allow us to put Mr. Cowan in the witness box and get him to tell us under oath the circumstances under which he got that limit?

Mr. OLIVER. Will the hon. gentleman give me a reason why a reputable man such as Mr. Cowan should be put in the witness box to be cross-examined by the hon. member for St. Antoine Division (Mr. Ames)? I think that private citizens of this country have some rights, and I hope my hon. friend does not expect to abuse the privilege of parliament outside of parliament as he does inside. I commend the suggestion of my hon. friend to the House and to the country, that Mr. William Cowan, of Prince Albert, shall be put in the witness box to gratify my hon. friend's curiosity in regard to matters or things in which he has not the remotest concern, and in regard to which he has not even informed the House. The hon. gentleman must have an exaggerated idea of his responsibility in the position he occupies at present, and a very minimized idea of the rights of citizens of this country. I think I am safe in giving him

to understand that reputable private citizens of this country have rights which even members of parliament must respect. Mr. Cowan not only acquired this berth which has been the subject of adverse criticism, but he was also a successful tenderer in other cases. I merely give this instance as showing that hon. gentlemen have absolutely no foundation for their suggestion of favouritism in connection with the letting of these tenders, or for the allegation that there has not been ample notice, adequate competition, and fair prices.

Mr. OWENS. I desire to ask the hon. gentleman a question merely for information. Does the hon. minister think that in his judgment ample time was given between the asking for tenders and their acceptance, or the opening of tenders, for a thorough examination of the timber limits that were offered or bid for ?

Mr. OLIVER. In some cases there was ample time, in some cases there was not. It was not, as I have said, a question of the amount of revenue that this country should derive from the sale of timber, the question was how to place the timber in the hands of those who would utilize it. The practice adopted was that the first man who applied for it had a right to get it put up, and then if he was the highest bidder he got it. There was no question of reserving the timber, or holding it for higher prices, or auctioning it off. That was not the policy of this government, nor was it the policy of the hon. gentleman's friends. When we change our policy or undertake to raise a revenue from standing timber, then the criticism of the hon. gentleman will be perfectly in order, if we fail in our duty as they think we have in this case. But I submit that when our policy is, if you like, to get rid of the timber, to get rid of the standing timber up to a certain point, and get it in the hands of private parties who we expect will utilize it, that being the purpose, it is not a question of whether there was too much or too little time, because the policy was that the man who paid the most money got the limit, without favouritism, or without advantage to one side or the other. I have already pointed out that in the case of the limits instanced by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron), there was no question as to ample time to explore these limits. There was ample time, they were right under the noses of plenty of capable business men, capable mill operators, and yet he stood up in the House and gave us the same rhyme as to the impropriety of the conduct of the government in these cases, as the member for St. Antoine did in regard to other cases, and for the same reason.

Mr. OWEN. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he wanted to get rid of these timber limits ?

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. OLIVER. That is a fair way of stating the avowed policy of the Conservative government from 1881 to 1896, and of the Liberal government from 1896 to 1907. We wanted to get the timber into the hands of persons who would operate it, just as we wanted to get the homestead land into the hands of the people who would work it.

Now with regard to the question of dealing with these matters in the House and in the department, it has been suggested by our friends opposite that there is something to conceal, there must be some impropriety contained in the papers in the department, or else every member of the House would be free to go into the department and examine those papers as he pleased, and that it would be the business of the department to place those papers upon the table of the House for any member who chose to examine them as he pleased. Now I have already had occasion to say that these papers in connection with timber limits constitute the title of the owner to his property. His title is set out in each of the regulations that have been made from 1881 to the present time, and the retention of the limit depends upon the fulfilment of the conditions set forth. Now the evidence of the fulfilment of those conditions is contained in the papers on file in the department, it is not contained anywhere else. The minister is responsible to see that the conditions are fulfilled, that is, he is practically the judge in the matter. Now that being the case, these papers constitute the title of these men to their property, and if that property has a hundredth part of the value my hon. friend suggests, then I say it is in the highest degree improper that these papers should not be kept in the most careful custody .

Mr. OWEN. Does the hon. gentleman say that all the timber limits which have been sold since 1896 are being operated ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. OWEN. Or are they being held for speculative purposes ?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, says that forty per cent are being held for speculative purposes.

Mr. OWEN. If they are not being operated why are the government so anxious to get rid of the timber limits of this country, selling them as they are for a mere pittance? As I understand the contention of the hon. gentleman it is that the government were anxious to dispose of the timber limits because they wanted the lumber brought upon the market. Now, I understand the hon. minister to say that these limits are not being operated.

Mr. OLIVER. The government has disposed of timber with the view to the limits being operated and in every license is a con-

dition under which the government can compel the limit to be operated or else cancel the limit. The government has not insisted upon that provision.

Mr. HERRON. In how many instances has the government put that clause into operation? Are there any cases or are there many of them?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not familiar with all the transactions in the department, but as far as I am aware, from 1881 until December last that provision was not insisted upon. But, if it is of interest, I may say that in view of the conditions as shown to exist last summer it was believed by the department that the time had come when steps should be taken to bring into operation that section and after looking over the ground carefully we decided that with respect to all limits which were accessible and which had been held without operation for five years, notice should be issued that these limits should be operated in accordance with the terms of the license. This is the first time that I am aware of that such action has been taken. It seemed to us that the time had come when it was proper to insist to a moderate degree upon the enforcement of this clause in the license which, up to that time, under our predecessors or under our administration, had not been enforced for the reason that it was considered desirable that private owners should hold timber limits with the view of interesting capital, either now or later, so that ultimately these limits would be brought into operation, and it was not considered to be sound public policy to cancel the limit because there was no mill erected upon it.

Mr. HERRON. Has notice been served on the operators in any instance that the minister can name?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. HERRON. It has been?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot name instances but if the hon. gentleman will move for a return I will bring them down. I was proceeding to say—I have so much assistance in making these few remarks that really I find difficulty in just meeting all the cases—that the title to the limit depended upon papers on file in the department and that the department would not be discharging its duty as a business proposition if it did not give every care to the custody of these papers. It would be trifling with the property of the citizens of the country. Now, when the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, asked the privilege of examining certain files in the department in regard to timber limits it did not seem to me that I could give him the right to examine these files and refuse it to other people. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman takes the position that he has rights over and above those of other people. Perhaps he does. He may be larger in his own eyes than any of his neighbours, but I will say to him in all kindness that he is not any larger in mine and that I could not accord to him a privilege or a right that I was not able to accord to other people who are just as good as he is.

Mr. AMES. May I ask the hon. minister if that right has not been accorded to many other people for a long time past?

Mr. OLIVER. I have said—I hope I will not have to make that speech again—that from the year 1892 up to the present time there has been a standing order in the department that such should not be allowed.

Mr. AMES. Has that standing order been obeyed in all particulars?

Mr. OLIVER. I think my hon. friend is evidence that it has been obeyed?

Mr. AMES. That is not fairly answering my question. I am aware that it has been disobeyed.

Mr. OLIVER. Can my hon. friend give an instance? I believe it has been disobeyed but I do not hold myself responsible for the fact that it may have been disobeyed. It has been disobeyed contrary to the orders of those in authority ever since 1892, but in so far as I am concerned I would be obliged to my hon. friend if he would give me any instance in which it has been disobeyed under my control. I will be obliged to him if he can give me that information.

Mr. AMES. I cannot give that but I would say that so long as senators and members of the House received that privilege I thought it was my privilege also. If the privilege is taken from all of us, in so far as the Department of the Interior is concerned, I will stand on just the same terms as every other member.

Mr. OLIVER. I have asked my hon. friend for an instance. He has said that he cannot give me an instance and yet he stands up in this House and says that there are instances. I want him either to give an instance or say that there are no instances.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman will permit me I will give him an instance.

Mr. OLIVER. Wait until I get one from the hon. member for St. Antoine.

Mr. AMES. I will give an instance in my own case. As I said before I had no difficulty a year ago in securing access to the files of the department. There was not the slightest difficulty raised on the part of the deputy minister when I asked to be permitted to consult the original files.

Mr. OLIVER. And because the hon. gentleman was accorded that privilege in a special case last year he comes before the House and demands a general right.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the minister want another case ?

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I will be obliged to the hon. gentleman if he can give me another case.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) stood up in his place in this House last session and said that he had read all the reports in the Department of Indian Affairs, from top to bottom, in the case of some islands in the Georgian bay, stating that he had spent the whole of an afternoon in the department reading the papers.

Mr. AMES. The hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross) said in this House the other day that he had repeatedly gone into the department and seen the files.

Mr. OLIVER. I suppose my hon. friend considers that he has a right to go into the department and examine a file for the purpose of building up a case to present to the House and the country against this government ?

Mr. BERGERON. Why not ?

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely, but the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) thinks that another member has not the same right or privilege to come into the department and build up a case against the opposition. This surely is a rule that might work both ways. A special case is not a general rule. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, was given the sepcial privilege last year to go in and see a file for a special reason because the matter was under discussion in the House, and I say it is absolutely unfair for him, that it is—I will not characterize it by its proper name—to suggest that because he was given a special privilege last year for a special reason he has therefore a general right. I say again that there is a standing rule in the department against that action ; it is a proper rule and the government would be acting improperly not to carry it out, and so far as I am concerned it is carried out.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. Against the Conservatives.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes and against the Liberals.

Mr. MILLER. While others are making explanations I would wish to say a word. Last session or the session before when the affairs of the North Atlantic Trading Company were being investigated I remember distinctly that the deputy in charge said to the Liberal members that it was disturbing the work of the department and that he could not possibly allow members to go into the department and look at the documents.

Mr. BENNETT. They were all burned up.

Mr. OLIVER. As to the question of bringing the original documents into the House ; my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) waxed eloquent on the fact that last year the original documents were brought into the House on the order of the House and this year they were refused. But last year there was an order of the House given to bring the original documents, and I would like any hon. gentlemen opposite to point to an occasion when any member of this government declined or hesitated to obey an order of the House. There was an order of the House given last year and that order was obeyed, and as I had occasion to tell the House the other night the original documents which were laid on the table then have never, so far as I am aware, been returned to the department, proving absolutely the impropriety of bringing those original documents into the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is now referring to what occurred in a former debate on this question.

Mr. OLIVER. I was only following the argument that my hon. friend on the other side put before the House.

Mr. BENNETT. It is the same rule for everybody.

Mr. OLIVER. Now, I want to say that as soon as the House gives an order for the production of papers, I do not care how many they are and I do not care what they are, so far as I am concerned they are at the service of the House. But I would like the House to appreciate the responsibility it takes in requiring that the titles to private property contained in the departmental files shall be placed in jeopardy by being taken from their proper custody and placed in the custody of others who are not directly interested in them. I think it is a fair proposition that before that action is decided upon by the House there should be some specific reason given for it. That is the position I took in the House when the question was up before. It is the only position I take, it is the only one I propose to take and I think it is a fair position. If the House sees fit to ignore the giving of a reason for the production of the documents and votes for their production, well, parliament is supreme and parliament becomes responsible for the custody of these documents. But it is only right that I, having been charged with the custody of these documents, should place before parliament the responsibility that is thereby assumed. We have nothing to conceal ; we do not desire to conceal any thing but we

do desire to discharge the business responsibility that is placed upon us in a reasonable business way.

Now with regard to the question of the tender for this Cedar lake timber limit, I have practically nothing to say. I was not connected with the administration of the department at the time. But, the advertisement was issued, tenders were received, the highest tender got the limit. The gentleman who had sole charge of the handling of the tenders at that time and who is now a member of the House has said, that he was responsible for those tenders, that they were opened and found to be as they are now, and that the limit was awarded to the highest tender because the money was there to pay for it.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Would the Minister of the Interior tell us how many tenders there were for that limit ?

Mr. OLIVER. Three. Why does the hon. gentleman ask me ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I thought the hon. gentleman stated it was given to the highest bidder. I understood there was only one tender for that limit and that tender was $500.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is wasting a good deal of the energy of the House. The original documents were on the table and the hon. gentleman had an opportunity of examining them and why does he ask me how many tenders there were. There were three tenders and the highest tender took the limit and the man who was responsible for the handling of the tenders declares now, as a member of this House, that there was no change made in the tenders by him, that they were awarded exactly as they came to him because the money was there. Our friends on the other side say that is not enough ; they want something more ; and the hon. gentleman who is in question says : Say that I am responsible in any way or to any degree for any thing in connection with these tenders that you complain about and I will demand an investigation at the hands of this House. But there is not one of them who has so far dared to say so. They have stood up and hour after hour they have declared their suspicion and have built up a suppositious case. Then, as the hon. member who spoke this afternoon did, they boast of the fact that they have created suspicion throughout this country that cannot be allayed. If there was an intention to get at the truth of this matter I think it is a fair proposition that they should state what they believe to be the truth. If they believe there is any thing wrong with these tenders they should state it, but they have not done so and I doubt if they will do so. They know that that is the proper course to take ; they know that that is the honourable and fair and manly course, to quote the words of my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff). But am I to say that they are not fair or honourable or manly that they will not take that course. I won't say so. Mr. Speaker, for I am sure you would rule me out of order. I will only make the statement in regard to this matter that Mr. Fraser the gentleman who put in these tenders made to me. I do not do it because I desire to place it before the House, because I consider there is nothing to explain, but certain statements have been made and Mr. Fraser has asked me to relate to this House his statement in regard to these tenders. His statement to me is this : That he was interested with certain associates and applied to have this celebrated Cedar lake timber limit put up to competition. It was put up to competition and on the understanding that he had with his associates he put in a tender for $1,000.

Before the time for the tenders to be opened arrived, he received either a letter or a telegram from a client in Winnipeg, authorizing him to put in a tender for this limit at $7,000. Having the authority of Mr. Nolan to use his name in tendering, and having already been required to tender in his own name, he could not use his own name a second time ; therefore he used Mr. Nolan's name to put in the tender for his client. He wrote out the tender, and, as he says was the custom, filled in the figures at the last minute before it was closed up and sent to the Department ; and the limit was awarded to his client. He points out, I think very fairly, that if he had any advantage in the department, any inside track as you might say, and if he wanted that timber limit and it was anything like the value my hon. friend from St. Antoine says it is, there was nothing in the world to prevent him putting in a tender at a higher figure than $7,000 and getting the limit for himself. It is on the record that he did not get it for himself; he got it for his client; and it was assigned to the Imperial Pulp company. There is no evidence that Mr. Fraser had or has any interest in that company. Therefore, on the face of the transaction, Mr. Fraser put in the tender in a legitimate way on behalf of his client, and the client got the limit, while the tender which Mr. Fraser put in on his own behalf and that of his associates of course did not get the limit.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister allow a question ? Where were the two tenders written out—at Mr. Fraser's office ?

Mr. OLIVER. So Mr. Fraser says.

Mr. BENNETT. Then can the minister explain why for one tender Mr. Fraser used his office paper and for the other tender a plain sheet ?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say. I am merely giving the statement as Mr. Fraser

gave it to me. I am not defending Mr. Fraser or his action. I know nothing about the matter except what he has told me. But I say that Mr. Fraser, acting with his associates putting in a tender for $1,000, was not in a position to discuss with them the fact that he had received an order from a client to put in a tender at a higher figure. Although he knew that the first tender which he was putting in was of no value, it was not his own personal tender; it was his and his associates'. But he put in the tender at the higher figure on behalf of his client as instructed. I give the explanation as Mr. Fraser gave it to me, and the fact that he was in position to profit to the extent of half a million dollars if he put in a tender in his own name for $7,100, but he did not do so, is evidence to me that the tender which he put in at $7,000 was an honest tender.

Mr. OWEN. Will you allow me to ask a question? Since you have been Minister of the Interior do you say to the House that you think you have in every case disposed of timber limits in the best interests of this country, or have you favoured the individual at the expense of this country?

Mr. OLIVER. I have had occasion to say already, and I have read to the House figures which prove that these tenders have been awarded without favouritism and without partisanship to the highest bidders, and we believe in the best interests of the people of this country.

Now, it may be said that if these regulations were good why should they be changed? It is within the knowledge of hon. members that some two years ago provisions were introduced and sanctioned for the setting aside of forest reserves, indicating the intention of the government to enter upon a policy of forest preservation. But a policy of forest preservation is a serious matter, and must be dealt with according to circumstances and knowledge acquired. It seemed to the government, in view of the progress that had been made in the development of the lumber industry, in view of the conditions that had arrived, as demonstrated particularly by the investigation held here last year into the lumber combine and the further investigation held in the province of Alberta into the same question, the time had come when it would be a safe proposition to deal in a more conservative manner with the timber areas than had been done in the past. As I said a while ago, the policy was to get the timber into the hands of the people who would cut it. It was not a question of getting a price for the standing timber; it was a question of getting the lumber on the market, and getting the benefit of the royalty on that lumber. But having reached a cut of 141,000,000 feet in nine months, having eighty-nine mills in operation in the woods under the control of this government, and there having entered into the question of the acquirement of these limits the element of speculation to a certain extent, it seemed that the time had arrived when it would be safe to change the regulations and adopt practically the policy that was adopted by the Conservative government in 1879 in their Land Act of that year, and to provide that timber should not be put up to competition, except in the judgment of the government, and that it should be so dealt with that the highest bonus would be obtained. Under the regulations that have been under discussion, the timber was there for the first applicant; there was no reservation. There being no reason to the contrary, the man who applied had the right to have the timber put up to competition, and if he bid the most for it he got it.

Now, we propose that the timber shall be put up only on the judgment of the government that it is right and proper and in the public interest that a certain area shall be advertised for sale. We propose to have the area examined so as to decide its suitability and its worth and then sell it by public auction with the view of getting the highest bonus. That is exactly in line with what my hon. friends opposite have been declaring is the policy the government should adopt, so that I hope we shall have their unanimous endorsation of it. But let me point out to those gentlemen that to have put such a policy in force, say five years ago, would, instead of being beneficial, have been most injurious to the best interests of the country. That was how the Conservative government found it to be in 1879, and that is how we would have found it to be had we undertaken to enforce such a policy before the investment of capital and the distribution of lumber interests gave sufficient assurance that the requirements of the people would be met without hindrance. But now that point having been reached, we believe it is opportune to change that policy and follow to a greater extent the line followed in this eastern part of the country with regard to timber limits. Whether we have done wisely or not can only be known later on. I am glad of this opportunity of placing before the House the facts with regard to these regulations and the reasons which have caused their adoption.

I would like to instance how these regulations would have worked had they, in their present form, been adopted many years ago. Supposing the Land Act of 1879 had been enforced and that timber could only be put for sale on bonus and on competition. Suppose there was a lumber firm operating in the city of Winnipeg, which had ample capital to extend its operations. At that time there was no demand for lumber. There were no people and consequently no lumber needed. Had, therefore, the system of competition

been insisted upon, that single lumbering concern could have bought every atom of timber that would ever be put up for sale in the great west, because, so often as a limit was put up, so often could this company outbid every other, and thus secure a monopoly. No doubt that was one reason why the Conservative government did not see fit to carry out the provisions of their Land Act in dealing with timber. They saw that, in the conditions then existing, that would have been unworkable and improper, and they adopted the policy of giving the timber to the first applicant, and this they did with the view of providing lumber for the settlers. That is the policy which they carried on and which we have carried on to a point where we think it will be safe to change it. We are now changing it and our hon. friends opposite have endorsed the change.

There is something I want to say regarding the large number of limits that were granted in 1882, 1883 and 1884. The policy of granting limits at that time without competition and without bonus, on conditions of operation, was a sound policy. But that principle was grossly abused, and when our hon. friends opposite ask us to consent in a motion for a committee of inquiry into the administration of timber limits during these later years they can hardly expect the House to concede to them that privilege in any expectation that they would give us a better or cleaner administration in timber matters than we have had during recent years.

Mr. BERGERON. Recent years—two or three years ago.

Mr. OLIVER. It is an old rule that he who seeks justice must himself be just—that those who go into courts seeking justice must go with clean hands. When a party, like that of hon. gentlemen opposite, goes about the country declaiming against the improper conduct of this side of the House and asks to be put in our places in order that they may carry out their better policy, it is desirable the country should know what are the ideas of these hon. gentlemen so that the country may judge what sort of an administration they are likely to give us. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has said that is long ago. But my hon. friend was a part of the business of long ago just as he expects to be a part of the business of the future, should his party come to power.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the hon. gentleman say that I did anything wrong?

Mr. OLIVER. Not at all; I would not say such a thing, but my hon. friend and his associates have spent three days of the time of the House declaring that this government has done wrong because it has done what he and his friends did when they were charged with the responsibilities of office. If it was wrong for us, it was wrong for them, and it is only fair that the House and country should be informed exactly how that matter stands. Again I say that the policy of hon. gentlemen was right under the circumstances of the country, but their administration was rotten. There was, as my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) said the other night, a population of some 6,000 white people in the two new provinces and perhaps 15,000 to 20,000 in Manitoba, and to supply lumber to some 30,000 or 40,000 people there were granted in three years 450 timber berths of 50 square miles each, so that in carrying out a good principle they grossly abused it. Were these limits granted to lumbermen? No, they were granted to politicians; they were granted to gentlemen who were members of the House then and who are members of the House now, and who were not lumbermen then and who are not lumbermen now. They were granted to their political friends who were not lumbermen then and who are not lumbermen now. In that long list of names you will not find a fraction of one per cent who are practical lumbermen, but you will find that all were active Conservative politicians of that day. The abuse was not in the principle, but in the administration of the principle. About that time, in 1882, there was a general election and on the face of the record it would appear that not the interest of the settlers of the Northwest, not the interests of the development of the lumber industry, but party exigencies arising out of and through those elections were the cause and the reason for the granting of those enormous concessions. I should not couple the name of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) with this question, because at that time I fancy he was not in any way identified with the Conservative party.

Mr. BERGERON. I did not need it, I was elected by acclamation at that time.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not suggesting anything about it; I say there is no way in which that enormous grant could be justified on any ground of public policy or public advantage; it could only be spoken of as a piece of political rascality of the most atrocious character. I lived in the Northwest at the time, I know the conditions and I know the feeling that existed there. The fact was that that great country was being parcelled out in colonization tracts, in railway subsidies, and in timber limits amongst the supporters of the dominant party here at that time without regard to rhyme, reason, the public interest or the development of the country. My friend says that was 25 years ago. It was 25 years ago, but at that time there was just as much expectation of value in every one of those concessions as there

is to-day. There was a boom in the west in 1881 and 1882 such as there has never been since. Expectations were then entertained in regard to that country that have hardly yet been realized. When these concessions were granted they were believed to be of value and they were retained by the concessionaries who believed them to be of value until the time came that it was evident that they were not of value and they were given up.

The idea has been suggested that inasmuch as these concessions have all been given up they were in some way forced on the concessionaires ; that they knew nothing of them, that it was something altogether outside of their interest. The record shows that is not the fact ; that the concessions were granted, and that without any conditions being fulfilled, without licenses being granted, and without, in many cases, any payment being made, they were held as against that land ready to be turned into cold cash, if opportunity offered. Eventually it became necessary to cancel them. They were held from three to eight years without anything being done upon them, without any mill being erected or a stick of timber being cut upon them or a license issued, but the limit was held and the concessionaire had the right to dispose of it when he could.

Mr. BERGERON. Does my hon. friend know that these were granted under the Dominion Lands Act of 1879 ? The minister has apparently overlooked clause 8 which shows that what he has said is incorrect. It was impossible to retain these concessions under clause 8 if some of these conditions were not carried out. In the case to which he has called attention in which I was concerned, I had nothing to do with it, after I got the order in council, because I did not fulfil the conditions. This is the clause my hon. friend has not put in practice, since he came into power.

Mr. OLIVER. I have already said that clause 2 is an excellent clause and the Dominion Lands Act of 1879 is an excellent Act if the revenue came in ; but the revenue did not come in under hon. gentlemen opposite and the clause was ignored.

Mr. BERGERON. It did come in.

Mr. OLIVER. Not from this concession, it did not come in from the concession that was granted to my hon. friend.

Mr. BERGERON. No, not from me.

Mr. OLIVER. Nor from the concession of the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Ward).

Mr. BERGERON. No, that is what I am telling my hon. friend ; those who did not fulfil the conditions did not retain their concessions, but those who did fulfil them paid money into the government.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. WARD. Assuming that the Conservative administration was wrong, does that justify the outrageous administration of the present government ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not saying that the Conservative policy was wrong.

Mr. WARD. I said 'administration.'

Mr. OLIVER. I say there is no parallel between the administration of that government and this government, absolutely none.

Mr. WARD. That is what we say.

Mr. OLIVER. That is where we are with you, we are absolutely with you on that.

Mr. WARD. That is exactly what we say.

Mr. OLIVER. The administration of that government which granted 450 timber limits of 50 square miles each in three years without justification of population, without justification of any material kind or character, is not in the same class as the business administration which has prevailed during the last ten years.

Mr. WARD. Let the minister be honest ; he knows licenses were never granted.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the minister's honesty is hardly——

Mr. WARD. I did not mean it in an offensive sense at all.

Mr. OLIVER. I shall give to the House information as to how long some of these rights existed. I find one, H. A Ward, who applied on the 3rd October, 1883, for 50 square miles on Red Deer lake. This was granted by order in council of the first of November, 1883.

Mr. WARD. Quite right.

Mr. OLIVER. There was not six weeks to give a chance to cruise the limit, but less than a month between the application and the granting of the limit. The berth was cancelled for non-payment of rental by departmental letter on the 10th of April, 1891. No license was issued for this berth. That is my hon. friend held the right to a tract of timber limit of 50 square miles on Red Deer lake for a period of 8 years without paying one cent to the revenue of this country. I am not saying that that was wrong; quite the contrary, I say that if the instances had not been multiplied unduly, it would have been perfectly right. It was proper in those days and at that time that men who had capital or might be able to enlist capital should be granted timber limits in the hope that they might employ their own capital or enlist the capital of others, and it would not have been sensible to require them to pay a bonus or enter into competition at that time. I am not finding fault

with that, but I do say that to grant 450 of those limits at that time in the then condition of the country was neither more nor less than an outrage. It was not justifiable on any ground of public policy whatever, and no man can attempt to justify it, on that ground. The individual case I have no fault to find with, but it is with the general administration that permitted such an enormous alienation with so little result.

Mr. WARD. The minister has not answered my question yet.

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. gentleman will repeat it, I will try to answer him.

Mr. WARD. I simply asked the minister to state, assuming that all this was wrong in the administration of the Conservative government, does that justify what has taken place under the regime of the hon. gentleman ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not assuming that it was all wrong. Now I want to allude to an instance that was mentioned by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) on Friday night. He found that a timber limit of 200 square miles had been granted in 1878, in the last days of the Mackenzie administration, on the Saskatchewan river, without competition, but at a bonus price of $15 per square mile. I may point out that the average bonus secured by our friends opposite for the timber afterwards disposed of by them, totalled something less than $5 per square mile; but that has nothing to do with the case. I thought it well to look this matter up, because I happened to be personally acquainted with the conditions prevailing in that country at that time where I was living, and I can give the House some information as to why the limit was granted. The record is that Mr. Sutherland applied for a timber limit on the North Saskatchewan river, of 100 square miles area on February 22, 1886, and Mr. Cook applied for a timber limit of 100 miles area on the North Saskatchewan river, on May 14, 1878; and on October 17, 1878, an order in council granting 200 miles of timber limits to Cook and Sutherland was passed by the Mackenzie administration, as the hon. member for Calgary stated, in the last days of their administration, after they were defeated in the country. But I notice that the next entry in the record is that by order in council of December 26, 1878, the timber limit was cancelled. The House will notice that the new government did not lose much time in cancelling this concession to a couple of political opponents. The same party which saw fit, of course in the public interest, to cancel this berth of 200 miles on the Saskatchewan river, which was paying $15 per square mile bonus, to cancel it within two months and a half after it was granted, this same party, within the next few years, granted 450 limits of 50 square miles each, in the same country, without competition, and without bonus. I do not know whether that would be considered as a case of political favouritism, but it looks very much like it to me. Now with regard to the justification for granting this timber limit, I want to say that Mr. Sutherland was a lumberman, Mr. Cook was a lumberman, and they were operating mills in the eastern portion of Canada. There was not at that time a saw mill on the whole length of the Saskatchewan river, except a small portable mill which had been taken there by the Mackenzie government in order to cut lumber for the government buildings at Battleford. This building having been completed, and the government having no further use for the mill, they sold it to Sutherland, and it was in order to get timber to be cut by that mill that his application was made. There was a mill there, it belonged to the government, the government had no further use for it, and it was for disposal to private parties. These parties, practical lumbermen, wanted to acquire timber necessary to operate the mill and they were granted that timber on those conditions. I say again that except this small mill, there was not a lumber mill in operation on the whole Saskatchewan river, and the lumber people used had to be sawed by hand. So if ever there was a case which justified the granting of a timber limit it was this case; and if ever there was a case which offered no justification for cancellation of that limit, it was this case.

I want to say a further word in regard to that particular case. In looking through the files I find the following letter dated Toronto, May 11, 1881. The letter is addressed to H. H. Cook, Esq., Toronto :

> Dear Sir,—In consideration of your consenting to permit us to retain one-third interest in the after-mentioned property, we agree to use influence with the government at Ottawa to transfer to you and us, the timber limits for which you applied to the Mackenzie government in 1878, situated in the Saskatchewan district west of Edmonton, and including 200 miles or thereabouts, we to have four months in which to succeed in this matter, and in the event of success, we agree to share to the extent of one-third all rents, costs or charges made or claimed by government hereafter.
>
> Yours truly,
> (Sgd.) H. H. COOK,
> P. H. JARVIS,
> T. M. DALY.

Mr. Daly, I may say, afterwards occupied the position of Minister of the Interior for some years in the government of our friends opposite.

Mr. BERGERON. What date was that letter ?

Mr. OLIVER. May 11, 1881.

Mr. BERGERON. What Daly was that.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know. I give it just as I find it. But there was a T. M. Daly, Minister of the Interior, from 1892 to 1894.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman made some insinuation; Mr. Daly was not in the House at that time.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not insinuating anything, I am merely giving my hon. friends some of those records they are so anxious to find out about.

Mr. BERGERON. You do not give us the records we want.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend can have all the records on a motion of the House. I suppose in this case a copy would do, it is a copy that I am reading. Now the House is asked

To appoint a committee of nine members to investigate, inquire into and consider all matters connected with or relating to the alienation, granting, rental, leasing or other disposal by lease, license or otherwise, since the first day of July, 1898, of any timber lands or timber berths forming part of the public lands of Canada, or of rights to the same or to the timber thereon, and to report upon the matters aforesaid to this House; to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses on oath or affirmation.

Now in regard to that resolution, I want to call attention to this fact, that while there is not the shadow of a suggestion in it of any wrong doing or of any impropriety on the part of the government of the day, every word that has been uttered in support of the resolution on the other side of the House, has not been argument, but has been insinuation and innuendo.

Mr. LAKE. Straight statements.

Mr. OLIVER. Absolutely none; does the hon. gentleman attempt to get up and make a straight assertion upon this subject?

Mr. LAKE. I made nine definite straight assertions in support of the resolution.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend's statement evoked applause before he had made it so that I was not able to hear it. Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to repeat it?

Mr. LAKE. I said that I had made nine definite, positive statements in support of the resolution immediately preceding as the reason for which I moved that resolution. The hon. gentleman will find them in 'Hansard' immediately preceding the resolution.

Mr. OLIVER. I have not the speech of my hon. friend before me and I do not wish to delay the House; but we are not voting on the hon. member's speech. We are voting on the resolution which he moved and my remembrance of his speech was that he was just as careful to skate around any assertion as to wrong doing in regard to the administration of timber as has been every other member in every other speech that was made on that side of the House.

Mr. LAKE. The hon. gentleman had better read the speech and refresh his memory.

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend will take the privilege I will give him—he knows what he said better than I do I will sit down and give him the opportunity to read it to the House now.

Mr. LAKE. It will take some little time. With the consent of the House and at the request of the Minister of the Interior, I will be very glad to read these statements.

Mr. OLIVER. I would be very much obliged. I have not the statements under my hand and I am anxious to hear them before I conclude my remarks. I would be very glad if the House would kindly permit the hon. gentleman to read them.

Mr. LAKE. (reading)—

1. That the order in council of the 14th April, 1903, which provided for a renewal of all licenses from year to year while merchantable timber remains upon the area licensed enormously increased the values of timber limits and encouraged speculative applications for berths for the purpose of holding for future increase in values.

2. That nevertheless the Department of the Interior continued to put up for public tender large areas of the timber lands upon which the prairie provinces of the Northwest would naturally rely for their lumber supply in the future, and this was done without any inquiry as to the value of such areas and without any reserve bid or upset price—a policy which has largely resulted in timber limits falling into the hands of speculators to the detriment and loss of the consumers.

3. That such areas have in a large number of cases been situated far remote from settlement where the products could not for some time to come be made available for the public owing to lack of transportation facilities, a fact which gave them entirely a speculative value realizable only on the future development of the country through the extension of railways and settlement.

4. That the selection was permitted of small blocks out of much larger areas, rendering the unselected portions of the belt of little value to any but the original lessees to whom they would ultimately fall at their own price.

5. That the manner in which tenders were called for prevented any effective competition, in as much as the limits were not sufficiently advertised; that in some cases the time allowed between the publishing of the advertisement and the opening of the tenders was too short to allow of inspection by others than the original applicants; that in other instances tenders were called for at seasons of the year when examination of the properties by would-be purchasers was an impossibility—all of which combined to prevent any effective

competition, so that as a result these valuable reserves were alienated for a tithe of their real value.

6. That in some instances tracts of timber situated at considerable distances from each other had to be included in a single tender, thus rendering still more difficult any real competition with those who possessed previously acquired information.

7. That the practice by which tenders when received by the department were opened and contracts awarded by a single official in his private office, has been highly detrimental to the public interest, has created distrust among intending bidders and has tended to discourage legitimate competition.

8. That in the case of the tenders for timber limit No. 1108 in which the original files have been recently laid by the government on the table of the House, the presence of two tenders in the same handwriting for widely different amounts, the figures in the higher of the two having apparently been added after the remainder of the document had been drawn up, together with other features apparent in the documents themselves, render an investigation highly desirable in the public interest.

9. That the returns brought down by the department show so many remarkable coincidences in the matter of close bidding, and other circumstances, as to lead to the conclusion that the amount of the tenders must in some cases have leaked out, and thus led to undue advantage of one or other of the persons competing and that a thorough investigation is necessary to set at rest any suspicion that may have arisen. For these reasons I beg to move in amendment:

That all the words after the word 'that' to the end of the proposed motion be omitted and the following substituted therefor:

In the opinion of this House a committee of nine members should be appointed to investigate, inquire into and consider all matters connected with or relating to the alienation, granting, rental, leasing or other disposal by lease, license or otherwise, since the first day of July, 1898, of any timber lands or timber berths forming part of the public lands of Canada, or of rights to the same or to the timber thereon, and to report upon the matters aforesaid to this House; with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses on oath or affirmation.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure the House will appreciate the opportunity of hearing this very remarkable set of statements again upon which is based the demand for support of the resolution. My hon. friend has read his statements and again I take the opportunity of saying that in so far as my understanding of the English language is concerned, he has been careful, just as careful as every other member who has spoken on that side of the House, to insinuate as much wrong-doing as he could without saying anything. Is the question that is before the House the question whether Mr. Fraser wrote the $7,000 figures in the tender or not? Will my hon. friend say that Mr. Fraser did not? Will he say that Mr. Turriff did? Will he say anything except to utter insinuations and slurs against his fellow members in this House?

Mr. LAKE. I can say that in my opinion the reason given in statement No. 8 alone is sufficient reason, or should be sufficient for any government to have the matter investigated.

Mr. OLIVER. These are matters of opinion; they are not matters of fact and from my point of view—and I think my point of view is entitled to just as much consideration as my hon. friend's—the assertion that he makes is absurd, and I think a large majority of the people who know the circumstances will take the same view of it. I cannot understand how my hon. friend can entertain the suspicions which he says he entertains and does not dare to rise in his place in this House and on his responsibility as a member say what he wants everybody else to think. That is all we ask him to do. He is careful not to say it in his resolution and he was just as careful not to say it in his statement. Every other hon. member who has spoken on the subject has been just as careful. It is a competition in so far as I can understand by these gentlemen to see how much dirt they can throw in the hope that some of it will stick. If these hon. members will produce a resolution that will say that the 't's' were crossed and the 'i's' were dotted in these particular documents by the wrong man there is no doubt they can have all the investigation they want. But let me suggest that it is not investigation they want. What they want, if I understand their position aright is the privilege of maligning and misrepresenting their fellow members and their fellow citizens without being held responsible for doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. OLIVER. I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that if that is not it, I misunderstand their position.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that is hardly a retraction.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. OLIVER. I take back any words you choose me to take back, Sir. I thought it was a retraction. I understood their position to be so and then I say if that is not it, I misunderstand their position.

Mr. TAYLOR. He could not do it right if he tried.

Mr. OLIVER. Anything I can do to place myself in order I wish to do it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Get through some time to-night.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friends on the other side have been making my speech

for me the greater part of the time and I cannot be charged with occupying the whole of the time. What I say again is that if I understand matters aright our friends opposite don't want an investigation; what they want is suspicion; what they want is to discredit their opponents without themselves being in any position of responsibility. That is their position as I understand it and I think that position is set out clearly in the resolutioin they ask the House to vote for.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). The Minister of the Interior in the earlier part of his remarks was comparatively sane in his expressions and he seemed inclined to deal with the question in a moderate way. But true to his habits he got away from that position as his speech went on and endeavoured to exemplify that system of mud slinging which he is so prone to charge against this side of the House. I do not know anything much more absurd—and I might use a very much stronger expression—than that the Minister of the Interior should stand in his place there and endeavour to connect with something he regards as discreditable the name of T. M. Daly without knowing whether or not that was the gentleman he desired to cast a reflection upon. Mr. T. M. Daly is a gentleman who once occupied the position of Minister of the Interior; he is not in public life at the present time, but notwithstanding that he cannot be left free from an attempt on the part of the Minister of the Interior to cast a reflection upon him. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) has talked a good deal about insinuation. I do not know any hon. gentleman in this House who during this debate has been guilty of insinuation to the same extent as the Minister of the Interior himself has in the course of his speech which he commenced about a quarter past five this afternoon. It is true that during a good deal of the time he had the assistance of several gentlemen on both sides of the House in his endeavour to complete his speech, and I do not suppose that we should charge all of the time against him; but I am bound to say that in the course of his remarks he showed himself entirely reckless in respect of his assertions both with regard to administration and with regard to policy.

Before I come to more important considerations than the speech of the Minister of the Interior, let me take up a few of the statements he has made. He has told us that these timber limits have been leased by the present government under exactly the same policy which prevailed under Conservative administrations from 1881 to 1886. Well, that is exactly the reverse of the statement and the argument of the hon. gentleman from East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) because that hon. gentleman's speech from beginning to end was an attempt to show that there had been an absolutely distinct and different policy under this administration from that which prevailed under the Conservative governments between 1881 and 1896. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who propose to vote on the resolution, as usual, will take their choice between the declaration of the Minister of the Interior and the declaration of the hon. member from East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). Which to 1896, or is it an absolutely new policy the Conservative administration from 1881 to 1896, or is it an absolutely new policy of brought into force by this Liberal government? The Minister of the Interior explained the position of affairs very frankly indeed. He admits in effect that in 1908 he is not conscious that the great west, which he ought to understand and know so well, has advanced one single foot since 1883, and he declares therefore that the policy which was good in 1883 is exactly the policy which should be followed in 1907 and 1908. Those are not his exact words I know, but that is the exact and definite substance of what it took him twenty minutes to endeavour to explain to the House. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite from the province of Ontario to consider for a moment how it would do for the government of Mr. Whitney in Ontario to hand over to the first comer, without one dollar of payment, timber limits for which that province is to-day receiving hundreds of thousnads of dollars; would it not be unwise and absurd to adopt such a policy to-day, although fifty years ago in this Ottawa valley and elsewhere in the province of Ontario these timber limits were given to the first comer. Which one of these hon. gentlemen opposite will have the hardihood to stand up in this House and to say that he for one moment would be prepared to defend on any public platform a proposal of that kind? Will any of those who were so ready with applause to the Minister of the Interior, venture to advocate such a policy ? And yet let them understand that this is exactly what they are applauding when they applaud the Minister of the Interior. Canada did not stand still from 1883 to the present time. Has it not been the boast of this government during the past ten years that Canada has been making the most marvellous progress. And yet the Minister of the Interior stands up and affirms that merely because a certain policy was a good policy in 1883 he shall invite his political friends to support that as a good policy in 1908. No such proposition ought to be entertained for one moment. The Minister of the Interior was equally frank in another respect when he said: We give these timber limits to the first comer unless two people want them, and he said further that the reason they did not advertise these limits properly was because the government was not looking

for revenue. Did any man ever listen to so extraordinary an absurdity? Is this system of advertising a farce? Why, if the Minister of the Interior followed his statement to its logical conclusion there would be no competition at all because the government desires to give these limits to the first comer, and these timber limits in the west on which there is a supply of timber which cannot be used for actual operation for years to come ought to be handed over, upon the principle and the policy of 25 years ago, to the first man who comes and asks for them, because the government does not desire any revenue from them. Is there any answer to that? Does my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior see any answer? Why then this farce of competition? Why advertise for three or four weeks when an advertisement for three or four weeks is absolutely of no use? Is it to mislead the country ? Is it to give patronage to some newspaper ? For what useful purpose is this pretense of advertisement if the Minister of the Interior is right in the statement and conclusion which he has put before this House to-night? I never heard a more absolutely illogical and absurd statement out of the mouth of any man in this House than that which has emanated from the Minister of the Interior on this occasion. I could understand the policy, although I would not approve of it, if the province of Ontario or the Dominion of Canada should decide to hand over to the first man who asked for them the timber lands of that province or of this Dominion ; but I do not understand the policy which pretends to ask for competition—reasonable, fair and legitimate competition—from persons desirous of embarking in the timber business, but takes good care to prevent any real competition. You must take either the one or the other of the two alternatives—either hand over the timber lands to the man who asks for them first, or, if you desire and intend competition, in order that these timber limits should bring to the people of this country such a reasonable amount as can be obtained in fair competition, then have a reasonable advertisment for a reasonable length of time, and see to it that such advertisement goes into the hands of all the people in this country who would be likely to make a bid when the limits are put up.

The Minister of the Interior says that these timber limits are only of speculative value, and he argues against gentlemen on this side of the House in that connection. Does he not understand that that was exactly the argument put forward on this side of the House ? Surely he might have appreciated the fact that he gave the whole case away in that particular aspect of it when he admitted that these timber limits have at the present time only a speculaive value, for the reason that they cannot be operated successfully or efficiently for a great many years to come. Now, what does that statement of the Minister of the Interior mean when we come to analyse it? It means just this. Those timber limits at the present time are not required for immediate use by operators in order to supply the demands of the people of the country; they have therefore, as the minister has truly said, only a speculative value. That speculative value will, however, be converted into a very real and actual value as settlement progresses and approaches the places where those timber limits are situated, and as the means of transportation increase in the country. Well, the policy of this government is that that present speculative value, in the future to be converted into an actual and real value, should be handed over for the purpose of speculation to persons who do not intend to operate in the immediate future. Of what profit or advantage is that to the people of this country ? Let us see how it will work out. In the province of Ontario to-day, there are, I suppose, thousands of miles of timber lands which years ago possessed only a speculative value, but which to-day possess a very actual and real value by reason of the progress the country has made in the last fifty years. The government of the province of Ontario did not see fit to alienate or lease those lands years ago. If it had done so, it would have acquired practically nothing for them. It has held them for twenty-five or fifty years until to-day, and without any increase in the price of lumber to the people of Ontario, an enormous revenue from these limits is poured into the coffers of that province. Is there any good reason why exactly the same policy should not be carried out in the Dominion ? Why should we hand over timber limits which to-day are only of speculative value, to men who do not intend and are not required to operate them immediately, in order that that speculative value may be in the hands of private individuals instead of the government, to be converted in ten or twenty or thirty years into a very real and actual value? That is an aspect of this question which every hon. member of this House will require to face when he comes to render his vote on this motion.

Let us now come to consider a few phases of this question, which have already been discussed. Time after time during the progress of this debate, upon motion which the government insisted on proceeding with from day to day because they regarded it as a motion of want of confidence, we have been astonished that they should permit the debate to proceed for two full days and well into the third day before the Prime Minister or any other minister of the Crown rose in his place and expressed his view upon the motion. It is an extraordinary system into which the

government have fallen in this case and in one other which has been before the House this session. Well, what has been the story? The member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) arose as the spokesman of the government after the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) had addressed the House and proposed the motion which is now under consideration; and what was the burden of the answer of the hon. member for East Assiniboia—delivered I suppose on behalf of the government—to the vigourous indictment propounded in the first place by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle, and then, in the absence of any answer on behalf of the government, by my hon. friend from St. Antoine Division, Montreal (Mr. Ames)? His answer was one which we have heard over and over again in this House until nearly every member who has the patience to listen to the hon. gentleman knows it practically by heart—the enumeration of a long list of persons who during the Conservative regime, twenty-five years ago, had obtained grants of timber limits from the Dominion government to the extent of fifty square miles in each instance. And I venture to call to the attention of the House the fact that in those days, according to the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), fifty square miles was the largest amount permitted to be received by any one; whereas in these later days that limit has been far surpassed, and we know of some hon. gentlemen who are now in the enjoyment of 300, 400, 500, even 600 miles of timber limits.

What has this story about Conservative misdeeds in 1883 or 1884 to do with the present case? I do not propose to consider those for more than a moment. The conditions of this country in 1883 were different from what they are in 1908 just as the conditions with respect to timber limits in Ontario and this very Ottawa valley were different in 1858 from what they are in 1908. For that reason, a policy, which may or may not have been good in 1883 or 1884, is no sensible answer to an indictment presented against the administration and policy of a government in 1908. In other words, it is not the Honourable Alexander Mackenzie or Sir John Macdonald or the government of either, but it is the present Prime Minister and the present government of Canada who are on their trial.

Let us look for a moment at the grounds upon which this inquiry is demanded. In the first place, it is demanded because 2,400 miles of timber limits have been alienated and have passed for absurdly small sums into the hands of men who hold them for speculative purposes. I make no attack on any man who, for speculative or other purposes, has availed himself, in a fair legitimate way, of the laws of the country and the regulations of the department. The attack is not on that man but it is on the system and the government which permits it. For what reason should 2,400 miles of timber limits, not required for immediate operations, be permitted to pass into the hands of speculators in order that they, and not the people of the country, may reap the increased value of these limits, which will surely come as soon as that western country receives the population we all desire to see poured into it. In the second place, the inquiry is asked because these lands have been alienated without any survey or any effort by the government to obtain reasonable information of their value. Is there any reason why the government should part with these enormous areas of timber lands in the west without even taking the trouble of having them surveyed or examined so as to find out what their actual value may be? Would any individual, would any corporation, having a heritage such as ours, permit that to be dissipated and pass into the hands of speculators without making at least some effort to ascertain its value? If, in the urgency of the moment, it was desirable that these timber lands should be put into the hands of lumber operators in order that the present needs of the people might be satisfied, I could understand the policy of the government in disposing of them to a sufficient extent to meet that want. But that was not the object in the present case because the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) himself gave to the House the fact that lumber supplies, far beyond the present needs of the people are now lying piled up in British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan. If the lumber lands in operation at present are fulfilling, and more than fulfilling, all the demands of Alberta and Saskatchewan, why in the name of all that is sensible in the public interest, why in the name of all that is honest and decent, should you pass these timber limits into the hands of men who apparently are not holding them for the purposes of operation, who are not likely to operate them, but who are holding them solely with the view of obtaining for them that increased price which is bound to come from the settlement and development of that western country?

No upset price was fixed and no reserve bid settled. My hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) has gone into that very fully. Up to the present, the government being devoid of any information as to the value of these lands, could not for that reason fix an upset price or a reserve bid. Therefore the tender that came in, if it was only one, was accepted; and if others came in the result was what we have had described in some cases already brought to the attention of the House. This result must, indeed, have been anticipated.

Then we have the undisputed fact that the time allowed between the advertise-

ment and the day for opening the tenders was so absurdly short as to prevent any real competition. When you go through the form—I am tempted to say the farce—of calling for tenders, why should you fix four weeks when four months are necessary? My hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) has pointed out that in Ontario, when a timber limit is advertised by the government of this province—although no doubt the exploration of a limit in Ontario would be accomplished in much less time than many of these limits in the Northwest—a period of four months was allowed between the date of the advertisement and the date when tenders were to be opened. Then why was the time fixed by this government so absurdly short? The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) himself, when challenged across the floor, frankly admitted that in some cases at least the time allowed between the first advertisement and the day fixed for the opening of the tender was entirely insufficient to permit any exploration to be made or to bring about any genuine competition.

We demand this inquiry because, in the next place, there was no effective publication of the advertisement, short as it was. Would any business man or corporation in this country, desiring to obtain a fair and reasonable price for timber limits, be content with one insertion of advertisement in one paper circulating generally in the province, and one insertion in some local paper nearest the timber limit, coupled with a little hand-bill three inches by two inches sent to a post office and perhaps to the office of the land agent? Would any business man or corporation expect that an advertisement of that kind would bring in any real genuine competition? We have had no reply on that point. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has not pretended to make any. The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) did not say a word about it or attempt to justify it in any way. There can be no justification for it. So far as the record stands before the House up to this moment, there is no justification for it, and no excuse, no answer sufficient for parliament or the country has as yet been made by this government; indeed, up to this moment not one word has been said by them on this subject which could be seriously regarded.

We demand this inquiry in the next place because the lands have been put up before the demands of population so required, and obviously for the purpose of promoting and encouraging speculation therein. Contrast the time allowed for men who become possessed of these timber limits to make their selections with the time allowed for advertisement. In the one case you have four or five weeks, sometimes six weeks, or even seven or eight; the ordinary period allowed was about seven weeks from the time of the first advertisement until the day for opening the tender. That was a shortening of time when the public interest demanded a reasonable advertisement so that a fair price for the timber limits could have been obtained. On the other hand when you come to safeguard the interests of those who have taken possession of these limits, nearly as many years are allowed as weeks were allowed in the case of the advertisement; three or four years for the selection of 500 miles out of a total area of 6,000 miles.

We demand this inquiry because the lands were put up and disposed of by giving an option to select out of an enormously larger area, and the selection was long delayed. I have spoken of that just now.

We demand this inquiry because tenders were accepted for very small amounts without any knowledge or information as to the actual value and under such circumstances as should have put the department on inquiry and suggested the necessity of new tenders. I was astonished at the answer of the government given through the mouth of the hon. member for East Assiniboia. Tenders? Why, he thought it perfectly absurd that he should examine the tenders at all for the purpose of considering whether or not there might be some collusion between the tenderers or in the department. He was not a detective, he said; the amount of the tenders was not a matter for him, for the department or for the minister. Let me point out how differently matters are managed under a Conservative administration in this very province of Ontario. Previously to December 20, 1906, the government of Ontario had advertised for tenders for mining rights under Kerr lake. Tenders came in for those mining rights and they were opened by the Department of Mines of Ontario on the 20th day of December, 1906. The highest price offered was $51,500. The Department of Mines of Ontario, the Conservative government of Ontario, did not come to the conclusion that because a tender came in they were absolutely and necessarily bound to accept it. They regarded themselves as trustees of the people of the province of Ontario and they considered it no more than their duty to have regard for those interests before they decided to accept that tender. They thought that, having reasonable consideration for the prices which mining rights of that character had been bringing in Ontario, the amount offered was too low; so they decided they would not accept that tender, they advertised for fresh tenders, and on the 9th of January following they sold the same mining rights for $17,500, plus a royalty of 10 per cent of the gross value of all the ore that shall be extracted from that mine. In the first case they were offered $51,500 without any royalty; they declined to accept it, and about two or three weeks after they received for the people of

Ontario in respect of these mining rights the amount I have named.

We demand this inquiry because the encouragement of speculation in timber limits which were not required for operation in the interests of the people of the west in the immediate future, was accompanied by a change in the regulations which was apparently designed to make and does make the leases perpetual. The circumstances in connection with this alteration of the regulations deserve the consideration of the House and of the people of this country. You are proposing, according to the frank and candid statement of the Minister of the Interior here to-night, to hand over the present speculative value (in the early future to be converted into an actual real value) of these timber limits; the applicants receive these timber limits, by the confession of the minister without any effective competition. I say by the confession of the Minister of the Interior for this reason, that he himself has definitely stated to the House that there was no sufficient advertisement in some of the cases at least; and it is obvious to every man, even to the Minister of the Interior, I think, that without effective and reasonable advertisement there could be no competition in the true sense of the word. You are therefore handing over to these gentlemen—and I do not blame them, I blame the government which permits this thing to be done—that possible future value, that speculative value, to be converted into an actual and real value in the near future; and at the same time you amend the regulations and convert these leases delivered to these gentlemen for speculative purposes into an absolute tenure for all time to come, so that the government cannot in good faith recede from that view of the situation. More than that, you so altered that regulation on the 14th day of April, 1903, that according to its meaning, as I understand it, you prevented the government while that regulation remained in its then form from increasing the royalties to be derived from timber cut on these lands, beyond the amount at which they had been placed at that time. That was accomplished by the omission of certain words contained in the order in council which preceded it. In order that there may be no misunderstanding as to the meaning let me read the regulation as it was at first, dating from 1898 and the regulation as it was passed in 1903. The order in council of the 1st of July, 1898, fixed the regulation in this way:

Section 3. When a licensee has complied with all the conditions herein set forth in his license and the regulations, and where no portion of the timber berth is required for settlement or other public purpose, of which the Minister of the Interior is to be the judge, the license may be renewed for another year, subject to such revision of the annual rental and royalty to be paid therefor as may be fixed by the Governor in Council.

Now that regulation was repealed and the following substituted on April 14, 1903.

So long as the licensee complies with the conditions of his license and of the regulations, he shall be entitled to a renewal of his license from year to year while merchantable timber remains upon the area licensed. When a reasonable portion of the said area has been denuded of timber, the minister may dispose of the same under sale or settlement regulations, provided that no such disposition shall be made of land immediately contiguous to merchantable standing timber, or in such a way as to endanger destruction thereof by fire.

The House will note that the following words contained in the previous regulations are entirely omitted from the regulation of 1903, namely these words:

Subject to such revision of the annual rental and royalty to be paid therefor as may be fixed by the Governor General in Council.

It is true that after a storm had been raised in the House with regard to that, after a trenchant criticism had been made by some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, those words omitted were supplied in an order in council passed further on. But I am pointing out at present the exact terms of the regulation which was enacted by this government on April 14, 1903, and I am pointing out that not only was the tenure rendered absolutely permanent by that regulation, but there was a distinct and noticeable omission of any provision as to the future revision of the annual rental and royalty to be paid to the government therefor. Now what has been the result of this regulation of April 14, 1903? The effect of it was stated by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley), a gentleman who has had enormous experience in this business, a gentleman who to-day is the holder of very large timber limits in the province of Ontario. I will not quote his exact words, but I will give their effect. He declared that the passage of such an order in council must necessarily enormously enhance the value of any timber limits in the west held under lease from the government of this country. Well, I understand the answer that might be made by hon. gentlemen opposite. They say it is necessary to create that permanency, that fixity, that continuity of tenure, otherwise you cannot get business men to engage in the operation of cutting lumber in the west, and therefore it was necessary in the public interest, and especially in the interest of the people of that western country, I can appreciate that argument when it has any legitimate application; but I cannot appreciate that argument when its only use, in so far as speculative limits are concerned, is to enhance the speculative value of those limits and to put larger profits into the hnads of the gentlemen who have been fortunate enough to secure them. It is all very well

if you apply that regulation to limits which must be operated at once and which are required for the use of the people in the west. But what justification can there be for it when you are handing over to men for speculative purposes enormous areas, 2,400 miles of the best timber limits in this country, in order that they may receive in the future that great increase in value which of right and of justice should belong, not to them, but to the public at large? What reason is there for permanency of tenure so far as these gentlemen are concerned. If you gave them the right to sell this land for a year or two years and made their tenure permanent during that period, surely one would suppose they had received from the people all they could reasonably ask for. In making that statement I am not condoning the conduct of the government in passing these areas out of the ownership of the people. It seems to me to be an act of madness to alienate those great timber areas when they cannot be required for the use of the western country for many years to come. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has not controverted that. Why then should you hand them over? If you have some great natural resource which you cannot expect to develop in the immediate future, which the necessities of the people do not require to be developed in the immediate future, why in the name of all that is sensible should you hand that over to men who propose to hold it, not for the purpose of development, but simply in order that they may sell it and receive an enormous increase of price over that which they have paid to the government therefor?

Now there is another circumstance which I think demands the gravest consideration from the Prime Minister, who more perhaps than any other member of the cabinet is responsible for the public honour of this country and its good administration. This other feature which ought to commend itself to his earnest attention is the admitted practice during many years in the past, by which the land commissioner opens these tenders in the department alone, and without the necessity of any other officer of the department being present at the time. My hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has spoken in this House about the necessity of charges. He seems to regard himself in his capacity as land commissioner of Canada as nevertheless having all the rights and privileges of a member of parliament; and therefore when, by an accident, he comes into this House after having ceased to be land commissioner, and he considers himself entitled to demand charges against him as a member of this House in respect of his administration as an officer of the Department of the Interior. The case is exactly as it would be if the member for East Assinibioa were not a member of this House. Suppose he were not a member of this House, suppose he had continued to be land commissioner, and we were bringing to the attention of the government and the people the practice of that department by which one man, not in the presence of the tenderers, not in the presence of any other officer of the department, but alone, locked up if necessary in his own room, should open tenders for timber limits which afterwards were valued by hundreds of thousands of dollars. Why I would expect that any official of a department of this government which had been inadvertently led into a vicious practice—I use the expression advisedly, it is nothing but a vicious practice—I would expect that any official of the government led inadvertently into a vicious practice of that kind, would be the very first man to demand a most searching and thorough investigation into his conduct.

Yet that hon. gentleman stands up in this House and treats the matter as if it were of no moment to the people of this country. And, Sir, what is infinitely more extraordinary, he treats the matter as if it were of no moment to himself. It is of moment to every one in this country, but it is of infinitely more moment to the hon. member for East Assiniboia than it is to any other member of this House or to any citizen of this country. The right hon. First Minister frequently relies on British practice and declares that he is a Liberal of the British school. Did he ever hear of any Liberal of the British school in that grand old land whose institutions we all revere, who would venture for one moment to condone or defend a practice such as that? My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle has had some experience in the departments of the British government in days gone by; he has made some inquiries since and he tells me that in Great Britain the greatest possible care is taken in respect to the opening of tenders in every department as to which he could obtain any information. In the first instance they are put into careful custody and the utmost possible care is taken so that there shall not be any suspicion of tampering or unfair dealing. It is not only of tampering and unfair dealing that you must beware, but you must especially beware of even the suspicion of tampering or unfair dealing in such cases. How are the public interests and how is the public honour safeguarded in Great Britain? They are safeguarded by having these tenders sealed up and kept with the utmost care until the day for the opening of them comes; then they are opened, not by one man behind the locked doors of his private office, but they are opened in the presence of many of the superior officers of the department and even the very clerks who are charged with the care of these tenders, as they pass through the office, not by reason of any wrong doing of these clerks, but in order that suspicion may be absolutely absent, are chang-

ed from time to time. That is the policy which is supported by the Liberals of the old country of which school the right hon. First Minister professes in this country to be a follower. Yet, when we have asked for an investigation, when we challenged this practice two years ago in this House and challenged it, I think at that time, in language which was sufficiently forcible to have attracted the attention of the Prime Minister of this country, we had and we have no reply at all except that 'if you have any charges against me, the member for East Assiniboia, as a member of this House, have the manliness and the courage to make them and do not indulge in insinuations.' A more remarkable answer, a more remarkable statement surely never came from the lips of living man, under circumstances at all similar to this.

Now, the extraordinary appearance of the original documents which have been brought down has already been commented upon and if there is anything more extraordinary than the appearance of these documents it is the answer which the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) gave on behalf of Mr. Fraser in this House to-night. I sincerely trust that the minister may have misunderstood Mr. Fraser. The answer, in so far as I understood, was that Mr. Fraser, on behalf of himself and certain other associates decided to put in a tender for $1,000 and they did put in a tender for $1,000. Then Mr. Fraser received from a client in Winnipeg a telegram to put in a tender for $7,000. It never occurred to him to withdraw his own tender as it would be absolutely inoperative as against a tender for $7,000, and it never occurred to him apparently to tell the client in Winnipeg, that, being a tenderer himself for the same property, he could not possibly act for a client who also wished to put in a bid. I certainly think that Mr. Fraser must have been thoroughly misunderstood by the hon. Minister of the Interior in that regard. I do not think that any solicitor would put himself in that position, but assuming that he did put himself in that position, what did he do? He declares that he could not put in another tender in his own name. I do not know anything to prevent it. He did not see fit to take any of the partners in his office; he did not select any person in the city of Ottawa, but it seems that he had a standing authority from a gentleman in Montreal, Mr. W. H. Nolan, to use his name in respect of all tenders for all possible amounts, in respect of all timber limits and possibly in respect of everything else under heaven. With that comprehensive authority and without acquainting his client in Winnipeg that he was a rival applicant for the same property, he tenders in Mr. Nolan's name, signs that name to the tender without even putting his own name underneath to indicate that it is done by him as an agent, passes that tender into the Department of the Interior and, by the most extraordinary coincidence in the world, that tender of $7,000 happens to be just $200 or $300 more than another tender which had in the meantime gone in. It is so plain, so simple, so easily to be believed this story, that there is not the slightest pretense in the circumstances to justify any demand for an investigation by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Well, if that is the view of the gentlemen who sit upon the treasury benches and of those who sit behind them they are at liberty to enjoy it and to record their votes accordingly. I venture to think that perhaps it is not an explanation of what appears on the face of these documents which will greatly commend itself to such of the people of this country as realize what the appearance of these documents is to-day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is easy to see that the public interests of this country may suffer from the lack of an investigation. I venture to think that there is no man within sound of my voice to-night who would deny, if he spoke what is in his heart, that sufficient considerations have been put forward for an investigation of these matters in the Department of the Interior. I ask what consideration of public interest is against such an investigation? If everything is as hon. gentlemen claim, what prejudice to the public interest, what prejudice to private interest, what prejudice to the reputation or status of any gentleman, whether within or without this House, will be effected by such an investigation as has been proposed by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle. My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle made no insinuation. I desire to say to the hon. Minister of the Interior that he cannot place his finger upon one line of the motion or of the reasons given by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle which justifies his statement with regard to insinuations. He cannot put his finger upon one of the reasons carefully stated to this House by the member for Qu'Appelle which deserves to be called an insinuation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) stated circumstances and facts every one of which are proved either by the admission of ministers of the Crown or by official documents laid upon the table of the House. It is true the hon. gentleman drew certain inferences from these facts and circumstances, but, however, much opinions may differ as to what inferences should be drawn, no one can deny that there was reasonable ground for drawing the inferences he did. Every just man will admit that they were reasonable inferences to be deduced from the facts, and that they were inferences which the hon. gentleman had a right to put before the House. I submit that no public interest can be prejudiced by granting this investigation; I submit that public interests may be served by granting it; I submit that the administration of the Interior Department in relation to the matters which have been brought to the attention of the House, amply demands such an in-

vestigation, and if the government of this country be true to themselves and true to their position as trustees for the people of Canada, the investigation will be granted. They have legislated to a certain extent against combines and upon the report of a judicial officer customs duties may be lowered upon articles affected by a combine, but, Sir, the policy of the Interior Department in this respect tends to create in this country a more intolerable combine than has yet existed in Canada. They have created a combine which has already become possessed for speculative purposes of 2,400 square miles of timber limits of inestimable and incalculable value ; 2,400 square miles of timber which will be needed in the future for the wants of the people of the west. Let it be remembered first, last, and always that out of the pockets of the people of western Canada must in the ultimate result come the millions that are to flow to the speculators from the sale of these limits and from the enhanced price at which the lumber on these limits will in the future be sold. I am not advocating the sale of these areas at such a price as will increase the cost of lumber in the west. But I do say that if these areas are to be conserved for the future it is the duty of the government of this country as trustees for the people to hold them until such time as the present speculative and probable value will have been consummated into actual and real value. Just as conditions have changed in Ontario from fifty years ago, just as the province of Ontario receives an enormous income from her timber lands without any resulting increase in the price of timber and lumber, so in the future in western Canada the people of Canada would receive the enhanced price of these limits without increasing by one dollar the price which the people would pay for the lumber. Having regard for all the interests involved both public and private, I for one shall support with all the vigour I am possessed of the motion which has been proposed by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle.

On motion of Mr. Sifton, the debate, was adjourned.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 5, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

NEW MEMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, certificates of the election and return of Munro Young McLean, Esq., for the electoral district of South Huron, and Charles H. Lovell, Esq., for the electoral district of Stanstead.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Charles H. Lovell, Esq., member for the electoral district of Stanstead, introduced by Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. L. P. Brodeur.

SUPREME COURT ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. H. GERVAIS (Montreal, St. James) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 91) to amend the Supreme Court Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. GERVAIS. Last year I introduced practically the same Bill. The object of the Bill is very simple ; it is to make uniform the amount upon which an appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court of Canada where the appeal is taken from the Court of Review of the province of Quebec or from the Court of King's Bench of the same province. As a matter of fact this Bill is of exclusive interest to the litigants of my province. Its object is to get rid of an anomaly, a clerical error which was made by those who framed a section of the Supreme Court Act as it now exists. The right of appeal to the Supreme Court may be dependent upon the amount in dispute. If the appeal is taken from the Court of King's Bench, the highest court of appeal in the province of Quebec, the minimum amount is $2,000 ; but by section 10 of the Supreme Court Act which defines the right of appeal to the Supreme Court from the Court of Review, which is a court of appeal lower than the Court of King's Bench in the province of Quebec, the statute reads :

> An appeal will lie from the Court of Review of the province of Quebec to the Supreme Court in all cases in which there is an appeal to the Privy Council of England.

This is a re-enactment of the old proclamation of Governor Murray, the first English Governor of Canada, in which we find that when the right of appeal turns upon a question of amount, the minimum, if the appeal is from any court of Quebec to the Privy Council of England, must be at least £500 sterling, that is $2,433.33. The law as it exists to-day concerning the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada has been catching quite a number of litigants and especially lawyers. If I am to have an appeal from the Court of King's Bench, the amount in dispute in my action must be $2,000, while if the appeal is from

the Court of Review the amount in dispute must exceed $2,433.33. Quite a number of appeals have been dismissed by the Supreme Court during the last few years on this ground, and I have been requested by some legal gentlemen in Montreal, especially by the Chief Justice of Quebec, to introduce this legislation.

I shall read a letter of approval from Sir Melbourne Tait, Chief Justice of the Superior Court, which is as follows :—

I have read the extract from 'Hansard' which you kindly sent me regarding your Bill, the object of which is to put an appeal from the Court of Review upon the same basis as an appeal from the Court of King's Bench.

It certainly seems to me to be an anomaly that an appeal should be refused from the judgment of the Court of Review where the amount involved is $2,000, when such appeal is allowed from a judgment of the Court of King's Bench, which is a higher court. I think appeals from the two courts should be put upon the same footing.

This opinion was approved of by Sir Alexander Lacoste in the following words :

I am of the above opinion.

I have also a letter from Sir F. Langellier reading :

I have received a few days ago the speech in which is explained the Bill you had introduced to amend the law relating to appeals from the Court of Review to the Supreme Court, but I have been so much occupied by holding the Circuit Court and the Court of Review that I have found it impossible to answer you before.

I approve most heartily of this Bill. I do not see how one can question its propriety. It is evident to me that he who framed the law to amend the Supreme Court Act to provide for an appeal from the Court of Review to the Supreme Court was not aware of the fact that the amount for which an appeal could lie to the Privy Council from the Court of King's Bench is £500 sterling. For no one can imagine, for a moment, that a larger amount to appeal from the Court of Review would be required than for an appeal from the Court of King's Bench.

I am astonished that no one has thought before of proposing the amendment you are now introducing. The reasons you gave in support of your Bill, according to my mind, are absolutely peremptory.

I have also a letter of approval written by Mr. Justice Lafontaine. I think that under the circumstances this Bill should be allowed to become law.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. GERVAIS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 92) to amend the Criminal Code.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. GERVAIS. The Bill has two objects. By one of the amendments introduced by this Bill it is sought to make defamatory libel triable without a jury. As a matter of fact, in the district of Montreal, some newspaper men have asked that libel should be tried without a jury with the consent of both parties. When both parties in such a case agree to have the case tried by a magistrate exclusively it is unnecessary that they should go to the expense of having a jury trial just for the purpose of having the trial, I suppose, published throughout the country. That proposition may be subject to criticism or to discussion when the Bill comes up again at a later stage.

Then, it is proposed to so amend the code that persons who are accused of an offence or a crime which may now be tried by a jury may be allowed to give bail for their appearance without going to jail and have their trial at once without being bound to renew their bail or bond. For example, if I am accused of some kind of theft I am ready to be tried at once; I have given bonds to appear before the examining magistrate ; there being a prima facie case against me I have been committed to jail to await my trial before a jury or before a magistrate without a jury ; I make up my mind to be tried at once ; I have to be sent to jail first, then after I have been imprisoned I may file a request with the sheriff of the county asking him to send me back for trial before a magistrate without a jury. by way of speedy trial. But in the meantime I have been committed to jail ; I have been imprisoned and in some cases it has been found humiliating for quite a number of persons so accused. The object of this Bill is to get rid of that more or less formal commitment or imprisonment. If this Bill becomes law, after I have been committed to jail, if I make at once my election to be tried at once, I may give bail bonds and be tried before a magistrate without any commitment to jail. I think that such a Bill has been asked for by many of the presiding magistrates of the province of Quebec.

Mr. MONK. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the disposition of the Bill which provides for the trial of libel actions without a jury had been asked for by the publishers of newspapers in the city of Montreal ?

Mr. GERVAIS. One or two of them and especially magistrates Lafontaine and Choquette.

Mr. MONK. These are magistrates ?

Mr. GERVAIS. Yes.

Mr. MONK. I understood my hon. friend to say that the publishers of newspapers had also asked for it.

Mr. GERVAIS. One or two of them.

Mr. MONK. Does my hon. friend consider the effect that it might possibly have on the liberty of the press ?

Mr. GERVAIS. The Bill, as introduced, provides that no such trial without jury can be obtained except by the consent of both parties, unless it is agreed to by the plaintiff as well as the defendant.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

JUDGES OF THE SUPERIOR COURT, QUEBEC.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation) asked :

1. Are judges of the Superior Court in the province of Quebec under the supervision of the Minister of Justice?
2. If so, what steps does the minister purpose taking in regard to Judge Cimon, a judge of the Superior Court for the district of Kamouraska, in the province of Quebec, to compel him to reside in his district, as is required by the law?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. Only to the extent to which the general administration of justice throughout the Dominion may be ; but the administration of justice in the province, including the organization and maintenance of the superior court, is under control of the provincial authorities.
2. The minister has not been informed in what place, or places, the judge resides, and has not given consideration to the subject.

CENTRAL EMIGRATION BOARD, LONDON, ENGLAND.

Mr. VERVILLE—by Mr. A. Lavergne—(Translation) asked :

1. What moneys, if any, are paid on immigrants sent to Canada by the Central Emigration Board, London, England?
2. Has the Central Emigration Board, London, England, any authority to advertise as it does, that it receives in its work the 'co-operation of the Colonial Government employment agents and officials?'
3. Is the government aware that in the annual report of the said society, appearing in the 'Daily Telegraph,' London, England, January 4, 1908, it is stated that out of 369 persons sent out, two only went to Australia, the balance being sent to Canada, and that commenting on above statement, T. A. Coghlan, New South Wales, government office, London, E.C., states that it is true only two were accepted by Australia, 'the reason being that in the case of those whom we rejected it would have been unkind to themselves to send them to farm work, either in Australia or any other country'?
4. Has the government any information as to how many of the above number rejected by Australia, were subsequently almitted to Canada?
5. What steps, if any, are taken to protect Canada from the influx of immigrants rejected by other countries?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The board has claimed a bonus on a total of fifteen men, four women and one child ; total payments £14.10.
2. Yes, in so far as placing on farms or in domestic service persons emigrated through their organization ; this offer is made to all steamship booking agents.
3. The government is aware of the statement appearing in the society's annual report to the effect that all but two of the entire number emigrated were sent to Canada. The attention of the government has not been drawn to the comments re this made by T. A. Coghlan, representative of the government of New South Wales.
4. No.
5. A strict medical and civil examination of all immigrants is held at the ports of debarkation in accordance with the Immigration Act. A medical examination also takes place at the port of embarkation by medical officers of the Imperial Board of Trade.

TIMBER BERTHS GRANTED IN MANITOBA AND NORTHWEST.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked :

1. Of the timber limits granted in Manitoba and the Northwest, between the 4th of February, 1878, and the 17th of August, 1896, inclusive, as per list given in sessional paper No. 66a, brought down on 22nd April, 1904, how many berths were retained by the original grantees or their legal assigns, and
2. What was the total area represented thereby?

Hon. F. OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. 80.
2. 1,720·73 square miles.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—WINTER STEAMER BETWEEN ISLANDS AND MAINLAND.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Has any contract been entered into for the construction of a winter steamer to ply between Prince Edward Island and the mainland?
2. If so, when was the contract closed, what is the contract price, and when is the boat to be completed?

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

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.

THE QUEBEC BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved :

That a select committee composed of seven members of this House be named for the purpose of investigating the conditions and guarantees under which this government paid moneys to the Quebec Bridge Company and endorsed or guaranteed the bonds of the said company, and what measures were adopted by the government to insure the preparation of suitable plans of construction and the proper execution of the same and what security the government at present possesses for the sums already received by and guarantees given to the company.

That the said committee be empowered to send for persons, papers and records, and to employ a shorthand writer to take down such evidence as the committee deem necessary, and that the evidence be printed from day to day for the use of said committee, and that rule 72 be suspended in relation thereto.

He said, Mr. Speaker, in regard to this motion, which I have the honour to present to the House, I desire to say, as briefly as possible, that I have, on many occasions since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, presented motions of this nature for the nomination of a committee of investigation, but I do not remember having presented a motion having reference to a matter as important as the one which is contemplated in this motion. The Quebec bridge presents, for the examination of the House, a question which has been under consideration by the country and by the House for a great length of time and it presents itself to the consideration of this House under these peculiar circumstances that both parties have been, for a long time, committed to the construction of this great undertaking. Long before it had joined to it the further circumstance that it now forms part of the Transcontinental railway and must necessarily form part of the work of construction of that national undertaking, it at different times received promises of support from both parties, from the previous government and from this one, and even since the dreadful catastrophe of last summer when the whole structure collapsed into the water, the government on its side and my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) in the city of Quebec, at the very time of the catastrophe, pledged themselves that the work was not, on account of the sinister calamity that had supervened, going to be abandoned, but, on the contrary, it would be continued and terminated as expeditiously as possible.

In moving for a committee of examination I wish it to be understood that I am merely seeking to obtain for the House and the country that knowledge in regard to the affairs of the Quebec bridge undertaking which it has not been hitherto within our power to obtain, and which it is absolutely necessary we should possess to enable us to deal in an efficient way with the work before us. From the examination I have been able to make of the affairs of this company I have come to the conclusion, that, taking a moderate estimate, it is in my opinion impossible to complete this undertaking without incurring an expense which will amount to about $12,000,000. And in view of that, I feel that I am justified in my desire to obtain full information before the matter is dealt with. When the government was first called upon to help the undertaking the responsibility we were then assuming was not of great magnitude and the information given to the House was very meagre indeed. Then, later, when the country undertook to pledge its credit for over $6,000,000 in connection with the Quebec bridge the vote was put through a few hours before prorogation of parliament, after a prolonged session ; and although everybody seemed willing to encourage the undertaking we were not then in a position to obtain the necessary information, which no doubt explains why the vote was put through in what might be called, without exaggeration, a very singular and peculiar manner. A bridge at or near the city of Quebec was first projected a very long time ago. Many took an interest locally in it, and before it was destined to form part of the National Transcontinental Railway were anxious to see a bridge erected below the city of Quebec, passing to the island of Orleans and thence to the south side of the river. It was found on examination that the construction of a bridge there would be far more expensive than on the present site, but everybody agreed that were it not for the great cost, the bridge would have been better located below Quebec, and that the approaches to it (a very important item) would have been less costly on that site than at Cap Rouge.

On the 23rd June, 1887, by chapter 98, 50-51 Victoria, the company which at that time undertook to build the bridge was incorporated by the Dominion parliament. By section 5 of that statute the capital was fixed at $1,000,000 in 10,000 shares of $100 each. By section 7 it was provided that the company could not commence operations until $200,000 had been subscribed and ten per cent in cash deposited in a chartered bank.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was that a Dominion charter.

Mr. MONK. Yes, it was considered to be a work for the general advantage of Canada even at that time. By chapter 69, 60-61 Victoria, the amount to be paid in cash on the subscription of $200,000 was fixed at $50,000. Did the company, with which we are at present very seriously concerned, fulfil that condition ? I have been unable to ascertain that fact and I do not think it is

possible with the documents at our disposal to arrive at any certain conclusion as to the amount of stock which was actually paid in. The researches I have made lead me to think it is very doubtful if the company at any time conformed to that essential condition before it commenced operations. On the 12th of March, 1903, the secretary of the company, Mr. Ulric Barthe, certified that 2,145 shares of the capital had been subscribed representing a subscription of $214,500, while seven months later the same official certified that the subscribed capital was represented by 2,203 shares or $220,300. Now, as to what was actually paid in—and in this I am giving the House all the information I have been able to secure with the view of showing that there is still a great deal of information required before the House can possibly deal intelligently with this important subject. Now as to what had been actually paid in—on 1,928 shares twenty-five per cent or $48,200 had been paid in ; on 125 shares four per cent or $500 had been paid in ; on 150 shares the report says that 100 per cent or $15,000 had been paid in ; in all $63,700. That is what appears by the certificate of the secretary of the company. But this sum of $15,000 should be deducted, because in reality it represents 150 shares which were distributed between Mr. Parent and his co-directors, namely, R. Audette, Vesey Boswell, John Breakey, Narcisse Rioux, Nemese Garneau, Gaspard Lemoine, H. M. Price and Arthur Paquet.

So far as I have been able to ascertain, they were not paid for in cash; consequently they must be deducted from the sum of $63,700 of paid-up stock, leaving as the sum actually paid up in cash $48,700. I should remark here that the Act clearly decrees that the sum of $50,000 has to be paid up in cash, and section 15 of the same Act forbade the issuing of paid-up stock to promoters, restricting the use of paid-up stock to the payment of certain claims specified in the section, such as material for the bridge, work of construction and remuneration of engineers. By section 2 of the statute of 1897, 60-61 Victoria, it was provided that all those who appeared as subscribers to the bridge company before 1897 could withdraw on giving notice of their intention to do so. Up to 1897 the bridge company seems to have been composed of leading citizens of Quebec, without restriction to any particular political party; but it appears that pursuant to section 2 of the statute of 1897, most of the subscribers of stock withdrew, leaving the company under the control and in the possession of a few privileged individuals. There is a great deal of ambiguity in regard to the 125 shares to which I have referred upon which 4 per cent only had been paid. As far as I have been able to ascertain, these shares stand as follows : Ulric Barthe, secretary treasurer of the company, 50 shares; F. X. Berlinguet, 50 shares; and William Rhodes, 25 shares. But notwithstanding that information, there is a document furnished to the government, in which it is certified that 25 per cent, and not 4 per cent, has been paid on these shares. Apart from 75 shares which were given as I understand to Mr. Parent out of the 150 shares which were distributed among the gentlemen to whom I have already referred, Mr. Parent, who is the president of the company, had subscribed for fifty more shares, upon which he had paid 25 per cent like the others, that is to say, the sum of $1,250.

Now, this is as far as one can see by a reference to such documents as I have been able to obtain up to the year 1903 in regard to the shares. It was on the 4th August, 1899, that this House was asked for the first time to vote a sum in aid of the construction of that bridge, and we voted the sum of $1,000,000. It is sufficient to say, without referring to the evidence at greater length, that 40 per cent was to be paid on monthly progress estimates made by the government engineers. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister on that occasion gave a very short explanation of the structure which was then in contemplation, which explanation will be found in 'Hansard' of August 4, 1899. It appeared from that explanation that the length of the bridge was to be 3,280 feet and that the masonry would cost $1,200,000 and the superstructure $2,400,000, or a total for the bridge of $3,600,000, outside of the approaches, which it was considered at the time would cost more above Quebec than below the city. It also appeared from the remarks of the Prime Minister that $30,000 had been spent on plans, and that $50,000 had been paid up on capital. The cost of the approaches had been calculated, and according to the estimates submitted to the House by the Prime Minister at that time, their cost was not to exceed the sum of $400,000. In other words, it was calculated that the cost of the bridge complete, with all its approaches, would not exceed the sum of $4,000,000. Still, strange to say, in a letter bearing date October 14, 1903, which is document 148 of the session of 1905, Mr. Parent, the president of the bridge company, says to the government :

> It is calculated that the completion of these works will cost about $6,900,000.—S. M. Parent, president Quebec Bridge Company.

Mr. Schreiber, the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, in an estimate dated December 2, 1902, places the value of the work done up to that time at $1,416,394, and the amount required to complete the work in 1903, according to the statement of the president of the company, was $6,900,000, or a total of $8,316,394, or more by $300,000 than twice as much as had been

estimated as the cost of the whole structure with the approaches. With the Act of 1903, which is known as 3 Edward VII, chapter 54, is incorporated the agreement between the bridge company and the government, which preceded the Act by three or four days. The Act was sanctioned on October 24, twenty-four hours before the prorogation of that year, and the agreement is dated October 19, 1903. The enterprise had received in subsidies up to that date from the province of Quebec, $250,000, from the city of Quebec, $300,000, and upon the grant of $1,000,000, made by this parliament in 1897, it had received from the Dominion government $374,353, making a total subsidy received of $924,353.

The company had received in paid up capital $65,585.70, according to its statement. But according to my calculation $50,000 has never been paid up in cash as required by the statute, but only $48,700—$15,000 of shares having been distributed among the persons I have already referred to.

Moreover, outside of the grants received, amounting in all to $924,353, outside the paid up capital of $65,585.70, there were debentures issued by the company upon its own responsibility amounting to $472,000, upon which debentures the company had received, or had benefited at any rate, to the extent of $283,279. The total, therefore, in cash received by the company amounted to $1,273,217.70.

The company itself admitted at that time that it had paid $1,198,141, which, deducted from the sum of $1,273,217.70, left a balance in the hands of the company of $75,076.70. But of this balance I have sought in vain to find any trace anywhere. That is what appears, according to the statement of the company itself, and it should, at that time, have had in hand that balance of $75,076.50, but I can find no trace of it.

Let us resume consideration of the estimate of Mr. Schreiber. The value of the works executed at that time, according to the calculation of Mr. Schreiber, deputy minister, was $1,416,394. There was paid off in cash $914,862 and in debentures $283,279, being a total of $1,198,141. What at that time was the condition of the company, as far as its debts were concerned? As far as I have been able to ascertain by the statements of the company itself, which are reiterated in the statute passed by us at the end of the session of 1903, the indebtedness of the company stood as follows:

Amount due to contractor..	$218,253
Debentures issued and due..	472,000
Interest and accounts due by the company..	34,298
Technical work..	25,000
Superstructure..	30,000
	779,551

In other words, the company on the 15th October, 1903, had a floating debt of $779,551, and it is impossible to arrive at any other conclusion than that at the time when we entered into the agreement of the 19th October, 1903, which was sanctioned and incorporated into the Act passed the 24th October, 1903, that company was hopelessly insolvent, was unable to continue its operations, and it must have been evident to any one that by granting the company's request and guaranteeing its bonds for an amount exceeding $6,000,000 we were committing a most improvident and imprudent act. As regards the balance of $75,076.50 I have been unable to find any trace of it anywhere.

At that time, therefore, with this financial condition before us, and a few hours before the end of the session of 1903, we made the agreement and undertook to guarantee the bonds of the company to the amount of $6,678,200. Section 12 of the agreement, incorporated into the statute, provides that the plans of the bridge property had to receive the approval of the government. I do not know if they ever did. If I mistake not, since the beginning of the session the government was asked the question and it seems to me that my right hon. friend answered he presumed they had. But I have found no proof of that, though it seems impossible that the bonds could have been guaranteed and the agreement accepted before the government had ample occasion to look carefully into these plans and see whether they had good grounds for approving of them.

Section 14 of the agreement of 19th October, 1903, provides for the nomination of three directors. I believe that two were named in pursuance of that provision, but I have not found any trace of the third. Nor have I found trace of any report or communication or any evidence of these directors having ever acted with any great activity.

Section 4 is important, and I call attention to it because it provides that $200,000 of stock, before that agreement can be carried into effect, must be subscribed in the bridge company and paid up. Why was that disposition made part of the agreement? It was because when the bridge company discounted its debentures—amounting, as I have stated, to $472,000—it had paid as a discount the sum of $188,721. That is to say, it had given these bonds in payment for the undertaking at 40 per cent off their face value. These bonds, of course, as the House no doubt bears in mind, were not at that time guaranteed, but were the bonds of the bridge company itself. Section 18 provides for the expropriation of the company, because, as the House is aware, at that time, in 1903, it was perfectly apparent to everybody that our having undertaken the National Transcontinental road made it absolutely neces-

sary for us to take that bridge over. And it is a question extremely difficult to answer why, at that moment—the bridge company being in the financial condition to which I have already referred, and that bridge being absolutely necessary to an undertaking already sanctioned by the country—we should have confided the construction of that most important work to a company that was practically in bankruptcy, and abandoned virtually that careful supervision and personal attention—if I may use that expression—of the work of construction which was absolutely necessary for an undertaking upon which we were embarking such a large amount of money, and in connection with which we were assuming such a responsibility. Section 18, as I have stated, provides for the expropriation of the whole undertaking by the government at any time on notice of thirty days. A strange disposition in that section providing for expropriation was that we should pay over to the shareholders of the company, at the time we exercised that power of expropriation, their stock at par, including the $15,000 to which I have referred, and 5 per cent interest on so much of that stock as had been paid up from the time of its being paid up, and 10 per cent bonus in addition. I have already stated that at the time when the Bill, with its accompanying grant, was hurriedly passed, questions were asked as to whether that $200,000 additional stock would be found. The then Minister of Justice, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, said, if I mistake not, that it had already been found. Was it really found, and was it paid up in conformity with the agreement when this discount of the bonds was made? This is more than I have been able to ascertain. Coming down to the present, a matter of very great moment is the question: What has been done upon that undertaking? I have pointed out that there was an admission by the company in 1903 that the sum of $1,198,141 had been spent. We have handed over the bonds to the company, I presume; for, from an answer given on the 3rd instant by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to a question put by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), it appears on June 30th last the company borrowed from the Bank of Montreal, upon the security of the bonds endorsed by the government, the sum of $5,561,507.23 at 5 per cent. The bonds bear 3 per cent. It would appear then that on June 30th last the company went to the Bank of Montreal and borrowed, at the rate of 5 per cent, this large sum of over five and a half millions.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will permit me; he has hardly correctly apprehended that part of the transaction. It did not take place on that date. Moneys were advanced from time to time. The balance I stated in reply to the question was correct; but it does not mean that the whole transaction was of that date. It makes no difference so far as the responsibility is concerned, I admit.

Mr. MONK. It seemed to me as my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) has just stated it. A passing observation is that it seems very extraordinary that so very large a sum should have been borrowed just at that time in a market where there was such a great stringency, when, with the guarantee that they had, the company could have secured that sum at a lower rate of interest in another market which was in a different situation from that in which the market of Montreal was about that time. Another question which naturally suggests itself is: Has the floating debt of $779,551 been paid off in full? I presume that the money was borrowed partly for the purpose of paying off that large floating debt which made the company appear insolvent in 1903, but I have found no absolute proof in regard to the disposition of that very large floating debt. One thing appears to me to be certain at the present moment—and I shall just touch upon it, as I do not wish to delay the House, my only excuse for taking up so much time as I do being that the subject is of considerable importance—and that is that this bridge company now, as in 1903, is insolvent; it is as insolvent to-day as it was at that time. Exactly what its condition is seems to be one of those points which it is our duty to ascertain fully. For we are committed absolutely to this important work. There is no doubt now, it seems to me, that we must take up this work ourselves; and it is necessary, in order that we may do that in a proper manner, that we should ascertain exactly the situation of the company. But what is the situation of the Phœnix Bridge Company, which had undertaken to construct the bridge? So far as I have been able to ascertain—and I do not wish in any sense to malign that company, but I think that what I say is well founded—it is not in a financial condition to face this very large loss. Very few companies would be; but, from information which I have been able to secure, I do not think that the Phœnix Bridge Company, in that respect, is in a different position from what most companies would be in under similar circumstances. Were there any insurances upon this work? I am informed that there were not. The loss is, therefore, an absolute loss. There seems to be nobody at present responsible in connection with the work or able to meet the financial loss connected with it. I conclude from that, from such information as I have been able, as a member of this House, to gather in a very limited and restricted manner, that this great loss must fall upon ourselves; that is, upon the country.

Another point which deserves consideration from a careful examination of section 18 of the agreement of 1903, incorporated in the statute of that year. We are obliged under section 18 of the agreement to pay,

as I have stated, the shareholders of the company in the manner already referred to in order to disinterest them; but we are also bound to pay all the debts and obligations of the company, contracted with the approval or sanction of the government. This, to my mind, would undoubtedly include the floating debt existing to-day and it would also comprise all other debts or obligations of the company for which the company could presume to have the consent if not written at least tacit, of the government.

I would like to remark in connection with this same point, because it is intimately related to it, that on the 10th of July, 1903, by a statute known as chapter 177, 3 Edward VII., we increased very considerably indeed the powers of the company, particularly by sections 4 and 5 which I shall not take up the time of the House in reading. Suffice it to say in a general way that from being a mere bridge company the company became a terminal and connecting company. It was empowered to lay out wharfs, storehouses, elevators, at or near Quebec or at either end of the bridge; telephones, and tramways and terminal tracks from the north and south end of the bridge to Quebec and Lévis respectively; and powers of expropriation were given to the company in this connection. Have those powers been exercised? If they have, and I have heard some rumour to the effect that to a certain extent expropriations have been carried on—whether that is true or not, I cannot vouch—it seems to me undoubtedly that section 18 of the agreement would cover an indemnity to the company for such of those powers as it may have exercised. At any rate there is some very serious question on that point and I have no doubt that if those extraordinary powers granted in 1903 by this government and by this legislature have been legitimately exercised, our expropriation would have to cover an indemnity for the exercise of those powers.

An inquiry has been ordered by the government; and for this no doubt the government is to be commended, although I will say frankly that I am not in a position to very greatly commend the government for any other action of theirs in connection with this matter since 1903. It seems to me they could not have proceeded in a more imprudent and unbusinesslike manner than they have done. But the accident, the dreadful accident which we all have present in our minds to-day, occurred on the 29th of August last, and the following day a report was prepared and sent to Council on the 31st of August last, ordering an inquiry. The inquiry which was then ordered is in its scope and nature very different from the one which I have in contemplation by this motion. The object of that inquiry is set forth in the order in council, a copy of which I have here. It is to name three commissioners:

> to investigate and report upon the said matter.

That is, the breakdown of the bridge.

> —such investigation and report—but without thereby limiting the scope of the inquiry—to embrace and especially deal with the several questions suggested by the chief engineer.

Higher up it is stated that the chief engineer—

> States that it is his opinion that a commission should issue to three competent engineers empowering them to make an investigation, under oath, into the cause of the collapse of such bridge, and into all matters incidental thereto, and that this action should be taken immediately in view of the grave situation and the circumstances of the case.

The order in council further suggests the names of Mr. H. Holgate, civil engineer, Montreal; Mr. J. G. G. Kerry, civil engineer, Campbellford; and Prof. John Galbraith, of the University of Toronto. As I understand it, although as the House sees they are not absolutely circumscribed or limited, the object of that inquiry was to find out the causes of the accident and I for one am quite prepared to say that that was a very fit matter of investigation for this commission of three men, and one upon which it is desirable that the House should be fully informed. But it is of a technical nature, so technical in fact, that I am perfectly sure that very few members of this House, when that report is made, will be in a position to absolutely understand the cause of the accident.

The object of the inquiry which I propose is totally different, as the House will see on reading the motion. What I desire to know is our financial position, the situation of the company, the responsibilities of the company, the contracts, what disposal has been made of the money, all matters which, I submit to this House and to the government, we should be absolutely acquainted with, and familiar with before we can intelligently discuss a matter of this great importance. I take this occasion to say that I do not think we have abused select committees in this House but that there is rather a regrettable tendency to not grant select committees. It is my opinion that this is a very grave error indeed, and that we should as much as possible, follow the example of other legislatures of modern creation which have provided very largely for the devolution of their important work upon select committees. Even in England, within the last two or three years, any one who reads knows that the public men of that country are advocating on all sides a scheme of devolution by which a very great deal indeed of the multifarious labour devolves on the House of Commons in Eng-

land will be divided off and distributed to the committees. That is the tendency. It seems to me, Sir, that within a very short time indeed we have learned what we might lose in this legislature by not pursuing that course. We have made a treaty which I deem to have been an unfortunate one and which it seems to me would have been a very different one had it been studied by a committee as the American treaty with Japan was, as all treaties are submitted to the committee of the Senate on Foreign Relations. I was surprised the other day, when I attempted to have another important commercial treaty submitted to a committee of this House in order that we could know exactly what the advantages of that treaty were, that the idea did not seem to meet with any acceptance from my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. It seems to me, Sir, that all matters without any exception in regard to which the House desires information are fit and proper matters to be referred to committees.

It is only by means of such a committee that, upon the questions that we have to deal with, we can become properly informed. I venture to say that we would have, after the session has not been in duration for quite a long time, made a great deal more progress indeed than we have made in the tendency to distribute the work of the House of Commons amongst small commit tees had been carried out. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that this is a work to which we are committed; there is no difference of opinion between us on that point. Are we going, as we have already on one occasion been called upon, to dispose of this very important matter, of this national matter, without careful knowledge and investigation of the facts so that at any time, even if it is at the end of the session, and this question is brought before us we will be in a position to intelligently deal with it? I submit that this is the proper course—the course that we should adopt. This is the course desired in my own province. I know that in the province of Quebec there is at the present moment a desire that the country should be fully informed. There is a reason for it. In the city of Quebec where this undertaking perhaps interests them more—although I question that myself—than it does in other parts of the country, at any rate, where there has been for a very long time a desire to see the river St. Lawrences bridged at that point, there is also a desire that this matter should be fully looked into. It must be taken up, it must be taken up soon, we are the only ones who can take it up and in order to take it up properly I submit to the House, Sir, a motion for this committee of investigation.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, while I am not prepared to admit the general view as expressed by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in regard to the formation of special committees to perform the work which has been entrusted by the people to the House, still, on this occasion I admit that the subject to which he has called attention is a proper subject for investigation. As my hon. friend has stated, on both sides of the House we are committed to the construction of a bridge at Quebec. It is a work of national importance and the usefulness of it is no longer contested. The unfortunate circumstance with which we are painfully familar makes it imperative that the most ample light should be shed upon that part of the transaction which has conduced from the beginning to the catastrophe. It is all the more important that such an investigation should take place because there are, in the minds of many hon. members and certainly in the mind of my hon. friend himself, what I believe to be misconceptions in regard to the organization of the company and the distribution of its funds and the money which has gone into the bridge. It is therefore, I conceive, advisable, as I said a moment ago, that ample opportunity should be given to the House to be placed in a position to know accurately where we stand before the government has to come again for the credit of the House in order to prosecute this work. Therefore, Mr Speaker, I have simply to agree to the resolution of my hon. friend.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—ALLEGED RATE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST FREDERICTON, N.B.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence between the Railway Commission and the Department of Railways and Canals, or the Intercolonial Railway, and between the Railway Commission and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Grand Trunk Railway, and between the Railway Commission and the Fredericton Board of Trade, in reference to the alleged discrimination against the city of Fredericton in the matter of freight rates. And also for a copy of all other papers and documents on file with the Railway Commission in relation thereto.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I regret the necessity of having to move this motion in the absence of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), but it has been standing so long upon the paper without being reached that I feel I ought to avail myself of the present opportunity of presenting it to the House. The Canada Eastern Railway was acquired by the government and made a part of the Intercolonial Railway system in the autumn of 1904 shortly before the general elections of that year. The purchase was one of the principal government canvasses in that elec-

tion. All the changes were rung upon it—what great benefits were to accrue to the city of Fredericton, to York and the adjoining counties, by reason of low freight and passenger rates, improved train service, &c. The Minister of Railways and Canals at that time himself addressed a political meeting at Fredericton a few days before polling day and devoted, I may say, a great portion of his speech to an appeal to the people of Fredericton and York county for support on the ground of the purchase of the Canada Eastern by the government and the great things that it would mean for the city of Fredericton and the country traversed by the railway. This is a passage from the report of the minister's speech as it appeared in the government organ published in Fredericton :

> The Conservatives of Fredericton don't want the Canada Eastern improved. They don't want higher wages paid. They don't want a maritime express or an ocean limited, they don't want an efficient service on the Canadian Eastern branch of the Intercolonial Railway; they don't want cheap passenger and freight rates; they don't want an express and a freight train each way on the Canada Eastern every day.

And so on. Before the railway was taken over by the government and at the time that the Minister of Railways and Canals used these words the rate upon first class through freight from Montreal and points west to Fredericton was fifty-eight cents per hundred pounds. That was the same rate that the city of St. John enjoyed. No sooner, however, was the election over than a differential of eight cents per 100 pounds was imposed against the city of Fredericton, the town of Marysville and also against Gibson upon all through freight from points west of Montreal, the rates being increased from fifty-eight to sixty-six cents per 100 pounds. The matter was discussed in this House in the month of May, 1905, and at that time hon. gentlemen may remember that a letter or a telegram was produced which showed that even the general traffic manager of the Intercolonial Railway, Mr. Tiffin, had held that this was a most unjust discrimination against the city of Fredericton and one which was calculated to ruin the city as a distributing centre. The Board of Trade of the city of Fredericton afterwards took the matter up and a petition was filed with the Board of Railway Commissioners on the 15th June, 1905, protesting against the differential.

Copies of that petition were forwarded to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway on the 13th July, 1905. The petition was referred to the traffic officer of the Board of Railway Commissioners and a report was received from that officer under date April 28th, 1906, which report, I am informed, contained a recommendation in favour of the removal of the discrimination complained of. Copies of that report were sent to the railways interested and a reply was received on the 21st of June, 1906. Notwithstanding that 21 months have since elapsed, nothing has since been done and the matter remains in statu quo, so that Fredericton, Gibson and Marysville have had to submit for over three years to a differential freight rate which the traffic manager of the Intercolonial has pronounced to be without justification or excuse and which the tariff expert of the Board of Railway Commissioners has also reported against. That is the injustice which I wish to bring to the attention of the government at the present time, and I hope that the Minister of Railways and Canals or the Railway Department will deem it to be their duty to take this matter up and to see that justice is done without further delay. It seems to me that this injustice should have been remedied long ago without the necessity of an application to the Board of Railway Commissioners. It cannot be seriously contended that the Intercolonial Railway is not responsible for the differentiation of rates as between different stations upon its own line. Nothing illustrates this more clearly to my mind than the differential against Fredericton, Gibson and Marysville, which is complained of in the present instance. For example, take the case of a shipment of freight from Gananoque, Ont., to Fredericton, N.B., and the case of a shipment of freight from Gananoque to the city of St. John, N.B.; in both cases the freight comes by the Grand Trunk Railway to the city of Montreal, between the same points and over the same rails, so that so far as the Grand Trunk end of the haul is concerned the rate must be the same in each case. If there is any difference in the rate between St. John and Fredericton it must necessarily, therefore, be in consequence of the Intercolonial end of the haul. Fredericton is 56 miles nearer Montreal than is St. John, N.B., and, as I have pointed out, in the time of the Canada Eastern and until this differential was imposed shortly after the last general election, both cities were in the same group in the matter of through freight rates. It is very clear that either this differential must have been imposed by the Intercolonial Railway itself or the Intercolonial Railway must have consented to its imposition by others. That is a proposition which I think admits of no controversy. It certainly could not have been imposed without the consent of the Intercolonial Railway. The Intercolonial Railway must take the responsibility of having imposed it directly in this particular case, or of having permitted it under the terms of an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway by which they have surrendered to these railways the control of their rates on through

freight as between stations on their own line. If that is the situation, and I believe it is, the only explanation that has been offered of the differential complained of, it is, I think, a very ineffective defence, and so far as this government is concerned it will prove a more unpopular defence than if they had frankly admitted that the discrimination was imposed by the Intercolonial Railway itself without reference to the other railways, because it means nothing more or less than that they have entered into a combine with other railways of which the Intercolonial Railway is presumed to be a competitor, for the purpose of keeping down and destroying competition in rates. I have referred to the opinion of the traffic manager of the Intercolonial, Mr. Tiffin, on this matter. That opinion will be found in a telegram from Mr. Tiffin to Mr. J. W. Loud of the Grand Trunk printed in 'Hansard' (page 6118, May 17, 1905), which reads as follows:

Your telegram date re Fredericton rates. I still consider as a matter of justice and right that Fredericton rates should be on the basis of St. John and not any higher, in view of local changes made by the Canadian Pacific from St. John and Fredericton; and in view also of the reduction in their flour rates to their points north to Macadam Junction, this advance to Fredericton can have no other effect than that of crippling Fredericton as a distributing centre.

This being the opinion of the traffic manager of the Intercolonial, it seems to me that it will be very difficult to find any reason or excuse for the continuance of this discrimination against not only the city of Fredericton, but the important town of Marysville and Gibson also. I trust the government will lose no time in having the injustice remedied.

There is another matter in this connection which I also wish to bring to the attention of the government. The Fredericton and St. Marys Railway Bridge which spans the St. John river at Fredericton, became the property of the government in the summer of 1905 by virtue of the foreclosure of a mortgage to secure an advance of $300,000 towards the construction of the bridge. Notwithstanding that this bridge then became the property of the government and has since been and is now part of the Intercolonial Railway system, the government has continued to exact special tolls upon all passenger traffic crossing that bridge to and from the city of Fredericton. The ticket agents of the Intercolonial Railway are instructed upon the sale of all single first-class tickets from Fredericton to points beyond Marysville and from points beyond Marysville to Fredericton to exact an additional 10 cents, and in the case of return tickets to and from points beyond Fredericton an additional 15 cents as a special toll for the crossing of this bridge. In the case of Marysville the toll is five cents each way. Now, I believe that is a practice which cannot be justified by any government or by any railway company. This bridge being part of the Intercolonial Railway system there is no more reason why the people of York county or other parts of New Brunswick should pay a special toll for crossing that bridge than there is why passengers on the Intercolonial Railway should pay for crossing any other bridge upon the system. It is a burden upon the people of Fredericton and Marysville and bears specially hard upon the people of the rural districts of York county—a burden for which there is no justification and which should, therefore, be removed at once. It seems to me that I should only have to bring this injustice to the attention of the government to secure its removal, for I doubt if in any part of this country on the government railway or on any other railway tolls are exacted from passengers for crossing a bridge belonging to the railway system on which they are travelling.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am sorry that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways could not be in his place to-day; but I conceded that the hon. gentleman could not defer his motion any longer. I am sorry that I am not in a position to give any answer to the observations which he has made. The subject will, however, come up again for discussion when the Minister of Railways is in his place. In the meantime, I have no objection to papers being brought down.

Motion agreed to.

A BUREAU OF PUBLIC HEALTH.

Mr. J. B. BLACK (Hants) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when the government of Canada should perfect organization whereby present scientific knowledge should be made practically available for the suppression of the causes of preventable diseases.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have no apology to make for moving this resolution, which looks to the formation of a bureau of public health. This is a subject which has taken a deep hold on the minds of the medical profession for some years, not only in Canada, but in the adjoining republic, as well as on the minds of others who are interested in the bettterment of present conditions. The question has been twice discussed in the Canadian Medical Association, and at its last session a large and representative committee was appointed to wait on the federal government to urge the formation of a properly equipped bureau of public health; and that committee, I believe, will fulfil that duty very soon.

The subject-matter in this resolution is of such a great importance both from an economic and humanitarian point of view that it is

worthy of the earnest consideration and advocacy of the ablest minds of the Dominion. The consideration of the prevention of preventable diseases is to-day taking a place in the civilized world that it never did before, and the ablest men of this continent, of Great Britain, of the continent of Europe, and of Japan are giving earnest study and much time to the subject of government control of preventable diseases. The world has for several hundred years been making progress in banishing diseases, but it has been a slow and painful process. Ignorance of the laws violated, and when known, selfish indifference to the suffering of others or to the national loss have been the causes of failure and slow progress. Heretofore cowardice and personal fear of death and disease have been the chief motives in limping attempts at prevention. But in this enlightened 20th century science has more clearly seen the way of prevention. Political economists have seen the enormous loss to the state in dollars and cents, and humanitarians as well as economists have seen the appalling needless sacrifice of human lives, the needless suffering of sick and diseased humanity, and the needless and almost unbelievable slaughter of innocent children.

When dense ignorance prevailed and terrible epidemics of diseases swept the earth as in the 'black death,' in the 14th century, when 25,000,000 perished in Europe, or later when the great plagues swept over London and England, when half the population died, statesmen and physicians were helpless to save. But in the 20th century, when causes of diseases are so well known, when the prevention of so many of them is simply a question of organization and money, humanity and economy both demand why the present conditions should continue. They will not continue; for there is a persistent demand throughout the civilized world for government interference and there is growing everywhere a demand to teach and to be taught how to prevent preventable diseases. In England a course in hygiene and preventative medicine is being introduced into the universities, particularly the study of Galton's new Science of Eugenics—the science of improving the human race. In the United States there is a demand for, and an increased supply of literature bearing on the protection of public health. Among these are those touching on the prevention of tuberculosis, typhoid fever and the questions of pure water supply, pure milk, pure food, labour of women and children in factories, factory sanitation, &c.

A committee of 100 in the United States, embracing men of national and world-wide repute, are now engaged in conducting a campaign for the prevention of preventable diseases, and are asking the national government to reorganize the bureaus of public health so that the federal government may have a more perfect control of preventable diseases. I here quote from an editorial of the 'Yale Medical Journal' touching the United States government's Department of Health :

That the movement for a national organization of public health has gained a momentum which promises early and extensive legislation of Congress, few may doubt.

President Roosevelt, in his speech at Princeton, among other things said :

I also hope that there will be legislation increasing the power of the national government to deal with matters concerning the health of our people everywhere. The federal authorities, for instance, should join with all the state authorities in warring against the dreadful scourge of tuberculosis. I hope to see the national government stand abreast of the foremost state governments. This stand taken by the President is in accord with his letter to the Committee of One Hundred. In it he said: 'Our national health is physically our greatest national asset.'

To prevent any possible deterioration of the American stock should be a national ambition. We cannot too strongly insist on the necessity of proper ideals for the family, for simple living, and for those habits and tastes which produce vigour, and make men capable of strenuous service to their country. I can most cordially commend the endeavours of your committee to bring these matters prominently before the public.

He goes on to say :

By such an organization—a federal bureau of public health only can the pressing problems be met—such as the pollution of our rivers by means of which contamination of whole populations happens, and as a result typhoid is in constant occurrence; the infection of whole populations by travellers.

I am quoting now from the medical journal :

The dangers of the bubonic plague which already has a foothold on the Pacific coast, the extension of the federal quarantine and kindred questions. The progress already made in pure food legislation should also be maintained. There can be no question that laws regarding child labour and female labour, adulteration of drugs and food, contamination of water supply or such destructive scourges as tuberculosis are simply justified on the grounds of public health, and at the same time in legislation of incalculable value to the labouring classes.

I may say that the governments of Germany and of France have made the whole world their debtors for the work done for humanity, in the prevention of disease, by Koch, Pasteur and many others. These men, officials of their governments, with government salaries were able to devote their whole time and knowledge to scientific research which has blessed humanity everywhere. Government control, government patronage and a properly equipped government bureau is the keynote of suc-

cess in the prevention of preventable diseases. To the French and German governments both we are indebted for the antitoxine diphtheria cure.

Two or three questions naturally come to the front in considering this resolution :

1. Can certain diseases be prevented ?
2. Can we afford it ?
3. Is it the duty of the federal government to form and control a bureau of public health ?

To the first question I answer, decidedly, yes. Actuated only for the most part by cowardice and personal fear of disease and death we have destroyed the great epidemic of small-pox, have reduced leprosy to a very few isolated spots. Have completely swept scurvy from the navy. Yellow fever and typhoid fever are greatly reduced. So is scarlet fever and tuberculosis. Enteric fever that (awful scourge of the military camp) was in the last great war, Russo-Japanese, reduced to such an extent that it attracted the wonder and admiration of the world. If all this can be done by the dim light of the past what may not be done in this Dominion of ours with the present scientific knowledge administered by a government bureau of public health.

Let us consider the question of typhoid fever alone. There are cities and towns in Canada that have their cases of typhoid every day in the year, any one of which is preventable, Professor Irving Fisher of Yale university says :

Typhoid fever can be practically abolished by the prevention of the pollution of the rivers and other sources of water supply and by improving our milk.

Medical writers of undoubted authority have said that it is a disgrace to any community to have an epidemic of typhoid fever. I have seen cases where the cause was so apparent, the filth so near, that the result, as well as the conditions, admitted of no other word than disgraceful.

In regard to the most frequent cause of typhoid. I would like to read a quotation in part, of an article on this subject by Dr. Charles A. S. Reid, special United States commissioner to Panama 1905, and president of the National Legislative Conference of the American Medical Association. What he says here of one particular river and its towns will apply, though perhaps in a less degree because of less population, to the St. Lawrence, the Ottawa, Toronto bay and a score or more other sources of water supply and typhoid, in Canada.

Everybody who knows anything about the subject at all knows that typhoid fever is a water borne disease, that its chief medium of dissemination is the water we drink. And everybody knows too, that the cities, in the Ohio watershed for the most part, derive their water supply from that stream or its tributaries. Now the city of Alleghany had nearly 1,300 cases of typhoid last year, the discharge from which patients, a half million of them, went into the Ohio river. Pittsburg with a larger population and a higher death rate from typhoid probably contributed twice as much. Cincinatti had about 2,000 cases and consequently drained a million typhoid dejections into the river. Louisville reinforced the pollution with a proportionately large contribution. And what is true of these large cities is proportionately true of the hundreds of smaller cities and towns. Is it any wonder that typhoid is prevalent at all times in this great area.

Why is there not more of it? The question may well be asked. In the first place, the human system under normal conditions has great powers of resistance. Not every person who swallows typhoid germs comes down with the disease. In the next place, streams fortunately have the power of self-purification to a certain extent. And finally, some of the cities have an extensive plant for precipitation and filteration of the water and these help to purify it. If it were not for these factors there would be no typhoid in the Ohio valley for the good and sufficient reason that the people would have died with the disease. As it is thousands of them die every year, for all the preventative facts that I have mentioned taken together do not and cannot prevent the disease as long as the flagrant contamination that I have hinted at is permitted to continue.

For, understand, typhoid fever dejectia represents only one of the countless forms of filth that are drained into the Ohio river. And what is true of the Ohio river is true of the majority of all the other rivers of the United States. We are simply making sewers lions in a futile effort to cure conditions that ought to have been successfully prevented for a tenth of the money.

I want you to keep it in mind that what we have said just now about the Ohio river and the United States is just as true of Canadian rivers and of Canada. Now, I wish to quote again Dr. McCormack, an official of the American Medical Association, speaking of typhoid, he says :

This is not only a preventable disease, but the most typical of the filth diseases, for no one can have it except by getting into his mouth and stomach some of the discharges from the bowels or kidneys of some one who has typhoid fever. This is not a nice thing to think about, but it is so much worse to do it that nice people——

—like ourselves here,

—ought to think and plan how to stop doing it. It usually gets into the mouth through infected water.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is a picture of polluted water supply and its dreadful results which can be matched in miniature all over Canada, for typhoid fever is everywhere from Prince Rupert to Cape North, Cape Breton, whether from a conducted water system or from the farmhouse well, the baccillus typhosus gets in his work every day.

Now, I shall naturally be asked by practical men—and I want to consider this subject in a very practical way—can water supplies, whether from a river or a lake or a well be made so absolutely pure that no typhoid fever shall result. Medical science says, emphatically, yes. It is only a question of proper organization, proper control and money. And money ?—yes ; but less money than the cost of sickness, death, burial and the loss of producers. In other words, it will cost less, when properly used, to keep our drinking water clean than the loss occasioned by typhoid fever. I can personally cite more than one town where the ever-recurring annual list of typhoid has been completely wiped out by a correction of the water supply. I have taken the cases of typhoid fever, its chief causes and its prevention simply to illustrate what may be done in all preventable diseases. Of course, there are diseases which cannot be prevented, that is, at our present-time knowledge. Cancer and such things as that we do not claim to have sufficient knowledge yet to prevent. But I am sure that, at the present rate of progress in the medical profession, it will not be long before we can class cancer among the preventable diseases. I am just now discussing preventable diseases, and, God knows, there are enough of them without considering any others here. I hope I have shown that we can prevent preventable diseases. Now, let us try to answer the second question.

Can we afford it ? Let us look first at the appalling loss of useful lives, and of producing citizens to Canada, and the cost of protecting the public from the terror and alarm against the ravages of contagious diseases which should have been prevented. Canada contains a population, let us say, one-twelfth that of the United States. The natural condition and the state of sanitation are about equal in Canada and the United States. If I quote statistics by experts applying to the United States, we can judge how they should apply to Canada. According to that reliable journal,' American Medicine '—and it is a standard publication —typhoid fever alone costs the United States annually $185,000,000—that is a tremendous sum, and if it were not given by one of the most reliable medical journals in the United States, we might almost doubt. Taking the basis of comparison that I have mentioned, this would make the cost to Canada about five and one-half millions loss through typhoid alone yearly. Now, these are cold facts and there is no exaggeration about them. Dr. Hodgetts. the secretary of the Board of Health of Ontario, says that the neglect of sanitation has cost Ontario $2,000,000 in small-pox cases alone in the past ten years. Now, one would think that the sum of $2,000,000, if properly expended, would be sufficient to prevent small-pox in Canada—I was going to say for all time to come. Dr. Smith Walker, of Truro, N.S., says that he knows a county—presumably Colchester, N.S.—which, not long since spent $20,000 in one small-pox scare, the epidemic resulting in one death. We might go all over Canada and find like wasteful expenditure due to the want of intelligent and proper organization. According to our official statistics—and I have gone very carefully over them—the death-rate in Canada for the period covered by the census of 1901 was 81,201 per year on the average. According to reliable authorities on state sanitation, one-third of these deaths are preventable. That is to say, 27,066 people are needlessly lost every year to Canada—to Canada that needs citizens about as much as does any country in the world. At $5 a head, the amount paid as bonus to shipping companies for immigrants brought to this country, these 27,066 preventable deaths represent a loss of $135,330 a year, and these are good Canadians that die, and not foreigners. At the usual estimate that a citizen is worth $1,000 to the state, the loss to Canada annually is $27,066,000 from preventable diseases. Probably, the heaviest tax, state, municipal and general paid in Canada to-day is the tax paid for unnecessary funerals, unnecessary sickness and unnecessary deaths. We must keep constantly in mind that this enormous yearly loss of citizens is preventable, is needless, and that one of the first steps towards stopping this annual loss is the organization of a federal bureau of public health. It may further help us in our conclusions if we look at the loss from those diseases considered more immediately preventable, diseases that simply and actually arise from filth.

Now, ' filth ' is a nasty word, but it is the only one to designate the causes of diphtheria, typhoid fever, small-pox, scarlet fever, measles, a large percentage of cholera morbus, dysentery and diarrhœa. Leaving out the three latter our annual death rate from the others is 7,260—7,260 poisoned to death anuually. In estimating the loss to Canada from preventable diseases we must not count the loss merely from those who die; there is also the loss to the state of those who have been incapacitated from work by their illness, their producing power suspended for many weeks and the loss of time by those who nurse their friends.

Of all our Canadian-born who die of preventable diseases there are none done to death by such sheer and culpable ignorance as our children. Of all the deaths in Canada more than one-third, a little less than one-half die under five years of age. There are 5,000 more deaths annually under the fifth year than there are from the fifth to the fifty-fifth. 31,347 children die yearly under the fifth year and here the average of one-third preventable is far too small. There can be no doubt from experiments by private philanthropy that one-half are savable.

Of the awful mortality among our children I would like to read a couple of extracts taken at random from our daily press.

The Montreal 'Herald,' in an article on vital statistics, on March 25 last, said :

The record of births and deaths in the city last week, as shown by the statistics at the Civic Health Department, indicates that the heavy mortality is still being maintained in excess of the birth-rate. There were 144 deaths in Montreal last week. Of the total, 36 were infants under 6 months of age and 67 children under 5 years, or in other words, out of 144 deaths in the week 103 were children under 5 years of age.

I have also an extract from a Guelph paper of November 26 last, reading :

At the annual meeting of the Board of Health, Dr. Robinson, medical health officer, again drew attention to the excessive infant mortality rate, over 27 per cent of all our deaths occurring before the end of the second year. When it was considered that there were not more than 400 children under that age in the city the death rate at that period of life amounted to 110 per thousand against 11·34 per thousand of the total deaths of all ages.

I quote again :

If some truly wise man were asked what would be the best prescription for the future well-being and power of our country, I believe he would answer 'cut down the appalling infant death rate and care for the health of the children.'

I do not think there is a medical man within the sound of my voice who will contradict me when I say that more than one-half the deaths of children are from improper and impure food. To show what can be done by intelligent effort, even by one man, I would like to quote a very short extract descriptive of the work done by that wealthy philanthrophist, Nathan Strauss of New York—and please remember there is no difference between milk and babies in New York and milk and babies in Canada.

The first infants milk depot was opened in 1893 and the work has expanded with the public appreciation of the safety to be found in pasteurization. In the past season Mr. Strauss maintained 17 depots and dispensed 2,917,336 bottles and 1,222,045 glasses of pasteurized milk, making the total output since 1893 of 18,710,892 bottles and 10,089,674 glasses all of which has been sold at less than cost or given away on coupons distributed through charity workers.

With the development of this work the infantile mortality in New York has dropped from 96 per thousand per annum prior to 1893 to 55 per thousand in 1906, and the summer mortality from 136·1 per thousand to 62·7 per thousand.

Prof. Sedgewick said :

Milk is babies food and they are fed instead on a death seething liquid. They cry for milk and are given typhoid fever germs and perhaps also the germs of consumption. On September 29, 1897, I said: 'I hold that there is practically no milk delivered for general consumption in cities that is fit to be fed in its natural state to young children.'

No plague by which a city has ever been ravaged has yielded so plentiful a crop of deaths as that which is reaped every summer from the seeds of contagion deposited in the infant system by millions of noxious bacteria developed in milk.

Men of light leading have always said that the problem of preserving infant life is also in a great measure the problem of preserving juvenile health; and many men of action are taking the matter up with great earnestness.

May I also quote from an article by G. Pease Norton, secretary of the committee of 100 of the American Association for the Advancement of Science on 'federal legislation in the furtherance of public health.'

For a nation to not prevent great waste to go unchecked is more than a suicidal policy, for an evil more destructive than race suicide is race homicide. There are four great wastes to-day, the more lamentable because they are unnecessary. They are preventable death, preventable sickness, preventable conditions of low physical and mental efficiency and preventable ignorance. The magnitude of these wastes is testified to by experts competent to judge. They fall like the shades of night over the whole human race, blotting out its fair years of happiness.

Speaking of the United States he continues :

The facts are cold and bare, 1,500,000 persons must die in the United States during the next 12 months, equivalent to 4,200,000 persons will be constantly sick, over 5,000,000 homes consisting of 25,000,000 persons will be made more or less wretched by mortality and morbidity.

We look with horror on the black plague of the middle ages. The black waste was but a passing cloud compared with the white waste visitation.

During the next census period more than six million infants under two years of age will end their little spans of life while mothers sit by and watch in utter helplessness. And yet this number could be probably decreased by as much as one-half.

By all students of this subject, the average rate of saving of infant life is placed at one-half, while the average rate of saving of all lives is placed at one-third. In all the foregoing I have said nothing of the past enormous loss to Canada of deaths from tuberculosis or of the acknowledged decrease in deaths from that disease, even though this decrease has been accomplished by an association infinitely less powerful than a thoroughly equipped bureau backed by the weight of the federal government.

If then it is possible for man to win the fight against disease, to double the length of his working days, to vastly increase his energy and enjoyment of life, there is surely

no more crying need than for applying modern science to this subject.

It may be doubted that modern science can really lengthen man's day and reduce materially the number of deaths. Can we reduce the general death rate by one-third? Sanitary scientists say yes. Can we reduce by one-half the awful death rate of babies? Scientists and practical workers both say yes. Can we abolish from Canada smallpox and typhoid fever and diphtheria, and all that class of diseases coming from filth? Emphatically, and without a doubt, yes. If the results claimed by the sanitary scientists and by all the thinkers and writers on state preservation of public health are justified and if they are correct in their estimates, surely Canada can afford a thoroughly equipped bureau of public health.

Now, our third point is that it is the duty of the federal government to equip and control a bureau of public health, a bureau thoroughly equipped with a responsible, say, commissioner, with his staff of sanitary inspectors, sanitary engineers, bacteriologists and chemists, with its laboratories and departments of hygiene, of literature departments, &c., &c.

The government has already acknowledged its duty to protect the lives of our domestic animals, and there was spent, and I am convinced properly spent, nearly half a million dollars for this purpose last year, and I presume this is the average annual expenditure. In this laudable work the government employs 107 veterinary surgeons, with salaries ranging from $5 per day when employed to $1,700 per year. This staff does laboratory work, press work, and in fact conducts a very efficient system for the prevention of preventable diseases, epidemic and sporadic, among animals—how to keep them in best health, how to improve their breed and stock in every way.

Now, what is done for the preservation of the lives of our people? The Department of Agriculture maintains some quarantine stations at some of our principal ocean ports, and there are two lazarettos for the care of leprosy, and this is all. Science says the lives of calves, hogs, colts and lambs can be saved, that the days of the mature animal can be lengthened and his usefulness by good health made greater to man and to the state; and, lo, half a million is yearly wisely spent in the accomplishment. Science also says that the lives of babies, of men and women, can be saved by preventing diseases; that the lives of men, by reason of good health, can be made more valuable to the state, and the sorrows from death prevented; and, lo, nothing is done. Is this fair or reasonable, or is it good statesmanship? If the federal government acknowledges its duty in maintaining the life and preserving the health of domestic animals and spends half a million a year with this in view, how much greater is it the government's duty to preserve the lives and health of our people, and how much more than half a million a year should be expended in the effort? Of how much more value is a man than an ox to the state—to his kind? The government has given evidence of its responsibility for the health of our people by issuing recently from the Department of Agriculture a pamphlet, a very practical and useful pamphlet, on how to avoid tuberculosis, by our good friend H. H. Miller, M.P. Having done this, why not pamphlets on prevention of typhoid, diphtheria, or infant hygiene, and on and on, till the full and complete work of a fully equipped division of sanitary literature in a bureau of public health is inaugurated and in working order?

But some may say public health should be controlled by the provinces. As well might the provinces say it should be controlled by the cities, and the cities say it should be done by boards or committees of health, and the boards and committees say everybody should look after himself, 'and the devil take the hindmost.'

Again, there are questions affecting the public health which can only be dealt with by the federal government, and such questions will come up before long. For instance, the pollution of international waters by either or both nations; the upper St. John river, stretches of the St. Lawrence, the Niagara, the St. Clair and certain stretches of the great lakes.

Common sense says there should be one central federal head for public health, and then following, departments of public health in every province of this Dominion, in every city, in every town, and in every parish or township. These are as important as our courts of justice, federal and provincial, county and town.

There is no manner of doubt that money as well as population can be saved to Canada by the equipment of a thoroughly scientific, up to present knowledge, bureau of public health. In discussing these matters, I would just like to take up the question of the physical training of the young by the federal government. The gain to the nation in physical health, in physical strength, in the development of citizens, in the lessening of crime and in the lessening of sickness, would amply repay the cost of maintaining a bureau of public health if nothing else than this were accomplished.

All experiments, over and over again have shown that physical training of the young tends to the obliteration of crime in the young; that the round-shouldered, slouch-gaited, hang-doged boy of the kerb can by physical training be made into a straight, erect, well regulated, honest, and honourable citizen; that by physical training the young youth who has a tendency to be a criminal and a thief can be made into an honest and a decent citizen. In this physical training there is a mental regeneration, there is moral redemption and there is health and strength to the industry of our

country, ability to produce and to make wealth, and to beget a healthy and industrious generation. I would say that I have no wish to discuss details as to the lines of work to be pursued by a federal bureau of public health, but I would like to express the hope that the head of this economic, moral and philanthropic bureau would be a commissioner who would never change as the government or the party changed. I would like to see him a scientist of the highest rank, a man with practical business ability, and of an age young enough to be capable of the utmost enthusiasm at his work, and of the greatest ability. I regret I have taken up so much of the time of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. BLACK. Even in view of all I have said there may be some who think that this work is not practicable. There are many things in this world that look impracticable to a man who knows nothing about them but which are thoroughly practicable to the initiated. My neighbour may be a banker and a millionaire, I wonder how it is done, I cannot understand. All I know about a bank is that if I get a better name than mine on a note I may get it cashed, but the banker makes his wealth not by haphazard methods but by thorough business methods which he understands. So it is with other enterprises in life. What is difficult to me in banking is plain to the banker; what is difficult to the average individual about the prevention of preventable diseases is as plain and as practicable to me as banking is to the banker. I beg, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Dr. Chisholm of East Huron, to move the resolution which stands in my name.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM (East Huron). The hon. gentleman from Hants (Mr. Black) has so fully treated this subject that he has left little for me to say. He has presented to the House an array of medical opinions and of the views expressed by boards of health which surely must make an impression on the House. The hon. gentleman has done good work in bringing this matter up for discussion at the present time. The prevention of disease and the saving of the lives of our Canadian people are questions of such vital importance that I certainly consider it my duty to say something in support of the motion of my hon. friend. Weight is added to the words of warning pronounced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Black) because of his age and his experience as a medical man, and the fact that he is either a past president or vice-president of the Canadian Medical Association. Such a plain and strong and unvarnished complaint coming from such a source, and from one of the government's own supporters, should surely and promptly lead to the adoption of active measures for the dissemination of information and the prevention of disease. The hon. gentleman has told us that 27,000 of the people of Canada die every year from diseases that might be prevented. That is a startling statement but it is absolutely true. I endorse all the hon. gentleman has said about our ability to prevent diseases by the destruction of germs and by the removal of filthy matter which is always the home and breeding place of these germs. The hon. gentleman has given us an accurate although perhaps a somewhat disagreeable description of the manner in which typhoid bacilli are conveyed from one person to another, and of the fearful danger which is incurred by drinking contaminated water. The slaughter of the innocents which the hon. gentleman mentioned and the fearful loss of life among infant children, is mostly due, as he said, to parental ignorance and it can therefore be easily guarded against. In France not long since, it was found that the death rate was exceeding the birth rate and that consequently the population of France was diminishing instead of increasing. The French government appointed a commission to enquire into the cause of this, and that commission after sitting for several months and taking evidence in various parts of the country made a report in which it was stated that the death rate in France was mostly due to the very great and excessive number of children who died before they were one year of age, which bears out the contention which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Black) has so ably presented to the House to-day. The report went on to say that this might be prevented by instructing the mothers not to use foul bottles, not to use bottles with long rubber necks laden with germs, and that the bottles should be thoroughly disinfected before they are used. The report went on to explain that children should not be given starchy food before they were one year old; that they should have teeth before they are given such food, for, if a kind Providence had intended that infant children should eat the products of wheat and of corn He certainly would have given them teeth to eat it with.

But they insist on feeding infants starchy food, which is not suitable for their digestion. There is no farmer or cheese-maker in Canada who does not know that a calf's stomach is very different from that of a cow. He would not think of feeding a calf on hay, because he knows that milk is the natural food of a calf. In the same way milk is the natural and proper food for a child, and it should not be fed on starchy food. I presume that in the Garden of Eden there was no roller mill, so that if Adam and Eve ate wheat at all, they must have ground it in their mouths between their teeth. In doing this they would be obeying the laws of health, be-

cause the bran would go with the flour and the whole mass would be thoroughly mixed with the saliva before being swallowed. Did it ever strike you that Eve, when nursing Cain and Abel, would give them a handful of wheat? How absurd is the suggestion! Still, that is practically what many of our people are now doing in their ignorance of the laws of health; they are trying to feed solid food to children who have no teeth. A kind Providence has arranged that children for a certain time cannot take solid food into their mouths by not providing them with teeth to masticate it; yet people will insist on forcing food of that kind down their children's throats, and when the poor children suffer the mothers try to stop them by giving them more starchy food. Is it any wonder they die? It is not natural for a child to die, because it is young and has all the elements of vitality in it. This slaughter of the innocents, this terrible death rate among children, is something the government should take up.

The resolution before us to-day I regard as one of the most important ever brought before this House, and I am sure it will have far-reaching effects. The people living in this country twenty years hence will, I have no doubt, look back in wonder and pity at the time when the Canadian people spent hundreds of thousands of dollars every year to bring in half-crazy Russians and other foreigners to take the place of their own poor dead children, whose lives might have been saved by the expenditure of about one-tenth of the money. Take one single preventable disease as an example. Not many years ago consumption was looked upon as hereditary and incurable. Those who were afflicted with it looked forward to nothing but death; they did not think it was possible that they could get any assistance. Ignorantly and unconsciously they spread the disease in every direction. But since that great German professor Dr. Koch has discovered the germ of the disease, the tubercular bacillus, great changes have taken place. Consumption, if taken in its first or incipient stages, is not only now considered curable, but it has been found that, with the exception of some races and families born with physical defects and weakened constitutions, the children of consumptive parents, if removed to healthy surroundings immediately after birth, are no more susceptible to the disease than others. But although consumption is not strictly hereditary, it is very easily and readily communicable. An ignorant or careless patient expectorates, and the sputa which is comparatively harmless while moist, soon becomes dry and disintegrated, and escapes into the atmosphere in the form of very fine dust. This passes into the lungs of those unfortunate enough to

breathe that germ-laden air. When the tubercular bacilli pass into the lungs they are retained and invigorated by the moisture and heat of the body, and in some cases increase with appalling rapidity. It has been estimated that a single patient in the last stages of consumption will distribute seven thousand million of these bacilli in a single day. The mind of man can scarcely grasp the meaning of such a number. Think of what a menace such a person is to the community. Naturally we are afraid of savage animals, such as bears, wolves and rattlesnakes, but all the wild animals and venomous serpents in the Dominion of Canada do not destroy one-thousandth part of the number of people killed by these consumptive germs. Nearly one death out of every ten in the Dominion of Canada is caused by tubercular bacilli. A bonus is given by the government for the destruction of wolves. Why should not the government give a reward for the discovery of some system or process which, without injury to the patient, would destroy or prevent the distribution of tubercular bacilli? That would be an easy matter; it would not cost a great deal, and it might have wonderful results. Sanitaria have already accomplished a wonderful work, and they have been the source of a great deal of useful information to the people at large, but it is well to remember that if every sanitarium in the Dominion of Canada was now filled to its fullest capacity, forty-nine out of every fifty consumptives would still be abroad in the country spreading the disease. Many a poor man, the bread-winner of his family, is compelled to work on and on, a menace to his companions in the shop or the factory, until within a few days of his death, for he has not sufficient money to pay his way to a sanitarium, let alone support his family during his absence. Therefore I would say to the members of the government, something must be done to aid the poor man in his home if we are to conquer this terrible malady. The people, as the hon. member for Hants has said, must be warned and must be instructed. They must be taught that the destruction of the sputa, while moist and comparatively harmless, is of the utmost importance. They must also be taught that sunlight, fresh air, cheerful company and good food are important factors in the treatment. Nearly fifty thousand of the people of Canada are afflicted with this disease at the present time; ten thousand of our inhabitants die from its effect every year. The government are spending vast sums of money to prevent the spread of tuberculosis among cattle. Surely the people of Canada will sanction the expenditure of an equal sum to prevent the spread of that terrible disease among themselves. The government spend hundreds of thousands of dollars every year

to bring in immigrants. Would it not be well to use part of that money to save our own people, who are always our most valuable and useful citizens? At the close of the Crusades many of the Christian soldiers, having ravaged the east, returned to western Europe tainted with leprosy. Thus the disease was spread far and wide. At one time there were 19,000 lazaretti, or leper houses, in Europe. Ninety-five of these were in the British isles. But even in that untutored and unlettered age, by isolation alone, that horrible disease was almost entirely stamped out of the country. The last British leper died in the Shetland islands 109 years ago. It is therefore plain that not only consumption, but typhoid fever—a disease which need not at all exist—small-pox, anthrax, diphtheria, scarlet fever, measles, whooping cough and a host of other diseases can be absolutely prevented if the people of this country are really in earnest and the government will do their duty. There are other diseases for the prevention of which a great deal might be done. We should have a commissioner of health appointed, whose duty it would be to distribute information and give people instruction regarding the laws of health. For example, there are a great many people in this country, not engaged in active manual labour, but in sedentary employment which keeps them indoors—the great majority of these people eat too much. They take a greater quantity of food into their system than is required. Only a certain portion of this can be assimilated. The balance goes to decay and rot in the system. It generates irritating acids and other poisonous materials which injure the health. The eliminating organs are continually overworked, and the result is diseases, such as indigestion, cancer, gall stones, kidney diseases, which could be easily prevented.

Take the case of a common cold as a simple example. Any medical man will tell you that a cold is generally caused in this way. There are 2,000 little pores, open doors, as it were, in every square inch of the human skin. When you go into the cold, the pores contract and become closed. Nature generally throws out an immense amount of refuse from the system through the skin, but when those pores are closed up that material has to go elsewhere. If you follow the skin on the outside, over your lips, down through your throat, and all the way down through the tubes into the lungs, you will find a skin called the mucous membrane on the inside. That is not exposed to cold, its pores are not closed up, and the material that should be thrown outside the system is thrown through these on to the lungs and this creates a cold. If that material comes so quickly that you cannot get rid of it, you have inflammation of the lungs. The proper remedy would be to open the pores. If people understood exactly what caused a common cold, they would know that all they have to do is to open the pores. Let them take a lot of fluid into the system, and if they go to bed they will have a profuse perspiration. But the great mass of the people think that they do not need to take any fluid. They take a sweating powder without the fluid, and that weakens them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What kind of fluid ?

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. Water. There are some people who take too much fluid of the wrong kind, I admit, but there are a good many others who do not take enough fluid of the right kind. It is just as necessary that we should take a sufficient amount of fluid as that we should not take too great a quantity of food. As a medical man, I frequently found an old lady come to see me and complain of certain troubles, and I would say to her: You are drinking too much tea perhaps. Oh, no, she would reply, I only just drink three little cupfuls—a small one at breakfast, another at noon and another at night. I could have told her that nature required that she should take about eight or ten cupfuls every day to carry off the refuse, but by putting the question the way I did, she would say she only took a small quantity and then wonder that she was not better. A great many take too much fluid at the wrong time or of the wrong kind. If they would take a good drink of hot or even cold water, for that matter they would find it do a great deal more good.

We should have an officer of the government whose duty it would be to spread information which would assist the people in guarding against disease.

After spending a lifetime in the practice of my profession, I am satisfied that far more than one half of the diseases and deaths before sixty years of age in this country can be prevented. The people must understand what the laws of health are and what the laws of nature are. They must be instructed in those laws. There is not an old man going around the country with a steam engine and thresher who will not tell you that when the machine stops, he must take away the fuel. But you will get any amount of farmers who, after working hard all their lives, come into town to take things easy. They bring their farmers' appetites with them, they eat too much, and the consequence is their average life in the town is only five years. If people understood the laws of health and would follow them out, that would be a great benefit to the country. They must be taught to understand that although they may break the laws of the land and avoid detection and punishment, there is no way of escaping the consequences if they break the laws of nature.

However, Mr. Speaker, as I know there

are several gentlemen to follow me, and as I have taken more time than I intended, I shall now conclude and have great pleasure in seconding the motion. I trust that the government will see their way to support it and take steps to give it practical effect.

Mr. H. S. BELAND (Beauce). I must, in the first place, congratulate the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) for having drawn the attention of the House to a subject of such vital importance. In previous years this question of improving the sanitary conditions in Canada has engaged the attention of the Canadian parliament, and on every occasion the sympathy and good will of the government has been cheerfully extended to the object in view. But the medical body of Canada, the humanitarian societies, such as the Canadian Association for the Prevention of Tuberculosis, and the people at large, I believe, will expect the government to show its sympathy this time in a more tangible manner. They will expect that this parliament will pause for a moment and consider the immense ravages and disastrous effects caused by contagious diseases and especially by that dread disease, tuberculosis.

They feel that this question is worthy of the closest attention of any legislative body in any civilized country of the world. They also feel that, as men invested with the care of government in a country, we cannot remain unconcerned about the beneficent discoveries of medical science and especially of that branch of medical science which is called hygiene. What is hygiene? It is the science and the art of preserving and perfecting health. The layman as well as the professional is invited to share in its knowledge and to partake of its benefits. It is neither abstract nor very difficult; it is within the reach of every man, even of those men whose studies have not borne upon medical science. If the hygiene movement were to begin in this country, and not only the government and this parliament, but also the rich, those favoured by fortune, were invited to take part in it, that movement, you may rely upon it, would spread and make its effects felt by all classes of the community. It would work wonderful results. If you invite the rich to partake in that movement, that movement will have a far-reaching and wholesome influence upon the relations between the rich and the poor, between the mighty and the weak, between the capitalist and the labourer; and nothing could be devised that would be more conducive to the maintenance of an equilibrium between the different elements of the social community.

Leaving aside these considerations, which are of a rather general character, I may say that the diseases we are supposed to prevent are the contagious diseases. Some of these spread very quickly, some will invade a district in a few months, in a few weeks, even in a few days. Such are measles, smallpox, scarlet fever, diphtheria and typhoid fever. The people are very much afraid of these diseases, though the diseases themselves are far from being as deadly as some others, which, for convenience of description, we will call slow-spreading diseases; and, with the possible exception of diphtheria, the percentage of death resulting from these diseases is very low. Does a case of scarlet fever, for instance, make its appearance in a town, the people are instantly alive to the importance of it. As they meet in stores or on the street, they talk of it; and every man in the town, whether rich or poor, will favour any action of the municipality that will help to confine the disease to the person affected. This is a most commendable spirit. But, turn your attention for a moment to these other diseases that we have called slow-spreading diseases. Here you find one of the most insidious, one of the most treacherous, one of the most deadly contagious diseases—tuberculosis. This disease is all the more dangerous, because it does not herald its coming, it does not reveal its presence, at least in its early stages. It allows its victim to wander about unnoticed, spreading everywhere germs, disease, poison—in the streets of a large city, in the street car, in the railway trains, in the places of reunion, such as churches, halls, schools and colleges. The people look indifferently upon the consumptive. They have a feeling of sympathy for the poor victim. And, the moment the victim of tuberculosis is removed from their presence, they believe that they are on safe ground and that they have escaped all danger. Yet, it is of daily occurrence, it is within the observation of every medical man in this country or anywhere else, that, so far from the removal of the consumptive meaning the removal of danger, we have instances of tuberculosis being contracted in a house two, three, four, five years after that house had been inhabited by a consumptive.

Now, what are the ravages of tuberculosis? Leave alone, for the time being, the consideration of those painful scenes of a long, protracted and incurable illness. Leave alone the sad spectacles of separation. Leave unconsidered the case of the mother bereft of her only support, her son; leave out of account the children robbed of their mother. Stop and consider only that 8,000 lives are lost annually to the commonwealth of Canada through this disease, and that 40,000 people are constantly suffering from tuberculosis in this country. And if the humanitarian aspect is not enough to arouse this government, or this parliament, let us take the more matter-of-fact view—the economic view for instance.

What is the estimated value of a citizen in good health? The economists agree in placing it at $1,000. If it be true that a

citizen is worth $1,000—and we have no reason to doubt that this estimate of the economists is a correct one—then this country loses annually from tuberculosis alone (leaving aside the other contagious diseases which have been so ably referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Black) who moved this resolution), no less than $8,000,000. Add to that the loss through the weakened powers of these 40,000 people who have entered upon the fatal path of tuberculosis, and you will reach an enormous, an appalling total. Some have placed it as high as $16,000,000. Now, the question is, can we prevent this contamination. I say we can.

Although I do not desire to enter on any lengthy dissertation as to how best this disease can be prevented, let me say that tuberculosis is spread by sputum which being allowed to dry, permeates the atmosphere and floats around awaiting another victim who by respiration takes it into his lungs. If a patient is affected by tuberculosis and if he takes good care that the excretions from his lungs go only into a receiver; if he takes care that these excretions are destroyed before they are allowed to dry, there will be no danger of the disease spreading from him. Furthermore, if the man suffering from tuberculosis is a public speaker and if he refrains from the delivery of those forceful electoral speeches that might lead him to disseminate a few germs upon his hearers; if he has a mustache and takes good care of it, and last though not least if he abstains from kissing any other person he will practically confine the disease to himself. Now, these conditions may appear very severe on some people, but they are entirely compatible, I submit, with the enjoyment of life, and these precautions are necessary at all events in so far as public halls and places of assembly, churches, theatres, street cars, and railway cars, are concerned. It goes without saying that the best and most effective means of preventing the dissemination of tuberculosis is by the establishment of sanitoria in which, conducted as they would be on scientfic methods, the best means of prevention would be available. So much for the preventive features. The next question is: Is tuberculosis curable? My answer is in the affirmative. Tuberculosis is about the only contagious disease which if allowed to run its course will certainly bring death to its victim. That is a most serious thing but it becomes less appalling when we know that it is proven and admitted on all sides that 60 per cent of tuberculosis cases can be cured. How can the disease be cured? The treatment is very simple: Rest, absolute rest, pure air, and nutritious food. I submit, and in this I am borne out by every medical man, that this treatment will effect a cure in from 60 to 75 per cent of tuberculosis cases of recent origin. Serums also have been advocated and particularly that of Marmorek, and there is no doubt but that the administration of serum has had very beneficial results. But simple as the treatment may appear it cannot be availed of by the poorer classes. Pure air seems to be plentiful everywhere; anyone would think that pure air is available to all. It is not. It is not available to the poor family living in a crowded tenement in a large city. Pure air is available in the country to farmers who can breathe as much of it as they wish, but I think the medical men of this country will agree with me when I say that there is a prejudice among the people of the country districts against the outside air, and especially so in the case of persons suffering from lung trouble, for we find much reluctance on the part of our patients when we advise them to sleep eight months in the year with their windows wide open. Again, the best means to cure tuberculosis is the establishment of sanitoria all over the country where the poor victims—I mean the victims that are poor—can receive proper treatment and where they can be restored to health, to their families and to their country. The only consideration that could prevent the government establishing sanitoria in this country is the financial consideration. It is conceded on all sides that it is within the sphere of the provincial government to attend to matters of public health, but there is nothing in our constitution which prevents the federal government from joining with the provincial governments to establish sanitoria and to enforce rules and regulations. Now, comes the question: How can the money required for the establishment of these sanitoria be raised? We have said that 8,000 lives were annually sacrificed to the master disease, we have also stated that 40,000 Canadians were actually afflicted with tuberculosis; we have further advanced the opinion that if preventive measures are adopted that 40,000 can be reduced to 10,000, and retaining the proportion I may say that if 8,000 people die out of every 40,000 only 2,000 will die out of 10,000. And if we further assume that 60 per cent of the tuberculosis cases of recent origin are curable then you reduce the 2,000 to 800 and that will be the net loss to the country if proper means for prevention and cure are taken. I venture the statement that if these measures are adopted they will bring about the desired results. I will put aside the calculations of the economist, and I will be content for the purposes of this argument to compare the Canadian subject with the immigrant of the agricultural or domestic servant class. We know that such an immigrant is worth $5 and that being so can I not carry my argument to a logical conclusion by saying that the lives of 7,200 Canadians are worth to this country $36,000 annually? And, taking all these contagious diseases which

have been ably referred to by the hon. gentleman from Hants the amount annually required for prevention and curative purposes would be $135,000. Now, I am certain I voice the sentiments of the Canadian Association for the Prevention of Tuberculosis and other contagious diseases, when I say they would be ready to undertake to check the awful disaster caused by contagious diseases, namely to the 60 per cent I have mentioned with that amount of money.

I would also invite my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture to go into conference with his colleague the Minister of the Interior. They could have a chat over it and the Minister of Agriculture could say to the Minister of the Interior: You are looking for immigrants; what will you pay if I give you 7,200 solid Canadians next year? The Minister of the Interior would answer: I will give you $35,000. Well, the Minister of Agriculture could say: Give it to me and I will arrange that for you. To carry out successfully this policy I think that one thing is indispensable. It has been referred to by the mover and seconder of this resolution. It is the consolidation or concentration in one department, in one central bureau, of all branches connected with medical matters. What is the condition of affairs to-day? You have three or four departments with a medical branch. The Department of Agriculture sees to quarantine, the Department of the Interior supervises immigration, the Department of Marine and Fisheries overlooks the marine hospitals and the Department of Inland Revenue takes care of the food. If all these branches were concentrated in one department you would achieve two desirable ends. You would not require the appointment of one single man outside of the different staffs you have to-day. You have very good material. You would actually effect an economy and while doing more efficient work you would be able to gather information, to collect information, to distribute information frequently and profusely and correspondence would not be delayed as it is to-day. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that would be a desirable end. I cannot resume my seat without drawing the attention of parliament and of the government especially to what I consider is one of the most efficient measures for preventing the dissemination of contagious diseases and that is the periodical disinfection of passenger cars. As it is to-day tuberculos people are allowed to travel on the cars.

Mr. BLACK. It is the same with measles.

Mr. BELAND. And so on, as my hon. friend says, but I will confine myself to tuberculosis. Those people, either through carelessness or ignorance, will not hesitate sometimes to infect the floor of the car. What about the immigrants that we are carrying on our railway cars in the spring and summer months and who have with them their hand baggage? It is only reasonable to believe that this would be sufficient to contaminate the cars. I would ask the government to take up this matter with the railway companies. I am informed, in fact, I know that the process would be very inexpensive, as improved and perfected apparatus is available. Now, as many of my colleagues in this House intend to speak on this question I will bring my remarks to a close with an expression of hope that the remarks which have been and are going to be offered to the House this afternoon will fall into prepared and fertile minds and that they will bear fruit. I would not only appeal to this government to help this movement on but I would invite all the members of this House to undertake a campaign in sanitary matters in every county. I would invite the ministers of all the religious denominations of this country to thunder from the pulpit the new gospel of sanitation and I would also invite the public press, regardless of party, to join this movement. We may expect that this country which has led the rest of the nations in so many fields of human activity will, in regard to matters connected with public health, keep abreast of the most enlightened nations of the world.

Mr. A. N. WORTHINGTON (Sherbrooke). Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to go further into the matter under discussion than to merely endorse the sentiments of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) as expressed in his admirable speech in the interest of public health and the scientific prevention of disease. This is not the first time that this matter has been before the House and I have no doubt that the government has in its possession sufficient facts, figures and data for the establishment of a bureau or department of public health or to enable it to take some action in that regard. I trust that the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the government will well consider the suggestions of the hon. member for Hants and the other speakers who followed him, and not only their suggestions but the suggestions of some 6,000 medical men, speaking through the medium of the Canadian Medical Association, and their various medical journals and publications for and in the interest of some six millions of people. In England there was a demand for a minister of public health, in the United States Congress has instituted a board of public health in connection with its marine hospitals, in our sister colonies, departments of public health exist and surely, with the advancement in the scientific prevention of disease, Canada should not be behindhand in a matter of such vast importance. This department would be consulted in all matters now under the jurisdiction of different departments. It would immensely simplify matters and its statistics would be of greater

value and more readily accessible than a compilation of statistics from the provincial boards of health. The publication of information and of rules and regulations from such a department would have far greater weight with the profession and laity than such information and rules coming from other departments would have and such a department would not in any way interfere with the provincial bureaus. The hon. member for Hants has spoken of the contamination and pollution of rivers and waters and of our water supply in general. This, Mr. Speaker, is one of the greatest evils that confronts the medical profession and the public to-day. The hon. member for Hants gave a very excellent resume of the train of evils following the contamination of our water supply, such as diarrhœa, dysentery, enteric and many others. As illustrating what can be accomplished by sanitary precautions and what great evils can be produced by insanitary conditions I would give an instance taken from the statistics of the South African war. At one time in Bloemfontein there existed no less than 5,000 cases of enteric which it was very difficult for the army medical corps to contend with, having a train of disease in front and no communication in their rear; but strict attention to scientific principles and preventive methods arrested, checked and in time did away with the disease.

We have no greater example in Canada of what prevention can do than the checking of the ravages of tuberculosis that has already taken place ; but so far this has been done entirely by private and voluntary subscription and aid. I think it is now time that either federal or provincial action should be taken in this matter. I unite with the other speakers in urging the establishment of a national bureau of public health. It is time Canada was taking her place in a manner befitting her dignity in original reseach. A great deal of research is being done to-day by men of Canadian birth, such as Osler, but they are doing it abroad on account of adverse conditions which exist at home. I think it is time that an opportunity should be given to these men who have made a name for themselves and for Canada to do such work in the land of their birth and under the protection of the government of Canada.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE (Strathcona). Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House for a few minutes while I add my support to the motion which has been moved by my hon. friend for Hants (Mr. Black). It is not the intention in suggesting a Dominion bureau of health that it shall in any way interfere with the work that is now being done by the provincial boards of health, but rather that it should supplement and amplify the work of those boards. There is not to my mind any question of interference or of doubtful jurisdiction in this matter ; the very fact that the Department of Immigration, the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the Department of Agriculture have had to undertake some work along this line is of itself evidence that the Dominion must do some work which the provinces cannot do. It is therefore our suggestion that these departments consolidate the work they are now doing under an advisory board to be known as the Dominion Bureau of Health.

The advances which have been made in medicine in the last few years have been so great that our present means for the prevention of disease is not adequate or modern. In the work that is being done by the various departments that have been mentioned, a certain amount of expert research and expert work is carried on ; but in the matter of exact diagnosis such as is required by the Immigration Department, I venture to say that the officers in charge of that department have not the material at hand to make an exact diagnosis. It is therefore the duty of this government to provide such machinery as is necessary in order that these departments which are now doing this work shall be more fully equipped. The work of this Dominion Bureau of Health would be, partly at least, educative. The value of its educative feature has no more striking example than the statements that have been made by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House of the advances that have been made in the prevention of tuberculosis. This is a disease that was looked upon with dread, shall I say superstition, in days gone by, and to-day its exact diagnosis, cause and mode of transmission are so accurately known, that already the public have a wholesome dread of it and are taking steps to prevent it.

What about other diseases ? What about the prevention of typhoid ? I will say that the prevention of typhoid is more necessary to public health than the prevention of tuberculosis, because in the treatment of typhoid fever if it is of a virulent type the medical man is practically helpless. The only method of safety for the public in typhoid fever is prevention. Therefore I claim that it is necessary that this government should take some steps to bring about a national method of prevention of one of the greatest destroyers of human life among the contagious diseases.

As to the question whether this is a proper subject to be handled by the federal government, I would point to the fact that the scientific knowledge on which we and all civilized countries have been able to proceed in the fight against disease, has been acquired and perfected under the guidance and protection of certain governments.

Pasteur's celebrated discovery was made and perfected under government protection and the work of the celebrated Koch in re-

lation to tuberculosis was carried on in the same way.

The various modes of conveyance of typhoid fever have been very carefully stated by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) this afternoon. It is often a matter of very grave doubt as to how the germs are transmitted when an outbreak of typhoid occurs. This is particularly true in the more densely settled centres of population. In the west some years ago you might go to a village where the disease was practically unknown, and you would possibly find a single case coming into that village, but before long you would find nearly the whole village to a greater or less extent contaminated by it. Then you would begin to learn something about the contagion of typhoid. I have known a western town that had the good fortune to have a young medical man as the chief municipal officer to go to the extent of quarantining typhoid cases as we do in the cities with smallpox; taking those affected to a hospital, cremating their excreta and thus preventing what would under ordinary circumstances have become an epidemic of typhoid. I cite this instance to show what might be done towards preventing typhoid.

Another field of education would be the dissemination of common sense knowledge of the possibilities and limitations of medicines. We do not argue that we are going to teach the public the principles of medicine, but surely something should be done to prevent such recrudescences of superstition as Christian Science. There could be no greater danger in relation to the dissemination of infectious diseases than the idea held by Christian Scientists that there is no such thing as disease, and with the growth of Christian Science you will necessarily have an increased dissemination of contagious disease.

Another important field for educative work is in relation to the limitations of medicine. Imagine the enormous loss to this country caused by people reading trashy advertisements of patent medicines and following the advice given in them. Imagine reading in one of the leading journals as I did last week that Pink Pills will cure locomotor ataxia! Imagine that sort of thing being publicly stated! It is about as correct as to tell the public that sticking salve would restore an amputated limb. It is because of the gross ignorance of the public on a subject on which these advertisers profess to have knowledge that these false claims have any cause for being, and I say that, not a medical knowledge in particular, but a good common sense knowledge of the possibilities and limitations of medicine, if inculcated in certain pamphlets, would do a great deal of good along these lines.

There is another thing which is very important to my mind. There has been no

movement along the lines of scientific medicine that has so astounded even the medical world as the principles of seram-therapy —in other words, the principle of immunity as seen in the development of anti-toxins. It is believed by the medical profession today that this will be the wonder-worker in the medical profession of the future. A common sense knowledge of what we mean by immunity would immediately eradicate all nonsensical objection to the injection of anti-toxin, or vaccination. You find people purporting to be well informed opposing vaccination, and you know they have not the first idea of what the principle underlying vaccination means. It is a grave thing to find a population growing up forming a medium of culture for such a disease as small-pox. Older countries have recognized this. In Scotland, and I believe also in England and Ireland also, every child before it is six months old must be vaccinated. That is the safeguard against a great distructive process that may go on if children are allowed to be unvaccinated until they arrive at a certain age.

Another line of education has been mentioned and elaborated with great exactitude and force by the hon. member for Hants; that is, the dissemination of literature in regard to the proper feeding of infants. That is one of the topics on which every medical man both in this House and in the country must feel the necessity of further education on the part of the people, thereby stopping to a great extent the immense amount of infant mortality that exists.

But there is a practical side to this question. We must have laboratories established for the cultivation of germs, the manufacture of anti-toxins and the various other modern products for the prevention and cure of disease. This cannot be done without some considerable expense, but I venture to say that there is no expense which this government could assume that would yield the same return as the establishment of a properly equipped laboratory, with the privilege of using it open to the medical men of the country. With such a laboratory the last court of appeal in medicine the immigration and quaratine officers who guard our shores could do their work with much greater efficiency than they can to-day. An exact diagnosis may determine between the injustice of excluding an immigrant and the importation of a very virulent disease into the country. Our main method in the prevention of disease is still quarantine or isolation. When people are informed of the facts concerning a certain disease and learn that it is dangerous, one would naturally suppose that they would be careful about coming into contact with it. That is true, but there is another side to the question. People afflicted with a contagious disease are not so careful about their neighbours being protected from it.

That is one point in which the public is absolutely careless. Some years ago, while on the house staff of the hospital for sick children in Toronto, I found time and again playthings and books which had been used by children who had died of contagious disease sent to that hospital for the little patients. Can you think of anything more far-reaching than that for disseminating among the children of such an institution the seeds of contagious disease by kind-hearted but ignorant people?

There is another matter which this department of public health must take cognizance of. We in the west find that the immigrants coming into that country, not from foreign countries alone, but frequently from the older provinces, arrive in a convalescent stage of disease. They will go among their friends in the west and will say nothing about having been afflicted with disease, and the local authorities have no knowledge of the matter. What is the result? These people go among their friends and among children who attend the schools, and in a short time an epidemic breaks out. The number of deaths from diphtheria and scarlet fever in our western country, due to causes of this kind, is absolutely appalling. We cannot blame the quarantine officers, because they have no check on people coming from the eastern provinces. If a corpse were being transported from one part of this country to another, every precaution would be taken to prevent it spreading contamination; but a living subject may disseminate disease widely without any precaution being taken. It may be said that this belongs to the field of the provincial officers. At any rate, it belongs to somebody, and it is the duty of parliament or somebody to see that such a condition of things should not be possible in this country. Consider such a case a little further. Consider the hundreds of people an infected person comes in contact with in travelling 2,000 miles to the west; and we have a most inefficient method of disinfection of railway cars. The car in which that person travels may continue to carry the germs of the disease, year in and year out, to thousands of people. It is said that on the transcontinental trains there is a good method of disinfection, but I claim that the disinfection is so only in name. It should be carried on under an efficient officer subject to the direction of the Dominion board of health which we are so anxious to have established.

I have taken up so much time of the House as I see is at my disposal, and I have only to say in conclusion that I hope the government has obtained sufficient facts today to cause it to act and form a Dominion board of health.

Mr. ANGUS McLENNAN (Inverness). This is too important a matter to be disposed of in a discussion of a couple of hours, and I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

At Six o'clock the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 6, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. GERVAIS presented the first report of the committee appointed to supervise the official report of the debates, as follows :—

Thursday, February 6, 1908.

The Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of the House during the prsent session beg leave to present the following as their First Report. Your committee recommend that Mr. H. R. Holmden be appointed to prepare the analytical index to the English Revised Edition of the Debates of this session vice Mr. D. McGillicuddy who has discontinued to perform the work connected with the preparation of the said index and that the former be paid for his services the sum of $750 on the completion of the index in question.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Sgd.) HONORE GERVAIS,
Chairman.

Mr. GERVAIS moved that the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Debates be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. LEWIS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 93) to amend the Criminal Code and to punish homicide while hunting.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, the Bill which I desire to introduce to the House is in reference to homicide while hunting. It is a short Bill of one clause amending the Criminal Code as follows :—

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years' imprisonment who injures by shooting any person although the person charged believed the object he was aiming at was a deer, moose or other animal.

I have discussed this matter with a number of criminal lawyers in the province of Ontario. The general impression seems to be that the mens rea or criminal intent of the person charged would interfere with any such legislation. Now, Sir, I stand here on behalf of the man who is injured, the man who is shot by a person who is negligent; compensation should also be awarded for injuries inflicted. The mens rea does

not apply in a great many other cases. I contend that this House has authority to punish people who are negligent. The man who goes hunting is not obliged to kill a deer, moose or other animal; he is going there simply for his own pleasure. It is absolutely possible for him to prevent his injuring any human being. In the case of an unavoidable accident the facts are to be taken into consideration. By taking proper precaution he may avoid injuring a human being. It is not a very serious matter if the deer, or moose, or other wild animal escapes. The law that I ask this House to promulgate is not to punish but to prevent such accidents. There is no necessity of my bringing before this House a statement of the numbers of people who are shot from day to day and week to week by hunters. Here is the last case:

Mistook man for a deer.

Dauphin, Manitoba, January 16.—John Williams, aged 20, was shot by Ed. McCormick while going through the bush. McCormick took Williams for a deer and fired. The bullet passed through Williams' neck severing his jugular vein and he died almost instantly.

I wish the House to note that in all these cases the victim always dies. There is no person injured. It is a strange fatality that in every case the injured person dies. In the province of Ontario they have discussed the matter for some time and they have considered the advisability of making hunters wear red coats. How could such a law as that affect the person who is up in that country looking for mines and looking for land; how could it affect the habitant or the farmer or the lumberman. He cannot wear read coats. The enactment which I propose is simply a provision that people generally who are using firearms should take proper precautions and that they should be subjected to a penalty for negligence. This is no new provision of law for in the state of Michigan they have: 'An Act to punish the negligent or careless shooting of human beings by persons in pursuit of game.' And that law provides that a person who while in pursuit of game negligently or carelessly shoots and kills any human being shall be liable to imprisonment not exceeding ten years or a fine not exceeding $1,000. The state of Maine has a similar law. Now, as to criminal intent, we have already a law which provides that the master shall be punished if his servant sells adulterated food, and we have also a law which punishes an hotel keeper, even though he should be absent in England, if his clerk sells liquor illegally on his licensed premises. If a hunter should in contravention of the law kill a cow moose, or if he shoots a deer that is not over one year old, he is liable to punishment, and the newspapers have published particulars regarding the case of two poor men who have been hunted out of the country for shooting a cow moose by mistake. There is no criminal intent in a person who points a loaded or unloaded gun at another, still it is a crime. I trust that hon. gentlemen in this House who are of the legal profession will give consideration to this Bill, and if it be not accepted as drafted by me they will lend their talents to the framing of such a measure as will prevent such regrettable occurrences as have happened in the past.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

SESSIONAL PAPERS.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked:

1. How many returns or sessional papers have been presented to parliament in answer to motions for the same, since January 1, 1906?

2. How many of these returns have been taken out of the Office of Routine and Records, and the Journal Office, by members of this House since the above date, giving also the name of the member to whom delivered?

3. For what length of time were such returns retained by the members who obtained them?

4. How many of these returns had not been returned to the proper officer of the House of Commons on January 1, 1908?

5. In the case of those returned, how long were they out with the members?

6. How many of these returns are still in the possession of the members, and how long have they had them?

7. What steps, if any, are usually taken by the Clerk of Routine and Records and the Clerk of Current Sessional Papers to have outstanding returns retransferred to their possession?

8. What has been the average cost to the country of preparing these returns by the various departments interested, during the above period?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am informed that this question can best be answered by a motion for a return.

Question stands as a motion for a return.

BELLEVILLE HARBOUR.

Mr. PORTER asked:

1. What has been the total revenue of Belleville, Ontario, harbour, for the years 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906 and 1907?

2. What has been the expenditure for the years above-mentioned in that harbour (a) for salaries and to whom, (b) dredging in each year, (c) for building retaining walls along the river at entrance of harbour, and (d) to whom or what persons were such last-named sums paid?

3. Has the government advanced any money to the harbour commissioners of Belleville for improvements? If so, how much and when?

4. If any money has been advanced, what security has the government for repayment of the same?

5. How many tenders were received for building the retaining walls for improvement of Belleville harbour, who were the tenderers,

what was the amount of each tender, and to whom was the contract awarded?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). As the information in answer to this question covers an extended period and relates to more than one department it will be necessary to bring it down in the form of a return.

Question stands as motion for a return.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM—DISTRICT OF QUEBEC.

Mr. PAQUET asked :

1. Does the government purpose establishing an experimental farm in the district of Quebec?

2. If so, when will it be established?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Parliament has authorized the government to establish experimental farms, and when the Department of Agriculture takes steps towards that end I trust the district of Quebec will be among the districts favourably considered.

THE MINT.

Mr. THOMPSON asked :

1. When will the Mint be making gold coins?

2. Will the gold coins when made be in decimal system?

3. What denominations will be made?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. If gold of sufficient purity can be obtained from existing smelters in Canada gold coins will be made within a short time, but it may be necessary to construct a refinery. If so, there will be some further delay.

2. Yes.

3. The denominations determined on are $2½, $5 and $10.

AMERICAN BANK NOTE COMPANY.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What is the date of the last agreement made between the Department of Finance, Post Office and Inland Revenue, and the American Bank Note Company, in reference to printing notes and stamps?

2. Was this agreement made upon call for public tenders?

3. What is the comparative scale of prices in this and the preceding agreement?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. On the 1st April, 1906, an agreement was made extending the agreement then existing for a period of five years from the 1st October, 1907.

2. Tenders were not invited. The class of work is one in which there is very little competition in Canada. The prices under the contract were, in March, 1906, certified to by Dr. S. E. Dawson, King's Printer, as being fair and reasonable.

3. Briefly, the changes were in the cost of notes for the Finance Department, reduced from $65.03 to $62 per thousand sheets of four notes, and in the cost of postage stamps for the Post Office Department, reduced from 10 cents to 9 cents per thousand stamps. In other respects the prices were as before.

The agreement and all papers connected with it were laid before parliament in the session of 1906.

MR. JUSTICE MAGEE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. How many suits were tried before Mr. Justice Magee in the year 1905, on which he has not yet delivered judgment?

2. What action has the government taken to see that decisions are rendered in cases tried as long ago as the year 1905?

3. If no action has been taken, what do they propose doing in the premises?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. The government has no information on this subject.

2 and 3. Judges are not amenable to governmental control in the matter of the time within which their decisions shall be pronounced.

TORONTO POSTMASTERSHIP.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto). What steps have been taken to fill the vacancy in the office of postmaster at Toronto? The office has been vacant for several months and the public service demands that action should be taken by the government at once.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster). The general inspector of post offices, Mr. Ross, is filling the office for the present. He is an old and trusted officer of many years experience in post office work and there is no trouble about the office just now. The question of the appointment of a new postmaster is still under consideration.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. When is the appointment likely to be made ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Shortly.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the Postmaster General if he has received a report with reference to that vacancy from the Patronage Committee, and if it is satisfactory.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have not received any such report. We generally select the best man for the office in that department.

PATENT OR PROPRIETARY MEDICINES.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Can the Minister of Inland Revenue tell me when he will bring down the Bill with reference to patent or proprietary medicines which was presented to the House last year and which it was understood would be reintroduced this session. Has the Minister of Inland Revenue considered the subject very seriously ?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). The question of submitting such legislation is receiving the con-

sideration of the department. We are hopeful that if the measure will be acceptable to all interests concerned and acceptable to the House, it may be passed this session. I cannot say anything more definite just now.

SUPPLY—DISPOSAL OF TIMBER LIMITS IN THE NORTHWEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding that the House go into Committee of Supply and the motion of Mr. Lake in amendment thereto.

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Brandon). Mr. Speaker, the debate which we are resuming to-day on the motion of my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) and the speeches which have been made in support of that motion constitute a very carefully planned attack upon the administration of the Department of the Interior during the period that I had the honour to have charge of it. And therefore, although I have no direct responsibility, no responsibility except that of having to the best of my judgment and ability directed the administration of the department while I was in charge of it, it has seemed to me that the House (including our friends on the other side) might not be unwilling to hear a few words from me on the subject. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition in his remarks the other evening—speaking after the Minister of the Interior had spoken—assumed that the Minister of the Interior had stated that the policy which was followed by the Conservative government in the years 1881, 1882, and 1883 was a justifiable policy, That inference was I think wholly unwarranted. What the Minister of the Interior, if I understood his argument correctly, and I think I did, said was that giving a small amount of timber free of charge for the purpose of getting the timber into the hands of manufacturers might indeed be a justifiable policy if it were not carried to excess. But I gathered nothing from his remarks which would in the slightest degree justify the idea that the excess to which it was carried by our friends on the other side of the House was in any degree justified. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition proceeded to say :

> Is it a continuation of the policy of the Conservative administration from 1881 to 1896, or is it an absolutely new policy brought into force by this Liberal government?

I propose now, Mr. Speaker, to devote myself for a few moments to elucidating the answer to that question. In doing so, it will be necessary to refer, which I shall do only very briefly, to the particular administration of 1881, 1882 and 1883 in reference to which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition asks that question. In the year 1881 the Canadian Pacific Railway contract was let, and the whole question of the great western country from Lake Superior to the Rocky Mountains was opened up, to be dealt with as might seem best to the administration of the day. The result of their consideration is to be found in what they did. It was expected at that time that the railway would be rapidly constructed, and applications were made to the government for privileges in connection with the timber lands which they controlled. It is true that the gentlemen who made those applications were not in any considerable degree lumbermen ; and it is true that they did not have any special knowledge of the lumber conditions which prevailed in that country. But, Sir, they had information which was much more valuable than any private information could be. In the records of the Department of Public Works and in the records of the Department of Railways and Canals there were elaborate and detailed explanations of the many surveys and explorations which had been made all through that great country at the expense of the government of Canada ; and this information was at the disposal of those gentlemen and was used by them to enable them to locate timber lands. But we are told, with a superior virtue which I am sure is touching, that, finding that those lands were of no value, they gave them up. I venture to say that any person who has acquired property and afterwards finds it to be of absolutely no value, and rather difficult to carry, will be glad to give it up. I imagine that any of the gentlemen who since this government came into power have acquired timber lands and have found them to be of no value, would be willing to emulate the virtue displayed by gentlemen on the other side of the House, and give them up. But why was it that those lands were relinquished ? At the time they were taken up the definite route of the Canadian Pacific Railway was not settled. It was expected that the railway would follow what was known as the old Mackenzie government route. If it had done so, large quantities of those timber lands would have been extremely valuable. But, as time went on, it became evident that the railway was not going there and that the northern country was going for many years to be left out in the cold, and so these gentlemen year by year allowed the timber lands to drop out of their hands, finding that they were of no value.

Contrast that act of administration with the policy which has been followed by this government. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition has asked the House to make the contrast. We came into power in 1896. We undertook the duty of developing that western country as it had not been developed before, and we performed that duty. As settlement progressed, here and there, wherever it became necessary, we disposed of timber lands. During its eleven years of administration this government has disposed of 6,400 miles to satisfy the wants of a population of 900,000. What did our pre-

decessors do ? In three years they disposed of 21,000 square miles of timber lands for the purpose of satisfying the wants of 100,000 settlers. What in those days became of my hon. friend from St. Antoine's (Mr. Ames) principle of preserving the unearned increment for the people? The people did not have the unearned increment in those days ; and I can say, as having had some experience as a resident of the Northwest since the year 1875, that there were other things in connection with their administration of the timber lands which were of a most objectionable character. I have defended in the police court unhappy settlers who were prosecuted by the timber rangers of our hon. friends opposite for taking firewood from the timber lands of the government—their policy was 21,000 square miles for the speculators and the police court for the settlers. If the speculators did not gather in the proceeds of the 21,000 square miles, whose fault was it ? Was it for any want of intention on their part ? Was it because the government did not connive with and assist the holders of those lands to the best of their ability ? Not a bit of it. It was due solely to the fact that the settlement policy was an entire failure, and there was no market for lumber and very little market for anything else. That is the answer which I have to make to my hon. friend when he asks whether our policy was the policy that was followed in 1881.

Now, let me address myself to the criticisms which have been made against the policy which was followed during the time I was in office. We have been treated by our hon. friends opposite to long lists containing the names of people who purchased timber berths, the areas of the berths they acquired, the names of the people who tendered in competition with them, we have been treated to discussions as to whether the immediate people who tendered were principals, brokers or agents, and as to who were the stockholders in the companies which tendered. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I am bound to say to his credit, has not followed that line of argument. I can conceive of no application that that line of argument has to the question under discussion, as to the policy of the government in reference to these timber lands. It may possibly answer as a somewhat low order of campaign literature, when the time comes for taking the verdict of the electors. The reading of these lists, and the fictitious value placed on these timber berths, might possibly excite the envy or cupidity of those who are addressed ; but in a reasonable discussion of the timber policy of this government, I submit that they have no application whatever.

What is the duty of the government in reference to the disposition of property such as timber lands ? First of all, there is undoubtedly a responsibility resting on the officers of the department to see that in the main, to a considerable extent at least, the lands shall go into the hands of lumbermen who will probably be able to operate them efficiently. We have the admission on the other side of the House that probably two-thirds of the timber lands which we have leased have gone into the hands of actual operators ; so that that duty of the government has been reasonably well covered. Then, it is the duty of the government to provide by proper regulations that they shall control those lands in such a way as to be able to compel them to be operated in the interest of the settlers. That has been provided for both by the regulations of the former government and by our regulations.

And then it is their duty to put them up to public competition to see that notices are given, that tenders are called for, and that the limits are given to the highest bidder. That, it seems to me, is the duty of the government. What possible grounds can there be for bringing into a discussion of this kind the question as to discriminating between one tenderer and another? Imagine, for an instance, a government undertaking to do anything of the kind. It will be admitted at once that no officer of the department could be permitted to do that and that no minister would undertake to exercise such a responsibility. Suppose the case of three or four tenders for a limit. The minister takes them to council, the council takes into solemn consideration the question of several tenders. They call each tenderer before them in turn and interrogate them. They send for one, who is a lawyer, and ask him who his clients are, whether they are lumbermen, how much lumber they own in other places, what is their financial standing. Another tenderer happens to be a joint stock company, and they send for its representative and ask who are the shareholders and so on. Another tenderer, a lumberman, comes up and they question him about his financial circumstances. Then they sit down, and after careful consideration they decide not to give the limit to the highest tenderer but to somebody else. It is only necessary to suggest such a process being gone through to condemn it for utter and entire absurdity. All the government can do is call for tenders, and give the limit to the highest tenderer. Every citizen has a perfect right to tender, and every man who tenders has the right to have his tender accepted if it be the highest. So far as I am concerned, I entirely repudiate any responsibility whatever as to who the tenderer was, or who was known to own the limits after they have been sold by public competition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SIFTON. There is another thing I would call attention to. My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, and his supporters, have declared that our whole system of selling these limits has been vicious and sinister and suspicious. Well, if there is one thing every member of this House would be clear on, after listening to this debate, if he had to decide any thing, it would be this, namely, that the system which has been condemned in such unmeasured terms by our hon. friends opposite, which has been described in every detail as wrong and vicious and sinister, certainly must be the same creature of this government and must have been originated by them. They come here, they attack us most unmercifully, and call on the government to justify the manner in which these timber limits have been disposed of, and the only conclusion any one could come to would be that this system was originated by the present government. But when we come to inquire into the subject, we find that that is an entire mistake, and therefore it behooves me, for a moment or two, to indicate just how this system of selling timber limits came into effect. When in 1881, 1882, 1883 and 1884 the system then in vogue was criticised year after year by the then opposition in this House, it was decided by the late government that another system should be adopted. Consequently in 1889, the hon. gentlemen who then composed the government adopted a system of regulations for the disposal of timber. That system was provided for by an order in council, a copy of which I hold in my hand. It went into force the 17th of September, 1889, and was the result of continued discussions in parliament from year to year. It was adopted as the result of those discussions and was supposed to be entirely satisfactory to both sides of the House. The evidence, I claim, is that it was satisfactory to both sides. It was satisfactory to the gentlemen who then sat on the treasury benches and I believe to those who sat on the other side because, from the time it was adopted until the Conservative government went out of office, there is no record of any serious complaint having been made. So that we have a system adopted in 1889 for the sale and disposal of timber limits and carried on until 1896. What was that system ? Under it, it was not the practice for the government to offer timber lands for sale unless some application was made for them. It was the custom of the officers of the timber and mines branch to receive applications for timber lands. When anybody wished to have a timber limit put up for sale, he made application to the timber and mines branch, then the officers of that branch issued the notices and advertisements after seeing whether the land was available and open to be sold by the government. Tenders were advertised for, and after the tenders were received they were opened on the day fixed and the limit given to the highest bidder. That was the plan adopted under the regulations of 1889, and it was carried on from 1889 to 1895 without complaint having ever been made by the opposition then in parliament, so far as I know. It was carried on when I took office. I found the timber and mines branch in charge of officers appointed by my hon. friends opposite. The chief clerk was Mr. Ryley, an officer well known as one of the most competent and capable officers the Canadian government ever had. What did I do ? I simply let that system go on as before. I made no change whatever. Never during the whole time I was in the Department of the Interior did I change by one iota the modus operandi of selling the timber lands or the regulations for selling them. The system was the same, the practice was the same, the officers who carried it out were the same. From 1889 to 1896 and from 1896 to 1905, the period during which these complaints were made, the practice was precisely the same in every respect, and when my hon. friends opposite complain of the system they complain of the system they inaugurated themselves and which we carried on in the same way. If there is any thing that has to be explained, they are the men to explain how and why this system was continued.

Some questions have been raised about the opening of tenders. All I have to say is that while I was in the department I never heard a question raised or a suspicion discussed in this connection. It naturally fell to the commissioner of Dominion lands, who is at the head of that branch, to supervise the opening of tenders. If a complaint of any kind had ever been made, if any suggestion had ever been made to me in connection with that subject, not for the purpose of protecting the tenderers but for the purpose of protecting the department and the commissioner. I would have directed a change to be made, but no such suggestion was ever made to me and I never heard of any until I retired from office.

It has been said that the time I gave was too short, and the changes have been rung on this point day in and day out, and the fact that, in connection with this or that limit, the time was so many weeks. and was not so many weeks more, is held up before this House as proof positive that the whole system of selling timber limits under this government is something absolutely too rotten to be described. Now, what are the facts ? One fact is that, if the time was too short, I did not fix it. The same time was given and the same practice followed as under regulations which hon. gentlemen opposite themselves, when in power, had inaugurated; and, if the time was wrong, they are the men who are to blame. They instructed the

officers, they established the precedents. The officers who were there when I came into office were simply proceeding upon the practice which had obtained before I had anything to do with the matter. I took office, assuming the charge of an immense department. Upon me developed not only the administrative duties of that department, but the duties of advising the government practically upon all the complicated questions that arose in the development of the northwest. And I think I can say to the House, and with every assurance that the House would consider it reasonable, that, when I found a branch of the department established by hon. gentlemen opposite themselves, in charge of competent men, whose work had been carried on without complaint from either side of the House, I was justified in allowing it to go on as I found it, assuming that it was going on as it ought to do.

Mr. TAYLOR. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) a question?

Mr. SIFTON. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why were not the tenders called for by Mr. Ryley, who was in charge of the department, addressed to him as formerly?

Mr. SIFTON. They were not adressed to Mr. Ryley, but to the department. I want to make this point absolutely clear, because attempts have been made to show that the very fact that notices were so short is in itself an indicator that there was something wrong about the system, or, at least, that there was something wrong in intention, and that notices were deliberately made too short to allow the people to have a proper opportunity to tender. Therefore, I have had a number of cases of sales made from 1889 to 1896, taken from the records. These are taken absolutely at random, without any attempt at selection as to long notice or short notice, I would like to give these cases to show exactly what the practice was when our hon. friends opposite were in power, and when they were acting under regulations which had been adopted after full discussion in parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the hon. member (Mr. Sifton) a question? Would he read the situation of the berth in each case, and the area out of which it was selected?

Mr. SIFTON. I cannot give the area out of which it is selected, because it is not described here, I give the information I have.

My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) can get that information if he wants it.

The following are the cases to which I have just referred:

LIST OF SALES OF TIMBER LIMITS FROM 1891 to 1896.

No.	Date of Notice.	Sale.	Area.	Time.	Purchaser.	Price.	Manitoba.
						$ cts.	
592	Aprl. 21, '91	May 18..	4½	27	Thomas & Rothwell.	20 00	Manitoba.
96	Aug. 19, '91	Sept. 28..	.....	.....	.....	.....	British Columbia.
B	Sept. 11, '91	Oct. 26..	31½	35	.....	.....	Winnipeg River, Man.
596	Sept. 26, '91	Oct. 26..	14	30	J. A. Christie.....	510 00	Duck Mountains.
106BC	Aprl. 21, '92	June 27..					
230	June 2. '92	July 25..	18	53			
609	Aug. 6, '92	Sept. 26..	50	50	McRae & Rochester..	50 00	Long Lake, tributary to Lake Winnipeg.
616	Sept. 19, '92	Oct. 31.	50	42	Moore & McDowell..	101 50	To Teseleded, between Stony Plain and Trout Lake, north of Prince Albert.
617	Sept. 21, '92	Nov. 7..	40	47	B. E. Chaffet.....	110 00	Pigeon River, Lake Winnipeg.
621	Nov. 11, '92	Dec. 5..	25	24	R. H. H. Chapleau..	366 00	To be selected, Bad Throat River, Lake Winnipeg.
622	Nov. 19, '92	Dec. 19..	20	30	Wm. Robertson.....	275 00	To be selected on Black River—tributary Lake Winnipeg.
656	Aprl. 20, '94 Issued April 30.	May 28..	80	38	....	.....	Alberta.
659	May 8, '94 Issued May 14.	June 18..	12	35	Drake & Co.	15 00	Rice River on Lake Winnipeg.
695	May 29, '95 Issued June 7.	July 29..	25¾	54	John Marshall.....	25 00	Manitoba 22-14 W. Ist.
716	Jan. 18, '96	Feby. 17..	25	30	Wm. Robertson	285 00	To be selected on Black River, Lake Winnipeg.
733 to 737	Feb. 17, '96	March 2..	45	14	Mackenzie, Mann & Co.	500 00	5 Berths—Swan River, inaccessible.

Now, I have not given the particulars for the purpose of criticising the method under which these gentlemen carried on these timber limit sales, I have simply given them for the purpose of proving my assertion that the method of carrying on these things was absolutely the same from 1889 to 1896 as it was subsequently, and that no sinister inference is to be drawn from the length of time given for putting in tenders. If the time was too short between 1896 and 1905, the time was too short between 1889 and 1896. No rule can be applied to one that does not apply as well to the others. If the time was too short, why did not the lumbermen of Canada, on whose behalf my hon. friends in their speeches are making many pleas, complain ? I was there in the department year after year but the lumbermen of Canada made no representation to me on the subject. The only letter I ever received on the subject came from a gentleman in Prince Albert who explained that he had made certain representations against the sale of limits by the department but said he thought it was in the public interest that these limits should be sold. I have inquired since leaving the department and the only record I find is of a letter from a gentleman in St. Paul who wrote to the department, the letter arriving a few days before tenders were opened, asking for an extension of time. That letter was never brought to my attention nor were any letters from the lumbermen in this connection ; no lumberman said anything to me. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been sitting in parliament from 1896 to 1905, officered by ex-members of the government, by men who had been selling this timber under the same regulations year after year and yet they never said a word about the method in which these regulations were being carried out. They are the men to make any explanations and not myself. The rule was altered in no single particular during the time I was in office, either by my instructions or otherwise.

My hon friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) thinks we ought to have an inquiry for certain specific reasons which he gives. He says that we ought to have an inquiry because the lands were sold without valuation. They were sold without valuation from 1889 to 1896, and they were sold without valuation from 1896 to 1905. There are no facts in dispute, the fact is admitted, it is known. What is the committee to inquire about ? Will the committee ascertain any further facts in connection with that than are now before the House.

My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) says: Give us a committee of inquiry because there was no upset price. There could not be an upset price or a reserve bid if there was no valuation. The facts are known ; my hon. friend is in a position to make his argument and call for the condemnation of the government. If the people will condemn them after hearing his argument and ours well and good, but there is no possible ground for a committee, because there is nothing to inquire into.

My hon. friend says he wants a committee of inquiry because there was no sufficient publication of the notice. He has examined the particulars of the sales and he says that the average time we gave by the publication of the notice for the examination of the limits was seven weeks. I have read particulars indicating the time which they gave. Does that indicate that there was any ground for a committee of inquiry to ascertain why any more effective public notice was not given than in former times? They know what the notice was, the House knows, the papers are all on the table ; there is absolutely nothing in the world for a committee to inquire into.

My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) says there should be a committee because the lands were put up before the demands of the population required it. We know what the population was, what it is, and what lands were sold; and what in the name of common sense would a committee add to our information on the subject? It is a matter for the House to decide whether they will condemn the government in that respect or not; it is not a question for the consideration of a special committee of inquiry.

My hon friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) says there should be a committee of inquiry because there were certain changes in the regulations. I have dealt with the question of these changes in the House before, but, inasmuch as the question comes up perennially, I presume I had better deal with it again. My hon. friend puts forward as the changes in the regulations which call for a committee of inquiry two particular changes which were made during the time of my administration ; in the first place he asserts that by an order in council dated April 14, 1903, a change was made in the regulations which prevented the government thereafter from raising the dues as as against lumbermen cutting upon timber limits sold by the government. I have stated in this House before and I state now most emphatically and most clearly that no such change was made in the regulations and that the change that was made had no such effect as my hon. friend says. A clause was substituted for section 3 of the regulations as they stood on the 14th day of April, 1903. I can make the matter absolutely clear, at least to my legal friends, in a moment or two. Section 3, as it stood in the regulations of 1898, provided for the renewal of the licenses.

Subject to such revision of the annual rental and royalty to be paid therefor as may be fixed by the Governor in Council.

When that came before me, at the time I was making this other change which I shall discuss in a few moments, it occurred to me that the exception made in the latter part of the clause in favour of the regulation affecting the royalty and the rental had the effect, by implication, of preventing the government from making any other regulation of any kind. Every lawyer in the House will understand what I mean when I refer to the well known principle of law that if you make a single exception in a document you thereby, by implication, exclude everything else; and this section in the clause appeared to me to throw a doubt upon the power of the government to make regulations in other respects, and I said to the clerk: You had better throw that out because our power to make regulations on all matters of whatever nature under the Act is clear and undoubted and the only effect of that exception is to throw a doubt on the power of the government to make regulations in other respects. I have no doubt that would be the effect placed on the words by any court to which they might be referred. There was no intention to take from the government the power to raise the dues and I assert positively that in my judgment no such action was taken by the change to which my hon. friend has referred. It was discussed in this House and two years ago I stated the opinion I now state. But inasmuch as the question had been raised, the Minister of the Interior (Mr Oliver) proceeded to make a change which clearly set forth that the right to make regulations from time to time was reserved to the government.

My hon. friend refers to another change as having been made in the regulations and as indicating that there was a desire on the part of the government to do something which would add to the value of the limits in the hands of the holders; and that by reason of the action taken by the government in this respect, their administration should be the subject of a stringent inquiry. I have explained before the nature of the change and why it was made. I was perfectly clear upon the soundness of the policy of making the change when I recommended it, and I am quite as clear in my own mind now as I was then. Under the regulations as they stood, they having been carried on from 1889, there was a clause which was perfectly plain to everybody providing for the renewal of licenses from year to year. That was optional, as a matter of grace, on the part of the government. You have the same practice in Ontario; I believe you have the same practice in Quebec; you have the same practice in British Columbia; and, in regard to mining locations, you have practically the same practice in many cases where mining leases are in effect. At a certain period in the development of the Northwest we had a number of American firms coming in for the purpose of investing in timber limits and establishing lumber industries. The solicitor of one of these firms—the Red Deer Lumber Company—came to me and said: We are in a difficulty on account of the question of title to the limits, and I said: What is the difficulty? He said: Our people do not understand this clause, in which it says that the renewal of the right to cut is a matter that is optional on the part of the government. I said: Do you know it is the same in Ontario, and he said: Yes; but we have to make our financial arrangements in St. Paul and Minneapolis, and if it is true that it is the intention of the government to renew the right to cut from year to year, provided we comply with the regulations, why should not the government say so in the regulations? I considered it, and I came to the conclusion that there was no objection to this being so stated in the regulations, and the regulations were amended accordingly. Substantially the effect of stating that in the regulations is nothing whatever; it makes no difference whatever in the carrying out of the regulations, because everybody knows that when a man buys timber limits, whether he does it under the Dominion regulations, under the Ontario regulations or under the Quebec regulations, if he complies with the regulations from year to year, he is entitled to get a renewal. On what other principle would a man pay $500,000 for a timber limit? We find that half a million dollars or a million dollars is paid in the province of Ontario for a timber limit. Is it suggested that under these regulations, at the end of twelve months, that a man has no rights? Of course, he has rights. It is perfectly well understood that so long as he complies with the regulations he is entitled to get a renewal from year to year. In Ontario and Quebec the custom has been so sanctified by time that nobody raises the least question as to the fact, and the effect of this provision in our regulations does not alter the carrying out of the practice in any respect whatever. But if it did give the limit holder more secure tenure than it did before, even then it would be sound policy. It is not sound policy to put a man in a spruce bush to cut the timber with no interest in preserving that timber, but whose interest is to cut it as quickly as possible. It is sound policy to provide that a man who is operating that spruce bush shall have the greatest possible interest in cutting it providently and preserving the forest from destruction by fire. No better and no sounder policy could be adopted in connection with our spruce timber in the Northwest than to give a limit holder the strongest possible interest in carrying on provident operation of the limit and to protect the forest from fire.

The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) seemed to object to an advertise-

ment that was issued with respect to one of the timber limits which was sold some years ago. In criticising it he said:

Further on, in order to clinch the matter and make sure that nobody could possibly examine the limits in time, this last paragraph is added: 'No tender by telegraph will be entertained.'

And hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, thinking that that was such conclusive evidence of incapacity or fraud that it needed no argument, burst into derisive laughter when the hon. gentleman read that clause. Well, it will be interesting to find out where that provision came from. As a matter of fact, it will be interesting to know that our hon. friends on the other side of the House are responsible for that provision. In the first section of the regulations, which were adopted on the 17th September, 1889, we find this expression used:

No tender by telegraph will be accepted.

I commend that to the hon. member for Argenteuil as an indication of the fact that sometimes all is not gold that glitters.

Now, a word or two in regard to the estimates which have been placed upon the value of limits by my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames). I shall not attempt to follow the many statements that have been made, but in regard to a few of the statements, they are so misleading, they leave such an entirely false impression of the facts of the case upon the minds of the public and of the House, if they are not dealt with, that it seems to me to be necessary to deal with them at least briefly. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, makes use of this expression. Referring to a limit on Cormorant lake, No. 1178, he speaks of a report, accompanied by some photographs, and he says that superior timber grows upon that lake and that the quality is excellent. He adds:

It will cut by actual measurement from 6,000,000 to 7,000,000 feet to the mile.

Mr. AMES. That was incorrect reporting. I corrected it next day, sent a copy to the Liberal whip, and said that if any one wished to speak on that side of the House I desired him to know that that statement was incorrectly reported. My words were 'in some places,' and I can prove that.

Mr. SIFTON. Well, if my hon. friend wishes to have it corrected and corrects it himself, it is not necessary for me to correct it. The statement that a spruce timber limit in Manitoba or the Northwest will cut six or seven million feet to the mile would be a most preposterous statement for any person to make. You might find a few square miles or a square mile in the course of thirty or forty that would cut 2,000,000 or 2,500,000 feet. Some men say, I do not know if they are believed, that they have found limits which, in the course of two or three or four miles, they might cut as high as 4,000,000 feet to the mile, but to say that anywhere in Manitoba or the Northwest Territories in a spruce bush of forty or fifty miles you can cut anything like 2,500,000 to 4,000,000 feet to the mile is saying something that everybody in that part of the country knows to be absolutely incorrect. If the hon. gentleman will look at a report printed some three or four years ago from the chief of the Forestry branch of the Department of the Interior he will see that this gentleman estimated the quantity of timber upon the merchantable areas in Manitoba, the Northwest Territories and British Columbia at an average of 1,280,000 feet to the square mile, and that included the enormous forest of the railway belt of British Columbia, where, of course, the amount per square mile is enormously greater—twenty or thirty or forty times greater—than it is in the spruce bush of the Northwest. Any lumberman buying spruce limits in what we generally call the Northwest, taking one mile with another, if he gets a million feet to the mile, thinks he is doing fairly well.

Hon. gentlemen talk a good deal about prices and they would create the impression by the remarks that they make that the limits that are sold in the Northwest are worth phenomenal prices. As a matter of fact they have no such value at all as is talked about. There have been very few sales indeed of timber limits in the Northwest. An American concern went in and bought out a milling proposition at Prince Albert and the Red Deer Lumber Company established large mills and bought a few limits in the northern part of Manitoba, but they are about the only sales I know of having taken place. Generally speaking the men who have got the limits from the government of Canada have the limits yet, and there have been practically no speculative sales at all. Why? We know that American capitalists during the last three or four years have gone from Lake Superior clean through to the Pacific ocean with any amount of financial resources at their back looking for investment. They have bought city property, they have bought farm lands, they have bought timber limits in British Columbia, but they have not bought timber limits in the Northwest Territories, showing conclusively that these limits have no such speculative value as that which is sought to be attached to them. If you go through the list you will find hardly a sale at all (here and there one), but there are no speculative sales as an indication that they have any remarkable speculative value. And Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, that if any of the large buyers of timber limits from this government, any of the men whose names figure in this list as buyers on any considerable scale of timber limits from this government had sat down in a confortable office in the city of Winnipeg and if they had

bought property in the city of Winnipeg with their money or if they had bought farm lands in Manitoba or the Northwest Territories, in each and every case they would have been far better off than they are at the present time. Investment in timber limits has not been a gilt-edged investment. While property all through the Northwest has appreciated, the actual fact of the matter is that the timber property in which these men have invested their money has probably appreciated less than any other class of property. It is largely because the supply is so great. I can assure my hon. friend from St. Antoine that the supply is not nearly run out yet. There is a considerable amount of timber yet in the west; there is an enormous supply coming from the south of the line, the greater portion of which comes in free of duty. There is an absolutely illimitable supply in British Columbia and every one knows that at the present time timber limits are a drug on the market in British Columbia. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) wishes to invest he could go on the street in Ottawa and buy magnificent timber limits in British Columbia for 10 and 12 cents a thousand feet, the finest timber that stands outdoors. And yet the hon. gentleman comes here and he wants this House to judge the government on the assumption that spruce limits in inaccessible places in the Northwest Territories are to be valued at $2 or $3 per thousand feet standing when you can buy the finest timber in the world, accessible to a railway, favourably situated, for 10 or 12 cents a thousand any time you want to go out on the street and do so. That is an excellent reason, Mr. Speaker, why these timber limits have no speculative value at the present time.

Then we have a comparison made between our policy with regard to the Northwest timber limits and the policy that has has been followed in different provinces of the Dominion with regard to their timber. I shall not enter into a lengthy discussion of that question; it is a question upon which it might be difficult to arrive at any very definite conclusion, but we know that the province of Quebec sells its timber right straight along and we know that the province of Ontario sells its timber right straight along. The suggestion that this timber is only sold according to necessity would be absolutely incompatible with the facts, for the timber is sold constantly, and it is sold although there is no immediate necessity for it. We have not followed that policy in the Northwest; we have followed the policy of selling a sufficient number of limits, as was well set forth by the Minister of the Interior, to supply the men who find it desirable to go into the business with a sufficient extent of limits to justify them in making the investments that are necessary to carry on a lumber business. If you are going to have a large lumber industry established, say at Edmonton or Prince Albert, what is necessary to be done? The government is not going to establish that business; the government has to bring about conditions by which some person with the necessary capital who feels disposed to enter into that class of business will find it to his advantage to do so. If you are going to establish a large lumbering business it means you have to invest $150,000, $200,000, $250,000 or $300,000 in a milling plant and in improvements to rivers and roads and all that sort of thing. Now, we all know perfectly well that in the eastern provinces no person will establish that kind of a business and make an investment of that sort unless he has timber limits in advance, owned and absolutely under his control, good to keep his mill occupied for 20 or 25 years. Under any other circumstances a man in this part of the country would be considered to be doing an act of madness if he made an immense investment of that kind without sufficient precaution in the way of limit supply: It is the same in the Northwest, and unless the government permits these limits to get into the hands of private holders so that they can be collected, in the hands of private persons who are prepared to make this investment to carry on the business, it is absolutely impossible that the business can be developed. The Minister of the Interior referred to the fact that the supply of lumber has increased from 34,000,000 feet per annum in 1896 to 128,000,000 feet per annum in 1907. I expect that the production of lumber in the Northwest from the domestic supply will increase from the 128,000,000 feet of last year to 400,000,000 or 500,000,000 feet in the course of the next eight or ten years. But if that is to be done, how is it to be done? It cannot be done if the government keep the limits in its own hands and do not allow people to have an opportunity of acquiring property that justifies the investment. And when that increase takes place as it will take place, it will be upon these limits that we have sold that the lumber will be cut that will supply the people of the Northwest.

I wish to say a word about the question of price. We have been criticised in that respect, and I wish upon that subject to make a comparison which will take but one moment. We cannot, of course, compare the price that we get for the spruce limits of the Northwest Territories with the price obtained for white pine in Ontario or the choice limits of British Columbia. But we can compare the prices which are received by the government of Canada for such timber as we have in the Northwest with the prices that are received by the government of Quebec where they have a spruce country and where much of the timber is of a

very similar character. Now, it has been shown that in the last eleven years we sold 6,400 square miles and that the average price received for it was $81 per square mile. I find from an official statement made by the Hon. Mr. Gouin, Premier of Quebec, at Chateauguay in the month of August, 1907, that from 1888 to 1905, a period of 16 years, the province of Quebec sold 26,500 square miles of timber and that the average price was $81.16 per square mile, or the same price within a few cents of the price we procured for the limits sold in the Northwest, many of which are in most inaccessible places and of very doubtful value. I think, therefore, we may say that the prices we have obtained will compare favourably with the prices which have been obtained elsewhere and we cannot, therefore, be accused of having sold the timber of the country at a sacrifice.

There is a serious question which must be dealt with in connection with this discussion, and it is a question which I desire to address a few remarks to. My hon. friend (Mr. Ames), and other gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, have endeavoured to create the impression that we have practically sold the whole of the lands which are covered with timber in the Northwest country, or, that we have seriously depleted the timber supply of the people of that country. My hon. friend from St. Antoine went to Winnipeg and the Northwest, and he concluded that the reserve timber supply of the city of Winnipeg was to be found on Cedar lake, Cormorant lake and Moose lake. Well, if my hon. friend could not see any other sources of supply in the neighbourhood of Winnipeg than existed in those three little limits, I can hardly think that he made excellent use of his opportunities for observation. One hundred and twenty-five miles from the city of Winnipeg, at the mouth of Rainy river, is the largest sawmill in Canada, owned by the Rainy River Lumber Company. It cuts comfortably 75,000,000 feet in the year, or perhaps more, and has limits on both sides of Rainy river which will satisfy it, cutting at that rate, for the next thirty years. There is the Rat Portage Lumber Company, which has a large mill, cutting 20,000,000 or 25,000,000 feet a year, and which has extensive limits. The Bacchus Brooks Lumber Company of Minneapolis or St. Paul, has lately erected a large mill at Rat Portage, having bought out the Keewatin Lumber Company, which is capable of cutting, I suppose, from 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 feet a year, and I believe has limits which will keep it cutting at that rate for twenty or twenty-five years. In the three limits to which my hon. friend from St. Antoine refers there cannot possibly be more than 200,000,000 or 300,000,000 feet of lumber, and the three mills which I have mentioned would cut the whole of it in three years. These are the limits my hon. friend shed tears over because they were sold, and the supply of the Winnipeg district had thus been for ever depleted. The Grand Trunk Pacific is going through a magnificent lumber country which as yet has hardly been touched by the foot of man, and my hon. friend may rest assured that neither he nor I nor our children will ever see any lack of supply of lumber for the Winnipeg district.

Now, have we, in selling 6,500 miles of timber lands, sold more than we ought to have sold ? Have we been improvident or extravagant ? Have we depleted the lumber supply of the Northwest ? That is a serious question for this House to consider, and I want it understood, without regard to party, that I am responsible for what has been done, and I accept the responsibility. I ask the members of the House, in judging whether that responsibility has been well or ill carried out, to consider just what the facts are. I have told you in a general way about the lumber supply in the neighbourhood of the city of Winnipeg; but I am going to give you a few particulars, and in doing that it is necessary for me to give the authority from which I speak. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior referred to it briefly the other night, but it is necessary, I think, for me to go into it in more detail. In the report of the superintendent of forestry for the year 1903 we find the following estimate of the lumber of the west:

> It will be seen from the census of 1891 that an estimate is made of the area of forests and woodlands for each of the provinces and also for the territories. That of Manitoba and the territories is placed at 722,578 square miles. Add to this 20,000 square miles of Dominion territory in the railway belt in British Columbia, and we have 742,578 square miles as the total on Dominion lands. Probably about one-fifth of this contains merchantable timber, or say 150,000 square miles, or 96,000,000 acres. After thus reducing the area, and remembering that in addition to the timber suitable for lumber, a large part of it is covered with spruce valuable for pulpwood, it can scarcely be considered an extravagant estimate to place the merchantile timber, including pulpwood, at 2,000 feet board measure per acre, or in all 192,000,000,000 feet. We have thus arrived at a very rough approximation of the quantity of timber now fit for use on the lands owned and controlled by the Dominion.

Now, let us take the figures here given. The forest lands in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories are 722,578 square miles ; in the British Columbia railway belt, 20,000 square miles ; total, 742,578 square miles. This is the area of the forest lands on Dominion territory. Total area bearing merchantable timber in Manitoba, Northwest provinces and British Columbia, 15,000 square miles, averaging 1,280,000 feet to the mile; deduct for the railway belt in British Columbia, 20,000 square miles; leaving 130,000 square miles of mer-

chantable timber in Manitoba and the northwestern provinces. Sold from 1896 to 1907, 6,400 square miles. Remaining unsold bearing merchantable timber, 123,600 square miles. Sold in a period of eleven years, 6,400 square miles. To sell what is remaining unsold would take twenty such periods, or 220 years. Meantime I commend this to my hon. friend from St. Antoine for his comfort, the fact that we have in addition 592,000 square miles of forest area, largely spruce, growing, which can be cut once every twenty years if it is kept from being burnt up. The total annual growth is estimated by Mr. Stewart at 13,440,000,000 feet. If half of that quantity grows on the above 592,000 square miles, which would be a small proportion, there would be an annual growth, outside of the present merchantable area of 6,720,000,000 feet.

I want to add only a word or two in regard to the general question, as to the care of our forests and as to what has been done in that respect. I do not often agree with my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), but travelling on a train a little while ago, I picked up a copy of a paper, and, reading the parliamentary report, I saw that my hon. friend had addressed a few words to the House on the necessity of conserving our forest supply. I do not think anybody could state the case better than my hon. friend did, and I fully agree with everything that he said. There is nothing that is more important in the Dominion of Canada to-day than to properly conserve the forests of the west. The prosperity of Canada depends upon the continued fertility of our western provinces; every sensible man who gives consideration to the question knows that.

Every sensible man, who gives consideration to the question, knows that the fertility of those western provinces, their capacity to raise agricultural products, cannot continue unless the forest territory is properly preserved. I did not, during my term of office, do as much as I would like to do, but I did something. I had the honour of inaugurating a policy—it was the first, I think, upon this American continent—under which, under the direct supervision of the government, a systematic custom of tree planting was established upon the farms of the west. I could read to you, if it were necessary, the report from the forestry bureau which shows that, under that little system which I established, in connection with the Department of the Interior, of tree planting, more than nine million trees have been already planted on the farms of the western provinces.

My hon. friends opposite are not free from blame in respect to the adoption of that policy. When we came to parliament and asked for a miserable little appropriation of $15,000 or $20,000 a year for the purpose of establishing that system, my hon. friends opposite were just as denunciatory as they are in regard to the question now before the House. Day in and day out, week after week, they said it was for the purpose of carrying on some nefarious political scheme, that it was for the purpose of providing political parasites with office; but I venture to say now that they are not proud of the position they then took and are prepared to admit that the work done by thoroughly trained scientific officers in establishing that system of tree planting in the west is one which future generations will appreciate, if the present does not.

For the first time in the history of Canada, there was established some years ago, under my direction, a systematic system of fire guarding in our western provinces. It is not as systematic or as thorough as it ought to be, but since the establishment of the system, the thousands of dollars that have been expended have saved from destruction more than the entire mileage of timber limits alienated by this and preceding governments. No man who is at all familiar with the subject will deny that statement. I should have liked, Mr. Speaker, to have carried on this work to a more systematic and a more creditable conclusion. At the time when I left office I was in communication indirectly with Dr. Fernow, one of the greatest authorities on forestry perhaps in America to-day, and was particularly desirous that he should be brought into the service of the government in order that he might carry out the system of fire guarding and promoting our forests effectively. I commend the suggestion to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to have some such man to direct our fire guard system and have a systematic and careful policy in that respect inaugurated.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). In a discussion affecting the Department of the Interior at a time when he was the responsible head of that department, it would be expected that the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), the ex-Minister of the Interior, would have offered some defence of his actions as head of that department, and not only of his actions but those of his officials for whom he was responsible. But the strangest thing is that, after making a speech of over an hour's duration, he resumed his seat without once expressing any opinion on the resolution before the House. What are the ex-minister's opinions about holding an investigation into the actions of himself and his colleagues. He has not told us. He would have done well had he, instead of talking generally about the quantity of timber we had at our disposal, devoted some attention to the resolution calling for an investigation into the affairs of his department while he was minister of the Crown.

I did not intend to follow the hon. gentleman in all his remarks. He has taken us

back to his police court days, and that was not so very long ago. They lasted until a very short time prior to his advent into this government. But times have changed. What a wonderful revolution has taken place in the hon. gentleman's own history. Had he been as conscientious in the discharge of his public duties and as good a financier, in the interests of our country, as he has been in his own interests, would it not have paid us to have had him as Finance Minister ? He has said that he does not care who secures our timber limits. It matters not to him whether it be a speculator or a lumberman or the owner of a corner grocery, so long as he is the highest bidder. He is thus frankly antagonistic to the present minister (Mr. Oliver) who says that it is the desire of himself and his department to have our lumber limits fall into the hands of lumbermen in order that they may provide the necessary lumber for our settlers in the Northwest. The ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) however, who was the responsible head of that department, holds different views, and I can well understand why he should when we see into whose hands the timber limits have fallen.

There are several things which took place during his administration of the Department of the Interior, which call for special reply from him. But he harked back instead to the time when a Conservative administration was in power, and he said that if there was anything wrong in the administration by him in the department he could trace it back to the time when his predecessors held office. He told us that he kept as his head clerk in that department the gentleman who was there under the Conservative regime. Let me ask him why he did not promote that head clerk, and why instead he selected the present member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and placed him over Mr. Ryley and entrusted to him the opening of the tenders. The ex-minister (Mr. Sifton) has not attempted to justify his own action in selecting the Dominion Land Commissioner (Mr. Turriff) to open the tenders instead of Mr. Ryley. In that one respect, he did not follow the practice of his predecessors. Mr. Ryley was one of the officials who was present when tenders were opened when a Conservative government was in power. Could the ex-Minister of the Interior not trust that gentleman, why select Mr. Turriff, and allow that gentleman to open in secret all those tenders ? In that respect he might have followed the action of his predecessors because therein lies the mystery of many of those tenders. This question, which has been engaging the attention of parliament for several days—this question of the disposition of our forest wealth—is one of prime importance more especially to the people of the country from which I come. In view of the disclosures made by my colleagues of vast areas of timber limits having passed into the possession of private individuals who hold them for speculative purposes and who are bound to make millions from their speculations, this is a question which ought to engage more particularly the earnest consideration, not only of the government but of this parliament. There are hundreds of miles in the provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba entirely devoid of any local timber supply, and it is to the country to the far north that we must look for the major portion of the timber to supply not only the demand for fuel, but the rapidly increasing demand for lumber on the part of the population in that country. Any policy that would permit the alienation of hundreds of thousands of square miles of timber to speculators, to men, for instance, who secure information of a private character as to the location of a proposed line of railway, and who, in advance of settlement and of the requirements of the trade, send out their cruisers to estimate the quality, quantity and value of large areas of timber, and the opportunities of securing it, not for the purpose of manufacturing it into lumber to meet the demands of the trade, but for the sole and only purpose of holding it until these new transportation facilities make the limits more accessible and give them much greater value ; any policy that would allow these timber limits to be tendered for, so short a time being allowed as to handicap active competitors, with the result that, instead of the government holding these limits as trustees for the whole people until the public should get the benefit of the increased value, the control goes to speculators who stand to reap profits of thousands and perhaps of millions—any such policy I say should meet the condemnation not only of the members of this House but of the people of this country, and such a policy should not be tolerated for the future. Lumber is rightly regarded in the west as being almost one of the necessaries of life. In that country of strenuous winters, it is absolutely necessary that every settler should be in a position to secure his building material at the cheapest possible price, not only that he may have the opportunity of providing a home for himself and family, but also that he may provide needed protection against the rigorous climate for the stock he owns. When the Conservative party was in power, a tariff commission was sent to the Northwest. Strong complaints had been made of a combine in the lumber industry in that country. Evidence was adduced before that commission that went far to prove the truth of that contention. In order to break the power of that combine and give relief to the people the Minister of Finance of that day at the next session of parliament, placed on the free list lumber in the rough and lumber planed on one side. This was declared

by our opponents to be entirely inadequate to meet the condition, and we were promised when a Liberal administration was in power that we should have complete relief and that all lumber should be placed on the free list. A change of government came, but the change of duties so far as lumber was concerned failed to materialize. But this is only another of the many unfulfilled pledges with which the country have become so familiar in the case of hon. gentlemen opposite. Apparently, there is still complaint of the existence of a lumber combine, and, last session, so important did the government think this lumber industry and so serious the condition of affairs shown by the representations of members of parliament from the west, that they agreed to the appointment of a committee of this House to investigate the whole lumber business. Powers were conferred upon that committee to send for persons and papers and to take evidence under oath. The committee did its work. An enormous mass of evidence was adduced. And what have we as a result of that investigation ? Not a particle of information has been vouchsafed to the members of this House that the government are going to lift a finger to prevent a continuance of the state of affairs shown by that committee to exist. It is true that one of the provincial governments, that of Alberta, did prosecute one member of that combine ; true, a verdict of guilty was secured, and a fine imposed. But, for all the time, labour and money spent upon that committee last year, what have we to show? Aparently, we are going to have the whole matter treated as was the telephone committee, which cost thousands of dollars but did not result in anything of a practical character, excepting the driving out from the government of Sir William Mulock because he was in favour of the nationalization of telegraphs and telephones. Important as is the question of cheap telephones, the question that is now before the House is of vastly more importance, because it relates to the source of supply of a commodity of crying necessity in the west, and also relates to a great national asset that should be preserved for the benefit of generations to come. But, when the members of the opposition, in the exercise of their duty, attempt to criticise the government for its actions and its policy, they are met with a tu quoque argument, as we were by the ex-minister (Mr. Sifton) here to-day, and as we have been by every other hon. gentleman on that side who has spoken on this subject. As if that settled the question; as if what these hon. gentlemen condemned in their opponents is to be approved in their own party to-day. We find the same policy pursued in everything relating to the public domain, mining, agriculture or timber ; but, more especially in regard to the timber supply, we have had the spectacle of hon. gentlemen on the other side rising in their places and reading from long lists of applicants for timber licenses under the Conservative regime with the evident determination to leave with the House and the country the impression that each and every one of these applicants had secured timber limits to the area set opposite their names, and that all those timber lands had passed out of the possession of the government into the possession of those individuals to be used for their own purpose and absolutely without compensation to the government. Nothing could be further from the truth, and I think that the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was not too severe in his characterization of that plan of campaign when he said it was a stale falsehood, which had been repeated in this House, which had been again and again exploded in this House, but which, undoubtedly, will be used again by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side. It is true that numerous applications were made for licenses during the Conservative regime for licenses to cut timber. But the applicants were not confined to persons of one political faith, as hon. gentlemen opposite would have us believe. Any person could apply for a timber berth and secure the same if he followed out the regulations; and if he did not follow out the regulations he could not secure the license. And I desire to say that in the long list that has been time and again, this session and previous sessions, read to this House, there are not more than five per cent of the men named who ever secured an acre of timber limits. That is all that it is necessary to say in order to controvert that statement.

Now, let me advert just for a moment to the regulation. This matter has been spoken of before, but I ask leave to refer to it again. In 1872, an Act relating to public lands was placed upon the statute-book under the government led by Sir John Macdonald. This Act provided that leases of land on which to cut timber could be put up for by tender or public auction, that the leases should exist for twenty-one years, and that the annual ground rent should be $2 per square mile—that being the ground rent charged at that time by the Ontario government. In lieu of stumpage dues, a royalty of 5 per cent was imposed on the sales of the products of the berth. I refer to this because one of the hon. gentlemen opposite states that the bonus is not everything, but that there is ground rent and also royalty, because these parties getting timber berths have to pay 50 cents per thousand feet on the lumber cut. But, Sir, there was a royalty in those days which amounted to a very large sum, very much more than 50 cents per thousand feet, that is the royalty of 5 per cent of the value. The price of lumber was over $20 per thousand more often that it was under $20, but taking $20 as an

average, 5 per cent is $1 per thousand feet, instead of 50 cents as these gentlemen are charging even at present.

I have stated that in 1872 the government of Sir John Macdonald passed a law in this matter. I have here the statute of 1872, chapter 50, which provides:

The right of cutting timber on such limits shall be put up at a bonus per square mile, varying according to the situation and value of the limit, and sold to the highest bidder by competition, either by tender or at public auction.

Other sections of the Act provide for the erection of a sawmill with a capacity of 1,000 feet in 24 hours for every two and a half miles in the lease and, in addition to the bonus, an annual rental of $2 per square mile and a royalty of 5 per cent on each monthly account.

The government of Hon. Alexander Mackenzie succeeded that of Sir John Macdonald and in 1874, the very first year they were in power, they repealed the existing Act and did away with all competition. Again I say if there is any fault to be found with the regulations in that respect, the fault lies with that government and not with the Conservative government. In 1874 a new subsection was added to section 11 reading:

Provided further that in cases where applications may be made for limits on which to cut timber in unsurveyed territory the Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the Minister of the Interior, authorize the same to be leased for such bonus as may be deemed fair and reasonable.

No competition there.

Such lease to be subject nevertheless to the foregoing conditions of this section, except as to that part of subsection 1 which provides for the erection of mills, which provision in respect of limits in unsurveyed territory may, if considered expedient by the Minister of the Interior, be dispensed with.

Here competition is entirely done away with and cancelled and the erection of mills which was compulsory under Sir John Macdonald's Act of 1872, was made optional with the minister by the government of Hon. Alexander Mackenzie in 1874. Thus the law remained for a short time after the succeeding government of Sir John Macdonald came into power in 1878, but with these alterations: The ground rent was raised from $2 per square mile to $5 per square mile so that had the regulations of the Mackenzie government remained in force those timber berths that had been given without bonus would only have drawn $2 per square mile ground rent; whereas under the ground rent exacted by Sir John Macdonald's government, they yielded $5 per square mile. The result was to encourage the building of mills to produce timber for the settlers in that country. That remained until 1889 when it was made compulsory and also I may say that the Act provided that where there was more than one bidder tenders should be asked; but where there was only one bidder he got it without any competition. That was continued until 1889 when it was made compulsory to have all timber limits put up for tender whether there was one tender or more.

I am somewhat surprised at the ignorance (I do not use the word offensively) displayed by the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) in regard to something of which he should have knowledge, for a man occupying the position of commissioner of Dominion lands for years and years should be acquainted not only with the laws governing his own administration of the timber limits but of the laws prior to his administration that hon. member made an astounding statement, just about as reckless as the major portion of his speech, when he stated:

Now that is a long time ago, but in those days of the Mackenzie government when the timber of the west was properly administered, was put up for competition, was sold to the people who wanted it, was sold to the highest bidder, was handled in a proper manner and not given away for nothing, as it was to the pets and favourites of the late Conservative government, it shows that the Mackenzie government got a reasonably fair price for the lumber.

From the extracts I have read from the laws governing the disposition of timber limits, hon. gentleman will see how far astray these statements are. I defy the hon. gentleman to point to one mile or acre of timber disposed of by competition during the Mackenzie regime.

In reference to the claims that have been made as to the manner in which these gentlemen have disposed of the lands to their own friends I am going once more to refer to a matter which was referred to by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) and to which the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) also referred. After the Mackenzie government were defeated at the polls, one day prior to leaving office, by order in council 200 square miles were granted, not to a Conservative but to a political pet of their own at that time, Mr. H. H. Cook and Mr. Sutherland. I have the order in council dealing with that and I marvel at the Minister of the Interior defending the action of that government on that score. This order in council was passed on the 7th day (not the 17th as the minister said) of October, 1878, one day prior to the Mackenzie government leaving office. And what was granted by it? The right to roam all over the Saskatchewan valley and select 200 square miles of timber limits in lots of 20 square miles each and to make the selection they were allowed the long term of three years. Still they were anxious to have the lumber and timber

fall into the hands of the proper parties. I maintain that the government of Sir John Macdonald were quite justified in cancelling that order in council giving three years to make that selection of 200 square miles in blocks of 20 square miles each, particularly as the order in council was granted after the people of this country had expressed a want of confidence in the government of Hon. Alexander Mackenzie.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have said that only 310 or 311 square miles were alienated by the Mackenzie government and this at an average price of $23 per square mile. That statement is absolutely unfounded. In making that calculation hon. gentleman took good care not to include this 200 square miles in the 311 square miles. This 200 square miles had been alienated by their own friends but thanks to the government of Sir John Macdonald it was again secured for the crown.

But that was not the only order passed by the Mackenzie government after their defeat. I find an order in favour of Messrs. Dick and Banning of Winnipeg of 20 square miles. This too was omitted by hon. gentlemen in making their calculation. These gentlemen were Liberals but I understand that they were engaged in the lumber business and Sir John Macdonald's government did them the justice, while not allowing them the same territory that was granted by the original order, because they had the opportunity to take it on all the small streams flowing into Lake Winnipeg, of permitting them to secure twenty square miles other than that provided for in the order at a bonus of $20 per square mile. This alienation was also omitted in the 311 mile calculation so that the addition of these two areas will bring down their average price per square mile very materially, will practically cut it in half.

I shall quote other authorities to show that the government of Mr. Alexander Mackenzie alienated 605 square miles and that the average bonus per square mile was nothing like what these hon. gentlemen say it was. I have here a list, from which quotations have been made on different occasions, of members who had applied for timber limits during the Conservative regime. I simply desire to say that I take no stock in the 'tu quoque' argument because if these things were done by our friends they were punished for them. I want to show how far these hon. gentlemen have acted the manly part in skating over certain names in the list which has been read on many occasions, not only this session but in other sessions, of persons who, I personally know, are not of the Conservative faith and whom these hon. gentlemen knew but whom they overlooked because they did not wish to leave the impression upon the House that there were any Liberals applying for these timber limits or that any had been secured by them. In that list there are several names of parties who not only applied for limits but secured them. There is Mr. J. A. Christie of Brandon, Mr. Christie is one of the most prominent Liberals in Manitoba and a gentleman, who, if he has not been a Liberal candidate, has been balloted on in a Liberal convention. Another is Mr. J. D. McArthur of Winnipeg, another leading Liberal and a gentleman who has a contract on the government section of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Another is Mr. Jos. Boulton of my own town, a man who never cast a Conservative vote in his life, I understand. Messrs. Hooker & Co., of Selkirk are on the list, Mr. Hooker being a prominent Liberal and a fishery officer of this government. Another is Mr. C. A. McCool. Need I ask what his politics are ? He is the present member for Nipissing. More than that, Mr. Speaker, by looking at the past debates of this House I find that Mr. Charlton is responsible for having introduced this list in 1886 and that he held up to the odium of the public Mr. Bryson who was then the Conservative member for Ottawa and who had handed in some applications for timber limits, the same as my hon. friend in front of me did and how he turned it as a sweet morsel under the tongue when he got a Conservative member of parliament who had made application for a timber berth ! What did Mr. Bryson do ? He had never made an application for himself but for some of his friends and amongst others he made application for Mr. McCool. Yet Mr. McCool is passed over while Mr. Bryson is condemned. His name apears on that list on two occasions. As the hon. member for East Assiniboia says, he must have got hungry and come back again. Another gentleman is Mr. S. Jonnason, at the present time Liberal member of the provincial parliament for the constituency of Gimli, in the legislative assembly of Manitoba. Another is Mr. J. D. Dagg, the present secretary of the Liberal Association of Winnipeg, a gentleman who was an officer in the industrial school a few miles outside of Winnipeg, but failing to run things to the satisfaction of the party in power he was relieved of his position. Another was Mr. Charles Whitehead. I am sure that if the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), the ex-premier of Manitoba, were here we would only have to ask him, as we might also appeal to the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), as to the politics of this particular gentleman who held a dredging contract under that hon. gentleman when he was in the government for years known as the Boyne-March dredging contract and who was paid twice over for the work that he did and paid for work that he did not do at all. This same Charles Whitehead figures as an applicant on several occasions and he actually received timber limits from the Conservative administration. Another is Mr. Joseph Whitehead, I understand, the father of Mr. Charles Whitehead and he

was treated the same as any Conservative applicant. Another gentleman was the present member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows). It is true that the hon. member for East Assiniboia overlooked his name but he stated that it was because his partner was a Conservative that he got the limits.

Mr. TURRIFF. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to correct him? These people were not applicants in the year covered by the list of names that I read out. I read out the name of every man who had applied that year whether he was a Conservative or a Liberal.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I know the hon. gentleman confined himself to 1883 but some of the names I am reading now he will find if he looks at the list moved for by Mr. McCreary in 1894. Besides these I can give the names of some other persons who applied in 1883. There is Mr. A. Cameron whom I know personally, and who, I understand, is a very strong Liberal in Manitoba. Another is Mr. R. Hardesty of Edmonton, I understand, a strong Liberal. Another is Capt. Robinson of Selkirk, a gentleman who has made considerable money out of this government since it came into power. Another is Mr. A. G. Rutherford of Manitoba, who was formerly in the lumber business there. Another was Mr. Hugh Sutherland who at one time was a Liberal member in this House representing the constituency of Lisgar. Another was Mr. B. E. Chaffy who was the Liberal candidate in the provincial elections for South Winnipeg. This is a list of persons known to myself and that if other hon. members on this side of the House were to take up the list they could select many more known to them. Hon. gentlemen opposite did not desire to leave the impression that any Liberal had been successful in obtaining timber limits but they wished the House and the country to believe that the list was confined to the Conservatives entirely. I find in looking over the same return that many applications were made in 1882 and 1883 and I am going to leave it to hon. members of this House to say if the applicants are lumbermen or if they are engaged in a similar line of business. For instance, I find here the name of Mr. H. N. Bate as having applied in 1882. Who is Mr. Bate? Any person in Ottawa knows that he is not a lumberman and still he was an applicant for a timber license. Another is Mr. H. A. Bate. Another is whom?—Mr. John Sifton, father of the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior. If it was wrong for a Liberal to apply for a timber limit was it not equally wrong for that hon. gentleman's father to apply? Is he also to be classed as a timber grabber because he sent in his application? I do not say that there is anything wrong in it but these hon. gentlemen want the people to believe that there was. Again, Mr. Robert Lockheard, a gentleman who lives in my own constituency—near Newdale—and a very strong Liberal, applied for a license. Again we have the name of Mr. H. N. Bate in 1883 and also the name of H. N. Bate & Co. Nelson and Mackenzie, who are strong Liberals, and who formerly lived in Birtle, also applied. Mr. M. C. Cameron was another applicant. Another name of a gentleman who is very prominent in the councils of hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. C. J. Mickle, the present leader of the Liberal party in the local legislature and the prospective opponent of your humble servant in the next election, appears as an applicant. Another is Mr. William Nelson; another is Mr. Monkman, a Liberal lawyer of the city of Winnipeg; another is Mr. Robert McNeil, formerly near my own town; another is Mr. A. Macdonald, wholesale grocer of the city of Winnipeg, and another is Mr. A. C. Rutherford, the present premier of the province of Alberta who made application when he was here in a law office in the city of Ottawa in 1883. If these hon. gentlemen opposite wanted to adopt the manly course and the fair course they would read all these names and not merely pick out here and there the names of such as are Conservatives.

They say that the Conservatives only got some $4, less than $5 per square mile. How do they arrive at that conclusion and how do they arrive at the conclusion that $23 per square mile was obtained during the Liberal regime? They took about half the mileage that was disposed of by the Mackenzie administration which would necessarily represent a higher rate per mile, but in connection with the Conservative regime they took 29,000 miles for which applications were handed in and of which area not more than five per cent, certainly not more than ten per cent, was ever alienated and then they divided that by the amount of the bonus to show that we only got $5 per square mile. I have here some of the debates that took place in 1886 when this question was up and I am going to trouble the House to show how it was dealt with at that time by the then Minister of the Interior who spoke as follows:

Well, Sir, during the five years the Liberals were in office while they had given timber limits for 605 square miles, all the money they received for dues, ground rents, bonuses —no, there were no bonuses, because they put up nothing at public competition—was $6,160.

Instead of $7,000 as quoted by these hon. gentlemen opposite.

While during the last five years——

That is prior to 1886.

While during the last five years, this government has received from timber limits in the Northwest for ground rents, bonuses, dues and royalties, no less a sum than $539,433.

Again he said:

It is quite true that there were a large number of applications. The regulations fixed the

terms upon which applications could be made, and under which grants could be given. The law fixed the lines which had been considered by hon. gentlemen opposite the proper lines on which people could obtain limits, and surely it was not an offence for any one to make an application for a timber limit under regulations open to the world, known to everybody, and under which everybody had the opportunity of making an application. If the hon. gentlemen could point out a case in which a Liberal applied for a timber limit, and a Conservative applied for the same timber limit and the Liberal's application was set aside, and the timber limit was given to the Conservative without competition, then he would have a case; but in that speech of his—which exceeded somewhat his own limits of what should be a proper speech, for, I believe, he enjoined the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Wright) to give him a gentle reminder when he went beyond an hour and six minutes —in that speech, he never ventured to make a suggestion, among all the charges he had to make, that the government had in any one case given a Conservative a timber limit without competition for which a Liberal had applied or was applying; but on the contrary, wherever there were two applications, the limit was given to the highest bidder, and where there was only one applicant, it was given to him on condition of his fulfilling the conditions required, whether he was a Liberal or a Conservative.

And yet we had the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) stating the other night that if the members on this side of the House could point to any instance in which a Conservative had been refused concessions that a Liberal had secured, then there might be some argument on our side. I would turn the hon. gentleman's logic on to himself and ask him why, when he was quoting what was done in the Conservative regime, he did not point to an instance where a Conservative had secured privileges that were refused to a Liberal.

Mr. MILLER. I would answer that the accusation and the charge did not come from this side of the House, but from the other.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The accusation always comes from the other side of the House. Then the Hon. Thomas White went on to say :

Let the hon. gentleman put his hand upon a single case of a Liberal having been, because of his politics, refused a timber limit by this government. Now, Sir, what has been the practical result? There were no less than 2,029 applications for licenses ; the time of boom brought numerous applications.

It was not because there was an election in 1882. These hon. gentlemen opposite speak about insinuation, but they have insinuated that because there was a general election in 1882 all these applicants were given timber berths as a reward for services in the coming election, and that in 1883 they were given them as rewards for past service during the election. But the Minister of the Interior was frank enough to confess that it was during the time of the boom of 1882 that the applications were made. Hon. Thomas White continued:

But, Sir, an application was not of any value; it gave no one anything except the privilege of making it, and the trouble to the department of filling it; there was no money in the application, that is quite certain. I am speaking now of the applications up to May 1 of this year——

That includes all these years from 1882 up to 1886.

—and out of the 2,029 applications there were 568 orders in council authorizing licenses to issue. But, Sir, the order in council did nothing; it did not authorize any one except under permit to cut timber. In four cases in all, I believe persons have been permitted to cut timber under order in council.

Out of 2,029 applications and 568 orders in council but four of them were allowed to cut under these orders in council.

A license was required before any one could cut timber; and, Sir, we find that, before the licenses were issued, after the mere passage of the order in council, the result has been no profit to the people who applied, but this remarkable fact for ground rents alone.

Mark you, the ground rent had to be paid in advance.

—which did not give any one a right to cut one stick of timber, the country received $24,-062.27. Did that look like favouritism to any one? Now, let us see what the country received for bonuses under this system under which we are told the government gave away these timber limits in order to provide for their friends. In these cases, recollect, where no licenses were ever issued, the country received $21,226.25 from persons who were competing for the right to obtain licenses; and for royalties, in the four cases to which I have referred, in which timber was permitted to be cut, we received $8,587.92, so that for these cases where orders in council were passed, but no licenses were issued, the country received $4,176.44, and only in relation to $8,-500 of that was there a right, on the part of a single person paying the money, to cut a single stick of timber. Yet that was the kind of favouritism and corruption bestowed on our friends—the corruption of letting them apply for licenses and giving them order in council compelling them to pay the ground rent; and if they did not go further, if they did not make a survey, if they did not put up a mill and get out a license, they got nothing else and the country got the money.

That is to be found at pages 1042 and 1043 of the 'Hansard' of 1886, and that speech was made by the then Minister of the Interior, the Hon. Thomas White. I think that disposes of the order in council business to the satisfaction at any rate of any reasonable minded man. That there has not been 29,000 square miles alienated by the Conservative government, the

very best evidence is the evidence afforded by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) himself, who in reply to a question of the hon. member from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) stated that out of 367 leases now in operation only 56 were in existence which were granted prior to 1896, and these 56 licenses that were issued prior to 1896 will not cover more than 1,000 miles instead of 29,000. I shall now, Mr. Speaker, refer to some of these specific cases that have not been dealt with by hon. gentlemen who have already spoken on this side of the House—and remember that although every hon. gentleman who has spoken here has given some specific illustratioins, every man who spoke has not as yet touched upon the same limit. We have had a new list every time, and I think when hon. gentlemen read over 'Hansard' they will find sufficient material —and I commend this especially to the Prime Minister—to demand an investigation at the hands of the government. Now, Sir, it has been well said that when the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bill was before parliament in 1903 there were certain gentlemen who availed themselves no doubt of inside information and who rushed up into that part of the country through which they thought the road was going in order to secure these valuable timber limits. In almost every instance those were speculators. The Grand Trunk Pacific Act at first provided, not definitely, but almost in specific terms, that the railway would be very likely to follow the route via Dunvegan and the Peace river. I desire to read that portion of the Act, chapter 122, section 12, statutes of 1903, which reads :

The company may lay out, construct and operate a railway of the gauge of four feet and one-half inches to a point at or near the city of Winnipeg; thence westerly and northwesterly, passing through or near Battleford, Edmonton and Dunvegan, or by such other more feasible route as is hereafter located, but following in a general direction that herein indicated, and by way of either the Peace River pass, or the Pine River pass, or such other pass in the Rocky Mountains as is found most convenient and practicable, to Fort Simpson or Bute Inlet, or such other port on the Pacific coast between the said points as is considered more accessible and better adapted for the purposes of the company.

You will see that Dunvegan was specifically mentioned in the section, and this Act was assented to in 1903. A few months prior to this time we find some gentlemen rushing into that country to secure timber limits. As a result all the best timber along the Peace river has been taken up, so that when that country comes to be settled, to whom must the people go to get their supplies of timber ? In the first place, Mr. J. W. Stewart, an associate if not one of the partners of Foley brothers and Larsen, a firm of American contractors.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE.

Mr. HARTY. I beg to correct that. They come from Arnprior.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Their headquarters at any rate are in St. Paul ; and no doubt with the expectation of having a contract in that country, they secured a valuable timber limit of 330 square miles on the Wapiti and Little Smoky rivers, 200 miles north west of Edmonton. If they did not secure a contract themselves, at any rate they could hold up another contractor who wanted to get his supplies of bridge timber, ties, telegraph poles and other materials used in the construction of the road. There is practically no trail there, and to get into the country requires a journey of many weeks if not months, without cruising over this vast territory. Yet the notice was given on the 4th of May, and bids were opened on the 14th of June. Of course, no one but the applicant could tender ; any other applicants were handicapped. He made this selection of 330 square miles out of an area, I understand, three times as large. The result was, of course, that there was no other applicant. No person had time in the three weeks given by the notice, which appeared in the city of Edmonton, to examine the country. Mr. Stewart secured those 330 square miles for $7,500 or a little less than $23 per square mile. It is difficult to say what this limit is worth at the present time. I do not think the man on the street could secure it for 12 cents, as the hon. member for Brandon said to-day ; but we do know that while much of the country there has been burned over, this area is marked on the maps as plateau country, generally wooded. We also know that a gentleman named Elliott bought 24 square miles in that country, which he selected after Mr. Stewart selected his, and I have here a description of Mr. Elliott's limit over his own signature, which reads as follows :

Report of Timber Limit No. 1,272.

Location and area of limit.

This limit is situated on the Simonite river and at its junction with the Big Smoky river towards the entrance to the Pine River Pass about 200 miles northwest of Edmonton. The latest map issued by the Dominion government shows the located line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway passing through or immediately in the neighbourhood of the property. The limit comprises twenty-four square miles in area or about 15,360 acres, has a frontage of twelve miles on the Simonite river and a depth of one mile on either side. The Simonite has a width at this point of at least 150 feet with splendid booming facilities and makes a first class driving stream. Should more timber be required than is included within the area of this limit it can be acquired by going further up stream.

Timber and Basis of Calculation as to Quantity.

The timber consists mainly of spruce and white pine, all of the finest quality and of large size. The limit has been well prospected and

in estimating the amount of available lumber no tree has been included of less than one foot in diameter. A large number of trees will run over three feet in diameter. Taking as a basis the most conservative estimate of 10,000 board measure feet to the acre, I have placed the lumber value on this limit at 145 to 150,000,000 board measure feet. Beyond this there will be an enormous number of ties and wood suitable for pulp wood, of which no account is included.

I wish to emphasize the fact that the estimate I have placed on the available amount of timber is extremely low and I am convinced that many inspectors going over the ground would almost double my estimate. There are many square miles which will run 30,000 board measure feet to the acre, and the amount of 145,000,000 here stated is the minimum. The amount of pine is not large, perhaps 5 to 10 per cent. There is much large, beautiful poplar, some trees four feet in diameter. This wood is not exactly poplar, and is rare. A few trees of this variety grow along the Assiniboine river near Portage la Prairie, and the lumber was highly valued. It is ivory white to near the heart and would make beautiful flooring.

Market.

It is my opinion much of the timber on this limit will be required for the construction and future use of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. It is suitable in every respect for bridge timber, ties, station buildings, &c. The cost of installing a sawmill on the ground would be comparatively small, and the haulage short. I may state that spruce ties at Edmonton at present sell for 60 cents a piece. The life of a tie is from four to five years, and with the use of the latest preservatives the life and value of these ties would be greatly increased.

Leaving the Grand Trunk Pacific out of the question, there will be an immense demand for timber at Edmonton, and within a radius of 200 miles from the limits.

General Remarks.

The limit occupies the most favourable location at the junction of two rivers with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, insuring splendid facilities of the material cut, and for the delivery of the logs at the mill. There is bound to be a large and steady demand for ties which can be made by axes, the timber being of suitable size, for an immediate and quick supply of ties, bridge timber, &c. This must be regarded as a temporary expedient, as it is extremely wasteful.

Price of above limit is $72,500.

August 24, 1907. (Sgd.) E. J. ELLIOTT.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are very anxious to know whether I have heard of any sale being made. I understand that Mr. Elliott has refused $52,000 for his limit, which he secured for $7,500. While I have no figures as to the quantity or quality of the timber on the Stewart limit it is reasonable to presume that when Mr. Stewart went in and cruised over that district and passed over this Elliott limit, he secured other limits as valuable, if not more valuable; and Mr. Stewart's limit of 330 square miles, at the same rate at which Mr. Elliott values his limit, would be worth $990,000. It happens that the Grand Trunk Pacific is not going via the Peace river, but via the Yellow Head Pass. To whom then, will people have to go to obtain their timber? I find on looking at the map that along the route of the Grand Trunk Pacific as surveyed at the present time, Mr. T. A. Burrows, the member for Dauphin in this House, has a very large area on the Macleod and Athabaska rivers.

It is somewhat significant, and I admire his astuteness, that he took only that portion above, where the river leaves the line of railway, making it all the more valuable, because the Grand Trunk Pacific is surveyed right through every one of these timber berths held by him. I have here a map showing the line of railway, I have an advertisement here of the timber berths along that line. Timber berth 1903 is twelve square miles. The length of time given in the advertisement was a little longer than in some of the others, but it was very far out of reach, away out near the Yellow Head Pass, 250 miles west of Edmonton, and 62 days were given. If you take off the time used in sending out the notices and the tenders coming back and also the insertion in the paper out there—only one insertion—and a very few heard of it—that would reduce the time to about forty days. Mr. Burrows secured that. It is true he was the highest tenderer. The next tenderer was Mr. Gentles for $700. Mr. T. A. Burrows bid $1,500. It is somewhat significant, on looking over the timber berths referred to in the course of the debate, that in no single instance was Mr. Burrows unsuccessful, when he put in a tender, save when he was in competition with the mysterious Imperial Pulp Company. Whether that competition was a live, active competition, I am not prepared to say. Berth 1093 was secured by Mr. Burrows and the Grand Trunk Pacific passes right through it.

There was another timber berth a little further up the line of railway and along the Athabasca river, berth 1094. This comprised 27 miles. The length of time was the same and the same objection can be urged. The second highest tender was that of Mr. J. W. Blain of Strathcona, who bid $2,025. Mr. Burrows went a little better and got it for $2,500, very little above Mr. Blain's bid; and it is very amusing to hear these hon. gentlemen, notably the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre) stating that these men knew the value of these timber limits, that they had plenty of time to estimate their value, and therefore we might necessarily expect very close tenders. But if you look at the facts you will find there is great discrepancy. For instance the lowest tender for berth 1093 was $25, the second highest tender was $700, and Mr. Burrows got the berth for $1,500. In the case of berth No. 1094, Mr. Gentles bid $1,850, Mr. Blain $2,025 and Mr. Burrows $2,500. Take the case of berth No.

1099, and that again is on the line of railway. This is a most valuable berth. It is 44 square miles, and Mr. Burrows applied to have it put up for tender. The others were not in the name of Burrows but it is seldom that Mr. Burrows applies in his own name. In this instance he did, but although the berth was further away and very inaccessible, still Burrows was anxious they should know he was applying for it and they cut down the notices by days. Five days less than what they had done in more accessible places. Burrows was again the successful tenderer. The applicants were :

J. W. Blain..	$3,300
John Thompson..	5,116
T. A. Burrows..	6,500

In those three cases I congratulate the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) on being so very fortunate. It is somewhat significant that Mr. Burrows, above all others, should be the successful tenderer save in one or two or three cases, where he was the supposed competitor of the Imperial Pulp Company.

Mr. Burrows had been the land commissioner for the Canadian Northern Railway. He knew that the Canadian Northern had a charter to build through the Yellow Head Pass. No doubt he availed himself of the information he received in that position, and prior to the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill receiving the assent of parliament in 1903, he went out and had these berths put up for sale and secured the same. The building of the Grand Trunk Pacific will make that timber limit most valuable. I am not blaming Mr. Burrows for having asked that these timber berths be put up for sale, but it is the policy we are condemning and what the resolution calls for is an investigation, not only into the policy, but into the practice of the department, into the opening of tenders, in order to find out how it happens that one man should be so very fortunate in every instance he makes a tender. The government should have retained those limits in its possession in order to let the people reap the increased value which they are bound to attain by reason of transportation facilities making them more accessible.

I have also here a small limit that I wish to draw the attention of the House to, just to show how very close some of these gentlemen figure. I have here berth 1279 which was applied for on June 20, 1906. The notices were sent from Ottawa on August 25. How comes it that when Mr. Burrows applied for a timber limit, that limit was within twelve days placed in the market by the government, now berth 1279 is a limit close to that acquired by Mr. Burrows —it is a small one to be sure but it shows the discrimination made—when this limit was applied for by Mr. Hall on June 20, it was not put up by the government until August 25. In the meantime any friend of the government who desired to get it, would have this opportunity of cruising this limit and finding out its value. The tenders were opened on the 10th of October, 1906, making something in the neighbourhood of forty days. If any one is entitled to this timber limit, it was Mr. Hall. He and his party went into British Columbia to look up some other timber limits, and on their return they discovered this small berth situated on the Athabasca. Mr. Hall sent in his tender at $50. In the latter part of October he received a notice from the department that his tender was too low and that the successful tenderer was Mr. James Smith of Kamloops whose tender was $52—$52—just $2 in advance of Mr. Hall. Who opened the tenders ? It happened that on November the 1st this Mr. James Smith wrote the following letter to Mr. Hall :

Kamloops, November 1, 1906.

John Hall, Esq.,
Edmonton, Alberta.

Dear Sir,—Timber berth 1279, situate on the Athabasca, containing 480 acres, has been awarded to me and the license to cut timber thereon has been issued. Apparently it was put up to public competition by you, and if you wish to purchase the same I am willing to sell it very reasonably, my price is $500, which is a fraction over $1 per acre. I had it cruised and am satisfied it is good value at twice that price. If you wish to purchase it, kindly let me hear from you at your earliest convenience.

I remain, yours truly,
JAMES SMITH.

The pertinent question might be asked here: When did he have it cruised? Possibly between the time when Mr. Hall's request came in and the time when the government put it up. So, we have Mr. Smith writing this letter to Mr. Hall who had asked to have the timber limit put up, asking $500. He did not put up a mill. We would like to see the original documents in connection with this matter and to have some of these hon. gentlemen in the witness box to see if there has really been any manipulation of tenders. We would also like to find out something in regard to the identity of this Mr. Smith. In the return that was brought down to the House, I see that there is another letter in connection with this matter, and I desire to refer to it. Now, 'Smith' is rather a familiar-sounding name. This Mr. Smith writes a letter to the department in connection with some other limits. This letter is dated Edmonton, Alta., August 23, 1907, and the latter part of it is as follows :

As I am interested in berths 1330 to 1336, inclusive, held by Alex. Smith, of Ottawa, and which we propose surveying this fall, could you extend the time for surveying timber berth 1279 so that we could do it in conjunction with 1330 to 1336?

This 1279 is the small one to which refence has been made. Now, Alex. Smith, of course is a lumberman, is he not? Surely this Alex. Smith cannot be former organizer of the Liberal party in Ontario and now practising lawyer in Ottawa. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) himself has told us that he desires to see these timber limits in the hands of practical lumbermen. I find on looking up the tenders for the berths referred to as being held by Alex. Smith—1330 to 1336 inclusive, seven berths in all—that Alex. Smith was the successful tenderer in every case, and that in nearly every case his tender was just a little higher than the next highest. In the case of 1330, the lowest tender was $90. The next to the highest was $700, and the highest, that of Alex. Smith, was $930. And I desire to say that, in these limits in which Alex Smith tendered, he was fortunate enough to be successful in each and every case. Referring to berth 1331, we find that in this case also the lowest tender was $90; the second to the highest, that of the McInnes Lumber Company, was $900, and the highest, that of Alex. Smith, $920. Yet I understand that all these berths were granted after the present minister (Mr. Oliver) came into power. But I will do the hon. minister the justice to say that he did give a little longer time to put in tenders than had been given before, differing in this respect from the method of the hon. gentleman who spoke this afternoon, the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), who told us that no complaints had been made to him on this subject by lumbermen or by members of parliament. In No. 1332 the lowest tender was for $76; the second highest, that of the McInnes Lumber Company, was $600, and the successful tender was that of Alex. Smith, $660. In the case of No. 1333, the lowest tender was $75; the next highest was $168. In this case Mr. Smith did go somewhat higher and was the successful tenderer at $660—the same price as for timber berth 1332. In the case of 1334, the lowest tender again was $75, and the highest was that of Mr. Smith, again $660. For timber berth 1335 the lowest tender was that of the Western Timber and Mines, Limited, $75; the next $528, and the highest that of Mr. Alex Smith, $660—that seems to be his lucky number. In the case of 1336, once more the lowest tender was $75; the next highest, that of G. K. Allen, $352, and, in this case, Mr. Smith made a reduction to $450, but was successful. So here we have seven timber berths given to Mr. Alex. Smith, who is no lumberman, but who was the successful tenderer in every case, and who seems to own them in conjunction with Mr. James Smith, formerly of Kamloops, and now of Edmonton, these two being associated also with timber berth 1279.

The hon. member for Brandon this afternoon spoke about the way the public domain was given away during the Conservative regime, and other hon. gentlemen who have spoken have harked back not only to timber grants, but also to grants of colonization lands. The hon. member for Brandon spoke of this to-day, and the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) spoke of it when this subject was under debate before. They dwelt upon the alienation of lands for colonization purposes from 1878 to 1886——

Mr. BENNETT. A quarter of a century ago.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Yes, a quarter of a century ago. And these hon. gentlemen do not seem to realize now, in their reproaches, they include their own leaders of bygone days. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) referred to one leading Liberal who had applied for colonization lands—no less a person than Alexander Mackenzie, the leader of hon. gentlemen opposite at one time. Mr. Mackenzie, as the representative of a colonization company, applied to the Conservative government of that day for a vast tract of land. But he was not the only one. One who is still a leader of hon. gentlemen opposite, the present leader of their party in the Senate, Hon. R. W. Scott, applied for colonization lands. Mr. Gunn, then a Liberal member of parliament, representing Kingston, who was elected in 1878. Senator Reesor and Mr. Hugh Sutherland, then a Liberal M.P., were also applicants. Out of eleven members of parliament and senators who applied at that time for these colonization lands, five belong to the Liberal party and only six were Conservatives—a very fair proportion, I think. Yet these hon. gentlemen opposite would give an impression to this House that the Conservative government was parcelling out to their friends the public dominion in the form of colonization lands.

At Six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock I was referring to the fact that our friends on the government side of the House were reflecting upon the administration that preceded them, charging them with parcelling out western lands to colonization companies, to their own particular friends and supporters; I referred to the fact that of eleven members of the Senate and House of Commons who were connected with these colonization companies, five were members of their own political faith and their own political past leaders. In addition to those I have mentioned, Alexander Mackenzie, Hon. R. W. Scott, Mr. Gunn (formerly member of this House for Kingston), Senator Reesor

and Mr. Hugh Sutherland, I have to mention the present Senators Jaffray and Cox. These two gentlemen, I understand, were also connected with colonization companies during the Conservative regime, and certainly they were not particular pets of the Conservative administration. But the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) has stated that in those days it was the case of the grafter getting the timber and the lands and the settler getting the police court. Surely he does not include amongst those grafters a gentleman of his own name, Mr. J. W. Sifton, his own esteemed father, for he was one of the applicants, and certainly it is not right to call the Conservative applicants grafters and let the Liberals escape scot free. Of course, we are not in a position to judge how extensive the police court experience of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) has been, but the mere fact of his having defended one man in the police court for having burned some timber belonging to the government is no evidence that that was the policy pursued by the government of that day. That is the usual style of debate of the Minister of the Interior; he selects certain isolated instances, and dilates upon them with the evident intention of leaving the impression on the House that they indicated the general policy pursued by the Conservative government. He did exactly the same thing in discussing the timber berths.

The length of time for which these limits were advertised has been much discussed in this debate, and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) has claimed that under this government the same policy has been in vogue as was in vogue during the term of office of his predecessor. To that I wish to give a flat contradiction, and I wish to strengthen my contradiction by a quotation from the then Minister of the Interior as to the policy which was pursued in 1884 and later. The few isolated instances mentioned by the Minister of the Interior were not indicative of the policy pursued by the ministry.

During the session of 1894 a debate occurred in this House between practical lumbermen, the present Senator Edwards and Mr. John Charlton. I beg to quote for a few moments from the remarks made by these gentlemen. Mr. Charlton was moving for a return—

> Of all timber licenses granted since January 1, 1888, showing the date of each grant, the location, the area of the same, the name of the grantee, the bonus, if any, paid upon the same, whether disposed of: (a) at public auction duly advertised where the public were invited to compete; (b) at auction where only applicants for the berth or limit were invited to bid; (c) by private application; (d) if in neither of the ways above-mentioned, then stating in what way disposal and grant was made.
>
> Also a summary statement giving total area granted, and total amount of bonuses received.

He said: I shall ask leave to amend this order by inserting after subsection (d) an additional subsection as follows: The length of public notice given in each case when limits are sold, either at public auction or by other form of public competition.

This was the particular portion of his resolution to which Mr. Charlton desired to speak, and in discussing that question he said :

> The object, of course, of this amendment is to ascertain whether the government, in giving notice of sale, have given what would be considered a fair length of notice. The sale of timber limits, to be made advantageously, must, in my opinion, be by public auction, and that after ample notice has been given.

I would ask the attention of the Minister of the Interior to these remarks in view of his remarks upon the same subject yesterday :

> A short notice will, of course, prevent intending purchasers, who are not previously apprised of intention to sell, from making a thorough examination of the property. It is unnecessary to say that timber limits are invariably in the wilderness, not easy of access, and if the first intimation to be given intending purchasers be conveyed by the public notice, it requires a little time on the part of intending purchasers to make their preparations for examination. Men familiar with the lumber trade are perfectly well aware that any public notice, short of three or four months, is utterly insufficient.

Now, Mr. Charlton called himself a practical lumberman.

> The object of this motion is to ascertain whether the government, in giving notice, has given the length of time necessary for making examinations, sufficient for intending buyers.

Not only did he state that it was absolutely necessary in every case to have three or four months' notice, but he also stated that even at that day all timber limits should be put up to public auction.

He was succeeded by the present Senator Edwards, then a member of this House, who spoke in the same strain. Mr. Edwards said :

> Mr. Speaker, my only object in rising to speak upon this matter is to endeavour to impress upon the government the desirability of giving sufficient time for examination in cases of selling timber limits, both in the interest of the public and in the interests of lumbermen themselves. In a general way timber limits have become very valuable. To-day, the examination of these properties is made with very much more accuracy than was the case some years ago. For this reason, it is desirable that ample time shall be given to examine any timber limits that are put upon the market for sale. As to the time that it is desirable to give, that altogether depends upon the area that is offered. In some instances, three or four months might be sufficient, but, in a great many cases, six months would be required.

The very least that Senator Edwards thought should be given was three to four months.

It is desirable that the limits should be travelled closely in order to ascertain their real value; and one month is certainly not sufficient time in which to examine any timber limit. In my opinion, as a lumberman, one having had a good deal of experience in matters of this kind, in no instance should the time allowed for examination be less than four or five months; and, as I have said, in a great many instances, it should be six months, or even more. Now, as to the method of selling, I certainly agree that timber limits should be put up at public auction, and not sold by tender. My reason for so saying is this: If the principle of selling by tender is admitted, an individual knowing all the conditions of the limit, and the value of it, may ask that it be put up for sale; then, if tenders are asked for, the lumbermen generally, knowing nothing as to the value of the property, pay no attention whatever to the request for tenders. The consequence would be that the individual knowing the value of the property, might put in his tender for a very small sum, and secure the limit. I am speaking of a matter of which I have personal knowledge, for within the last few years I have received a great many requests for tenders, and in no instance have I known anything about the property offered, nor in any instance did I consider it in my interest to examine the property.

Now, the then Minister of the Interior, Mr. Daly, said in reply to that, not as the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior stated that there was only twenty-four, or twenty-eight, or thirty, or forty days, but that

Ample notice has been given in every case—three, four or five months, acording to the location of the limits, and the means afforded for people to go and examine them—and notice has been given by advertisements in the newspapers, not only in the locality of the limit, not only in the province in which it is situated, but in the newspapers in other parts of the Dominion as well. In addition to that, circulars are sent to all the lumbermen in Canada and the United States, whose addresses are known to the department, and I think we know them all pretty well. That is evidenced by what the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) has said, that he has received numbers of these notices. He says that in no instance has he sought to purchase any limits of which he has had notice.

Again, when Mr. Charlton asked him :

What does the hon. gentleman consider ample notice?

He replied :

Three or four months' notice according to location of the berth, giving ample time to people to examine the berths and obtain all the information they require.

This was the general policy adopted by the then administration and it shows that an erroneous impression was attempted to be left on this House, by the hon. member for Brandon this afternoon when he sought to lead the House to believe that the policy of the former administration was to call for tenders without allowing sufficient time to permit of competitive bids being submitted. A few isolated instances of tenders being received on short notice for some special reason only can be cited. But, these were far more widely advertised than they are under this present administration. To-day, for instance, the advertisement of the sale of this limit, located away up at Cedar lake, had only one insertion in the Winnipeg 'Free Press' and one insertion in the Dauphin paper. Here was a timber limit away out in Saskatchewan and as the Dauphin paper did not circulate there it should have been advertised in a Prince Albert paper. Besides that there were only a few notices sent around to those in the trade. With that one insertion in a weekly local paper and no other, except that in the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' it was absolutely impossible to have the required notice given which would secure active competition. The hon. Minister of the Interior stated yesterday in speaking about the system of public auction that it was his intention in the future to put that system in vogue :

Now, we propose that the timber shall be put up only on the judgment of the government that it is right and proper and in the public interest that a certain area shall be advertised for sale. We propose to have the area examined so as to decide its suitability and its worth and then sell it by public auction with the view of getting the highest bonus. That is exactly in line with what my hon. friends opposite have been declaring is the policy the government should adopt, so that I hope we shall have their unanimous endorsation of it. But let me point out to those gentlemen that to have put such a policy in force, say five years ago, would, instead of being beneficial, have been most injurious to the best interests of the country.

That, in the face of the declaration of lumbermen like Mr. Edwards and Mr. Charlton that they would advise the government to put up all timber berths at auction and not to sell by tender or until they had advertised them for three, four, five or six months ! The hon. member for Brandon has stated that the Conservatives sold their timber berths without giving sufficient notice by public advertisement. But, Mr. Speaker, there is one great difference between the berths that were sold by the Conservative administration and those that are being sold at the present time and that is that at that time a person tendering for any particular timber berth had to go and make a selection in one block. If it were thirty or fifty square miles he had to take that in one block, whereas, under the administration of this government, a man may select 50 miles out of an area of 100 or 200 miles and he may select 330 miles out of an area three times as large which is a vastly different proposition.

I would ask the hon. member for Brandon : Where did he get this information which he gave to the House this afternoon ? Where did he get the information about cer-

tain timber berths that were advertised for such a short time ? Has he had the run of the Department of the Interior, has he had the officials of the department, from whom we find it very difficult to get our correspondence nowadays, preparing ammunition for the government's friends ? Has the hon. gentleman still got the run of the department, is he allowed to peruse original documents, or to get his speech prepared by the Department of the Interior, or to look over the files of the department, notwithstanding the promise made by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) that the law that he was going to put into effect would be made to apply equally to Liberals and Conservatives ? It seems to me that the hon. gentleman could not get that information in any other way than by having access to the department or by having some one in the department to secure this information for him.

Mr. FOSTER. He says that he took it at random.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Yes, he took it at random and he must have had an opportunity to look over the files. He stated that no objections were made in the past when he was minister by any lumberman or by any member of parliament in regard to the length of time that these limits were advertised. I would like to have a little more evidence on that subject than the hon. gentleman's own word in view of a similar declaration that he made in this House a few years ago when he stated that he had received no criticism upon his administration of the Dominion lands branch of the Department of the Interior, and when he even referred to the member for Marquette as writing only one letter in connection with various reserves. I had the privilege of stating upon that occasion that I not only had furnished one letter, but instance after instance, letter after letter and application after application on behalf of my constituents all of which were practicaly ignored by the then Minister of the Interior. In this connection, also as upon that occasion probably the memory of the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior is not of the very best. He has defended the regulation which was changed in 1903 while he was minister in reference to the annual revision of the royalty and in that respect he has taken directly opposite ground to that of his successor in office. He states that limit holders had practically continuity of tenure, that so long as they carried out the regulations as a matter of course they had a renewal of their licenses. But, the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior, a couple of years ago, in discussing this question, made that one of the great reasons why he changed this order in council on April 14, 1903, namely, that lumbermen had no guarantee that there was continuity of tenure and he therefore had an order in council passed which did away with the revision of the annual royalty. So that, no matter how much the profit might be, the country, had that order in council remained in force at the present time, would not be the gainer thereby, but to show that the members on this side of the House were correct in the attitude which they took upon this question at that time it is only necessary to say that upon this as upon many other questions the course that the hon. Minister of the Interior adopted was the one which was forced upon him by this side of the House and now he has provided that there shall be an annual revision of the royalty if necessary,.

The hon. member for Brandon stated that those limits have to-day no speculative value whatever, that you could go out on the street and purchase them for a few cents per thousand feet. That is very strange in view of the letter that I read in the 'Free Press' the other day from one of these gentlemen who is the owner of some of these northern limits, Mr. McDonald, an ardent Liberal, I believe, and a gentleman, who, no doubt, would try to defend his party to the utmost of his power, and who takes exception to the figures quoted by my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) when he says that this limit is held to-day for $500,000. The writer states that the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, can have that limit for $75,000 if he desires it.

Mr. BENNETT. What did he pay for it ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. He only paid the sum of $1,845. Still, the hon. member for Brandon says that they have no speculative value at the present time. My hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, can get this limit of $75,000 at this stringent time peg by the selling partner in Winnipeg, Mr. Donald says he is quite willing to part with it if he gets this amount of money. This notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Fraser's limit on Cedar lake is being put on the market, is being offered in St. Paul and Winnipeg by the selling partner in Winnipeg. Mr. McDonnell, at the price of $500,000! If that timber limit is sold for half of that what an immense profit there will be ? And every dollar of it comes out of the settler eventually, and it will mean that the settlers will have to pay $2 or $3 per thousand more than they otherwise would have to pay, just the same as they had to pay enhanced prices for other lands sold by this government. The ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has said that when he had his estimate up for tree planting he was fought day after day and week after week by the members on this side of the House. Let him produce his proof. He has made that statement before and it has been denied and if he could prove it he would have the proof at hand. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) has a faculty of clapping and pounding his fists to lend em-

phasis where he lacks logic and when he makes broad statements without proof to support them. It is true that probably the members on this side of the House asked for some information in regard to that matter as they had a perfect right to and that they criticised some of his actions in regard to it, but as for opposing the planting of forests in the west that statement is absolutely unfounded.

I desire for a moment to refer to the Cedar lake limit. The hon. gentleman from Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre) has stated that this Cedar lake limit, which is claimed to be so very valuable to-day, was applied for—practically the same limit he stated—by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) 25 years ago. Even if that were the case, it would not be any defence of the action of the government to-day. Timber lands have increased in value as all other lands have increased in value during the last quarter of a century. But, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that it was not the same limit that was applied for by the member for Argenteuil, and it was not selected in the same manner either. In the first place I wish to draw the attention of members in this House to the description given by the member for Strathcona of that limit that was applied for by the member for Argenteuil :

Commencing at the discharge of the north Saskatchewan river into Cedar lake, thence to extend——

Not around the lake, mind you.

—up the river to a point on it eight and a third miles in direct distance from the point of beginning;——

It is to extend up the river on one side from its entrance into the lake, 8⅓ miles.

—the western boundary to be at right angles to the general bearing of the river within said distance; the eastern boundary to be the shore of Cedar lake; the southern boundary to be parallel to the general course of the river and back therefrom a sufficient distance to make the required area.

And what was the area? It was 50 square miles. And how selected? It was to be selected in one solid block and up the river, having the river as a boundary on one side, an area sufficient in depth to take in the 50 miles, running from its entrance into Cedar lake, 8⅓ miles up the river. That is vastly different from going around Cedar lake with a coast line of from 100 to 150 miles in length and selecting 60 miles in 6 blocks of 10 square miles, together with 30 miles in the islands. That is a different proposition. It was not the same area; it was not the same limit; it was not selected in the same way; it was not to be selected in 6 blocks of 10 square miles each around the coast line of Cedar lake, but it was to be up the Saskatchewan river from its entrance into the lake. Therefore, the hon. member for Strathcona was entirely wrong in giving as an illustration that the limit applied for by the hon. member (Mr. Perley) was considered entirely worthless then, although it is represented as being very valuable at the present day. It was not the same limit.

The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) has stated that at the present rate of disposing of this timber we will have enough to last us for the next 200 years. The hon. gentleman is fond of speaking in large figures; he is a high financier and possibly one reason why he has been giving the berths away as quickly as he can to all his friends is because he thinks we had abundance of timber to last us for years to come. Therefore, certain favorite gentlemen had to secure these berths because we had sufficient to last us for the next 200 years.

The reason given by the member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) why these applications were cancelled during the Conservative regime was because, he said, not of the onerous conditions, but because of the fact that the policy of the Conservative party did not tend to bring settlers into that country; in fact, the Conservative policy drove them out. These are his words, although later on in his speech he admitted the applications were cancelled simply because the conditions were not complied with. The member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) stated that it was the onerous conditions and regulations imposed by the late government that compelled these people to give up these timber limits, and the member for East Assiniboia said :

I venture the statement, Mr. Speaker, that you may go through the limits that were given in those days, and of all the hundreds that were given away for nothing you cannot find three that were cancelled for that reason.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the very reason that was given by the Minister of the Interior in his speech yesterday contradicts that statement of the member for East Assiniboia, for the minister has admitted that they were surrendered because the conditions were not complied with. In the first place there were no ground rents paid; in the second, there were no surveys made, and in the third place in the absence of these they could not get their license without which they could not cut one single stick of timber. But the hon. member (Mr. Turriff) goes on and says :

I will tell you why they were cancelled, not because there was not good timber on the limits, but because, under the administration of my hon. friends opposite, if the timber was not worth anything, they scarcely got any people into the country, and the people they did get in there did not stay, with the result that they could not afford to go paying five square miles ground rent, and they did not pay the five square miles ground rent, and for a good

many years many of the timber limits that had been given away and that were valuable, were canceled for non-payment of the ground rent.

Well, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turiff) changes his ground there, and he admits exactly what we have stated, that the conditions had not been complied with and the regulations not fulfilled and they reverted to the Crown. And, Mr. Speaker, that puts me in mind of a little of the history of the Liberal party. Why did we not get settlers into that country? I think hon. gentlemen opposite should be the last to twit the Conservatives with not being able to get settlers into that country as fast as we all would like. Let us take the unpatriotic stand in this parliament and out of this partliament of these same Liberals decrying the fair fame and name of their own country. Who was it stated that our great western plains were only fit for the red man and the buffalo? Who was it stated—when the Conservative party were carrying out the terms of confederation with British Columbia and building—the Canadian Pacific Railway—that it would brankrupt the resources of Canada to build such a railway? Who was it lauded the American northwestern states as a more advantageous field for immigration than our own Canadian Northwest? Whose photograph ornamented the frontispiece of a publication lauding Kansas in contradistinction to our own Northwest? It was the political leaders of the hon. member (Mr. Turriff) who did all this; it was the Hon. Edward Blake and his friends who took the unpatriotic stand of decrying their own country and is it any wonder that we did not get the settlers into that country that we ought to get?

Now, there are a few of those tenders that I have not referred to thus far as showing the methods of tendering for these timber berths. Take, for instance, limit No. 1031. I have already stated that so far as I can see on all these timber berths that have been discussed in the House in which the member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) was a successful tenderer, in no instance except where he was a competitor of the Imperial Pulp Company was he non-successful. Timber berth 1031 was put up and here are the bids—the second highest bidder was McDonald, of Ottawa, $31,161, and the highest bidder was the Imperial Pulp Company, $31,575. This timber limit which was worth such a vast sum of money was pretty closely figured between these two tenderers, as you will notice. But the member for Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre) tells us that these men are up in their business, that they have their cruisers out; they know these areas and they can estimate very closely what they are worth. Let us see. This is one of the cases where the member for Dauphin was unsuccessful against the Imperial Pulp Company, apparently because the Imperial Pulp Company had a little more pull than even the hon. member for Dauphin. But the member for Dauphin is an experienced and practical lumberman and he had a tender in for this timber limit and what was it? It was not $31,000 as in the case of the other tenderer, but just $6,057. What a wonderful discrepancy. The lowest tender was $2,000. Now, let us take berth No. 1046, and here is one where Mr. Burrows was again a successful competitor. The second highest tender was D. R. Fraser, of Edmonton, for $3,015; the highest tenderer was Mr. Burrows for $3,500, and the lowest tender, which was from Craft & Lee, was $815. Mr. Burrows had not any Imperial Pulp Company to go up against in this instance. Then again we have berth No. 1047 and this was put up and the highest tender was from Mr. Burrows for $15,000, and the second highest was from McDonald, and I just venture the opinion that as great a friend as McDonald may be of this administration, I think that if he would be frank he would say and possibly he has said, that he had serious grievances against this government; that he and his friends have been jockeyed on many occasions out of timber limits which they should properly have had. Their offer was $13,524. Mr. Burrows got the limit for $15,000; the lowest tender was $2,000. In this instance again we would like to have a peep at the original documents.

Next, take timber berth 1231. This case beats all the others, and when hon. gentlemen learn who the gentleman was who was the successful tenderer, I am sure that a broad smile will spead over their faces. There were four tenders: Craft & Lee, of Edmonton, $300; K. McDonald, $657; William Humberstone, of Edmonton, $1,000; and then the financier, the close reckoner, T. O. Davis, the present senator, $1,005—$5 above the next figure. Now, will not the Prime Minister give us an investigation? Surely after the statements I have given he will not only do that, but let us have a peep at the original documents so that we may see how these tenders were manipulated and who did the manipulating.

We have been told that we have made insinuations. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who twitted us with indulging in insinuations was the ex-commissioner of Dominion lands; and what did he do before he got through? I am not going to go through his speech and select all his insinuations. He challenged us on this side of the House to take an open stand and make our charges against him if we had any to make; and yet before he got through he said to the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames):

I think that possibly if the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, would look back

in his history, he might possibly be able to throw some light on this Rochester limit.

What did the hon. gentleman mean by that—a charge ? Nothing else but an insinuation. The hon. member for St. Antoine division informs me that he never saw Rochester, and does not know who Rochester was. Yet this is the hon. gentleman who insists on insinuations being dropped and charges being made. Other insinuations have been indulged in on the other side of the House. I think the hon. Minister of the Interior himself was not free from that offense when he mentioned the name of T. Mayne Daly, who wrote a letter to Mr. Cook, leaving the impression on the House that it was the ex-Minister of the Interior of that name. I do not think it was, but another altogether. Yet the hon. minister seemed to convey the impression that it was the ex-Minister of the Interior, though he afterwards denied that he was at all sure of that. The same hon. gentleman referred to all the timber berths which had been handed out in 1882 and 1883—an insinuation again—because there was an election in 1882. Is that the reason John W. Sifton applied for a limit in 1882 ? The Conservative government was not parcelling out timber limits to friends and pets of their own party, but many strong and ardent Liberals applied for timber licenses under the Conservative administration, and secured them, and they were quite right in doing so.

Now, these hon. gentlemen have stated that we have been parcelling out the public domain of this country among our friends. Look at their own record of the last few years in regard to not only timber licenses, but agriculture, mining and grazing lands as well. The Saskatchewan Valley Land Company got 250,000 acres of land ; the Robbins Irrigation Company got 380,000 acres—what for ? To help Conservatives ? No, not at all. The gentlemen who got that contract from the government were not required to pay a single dollar until 1910, and they went across the Atlantic and put their contract on the market and sold it for $500,000. Along with that, they sold the Grand Forks lease for between $800,000 and $900,000. We know of the grazing lands which were given to Messrs. McGregor and Hitchcock. We know that the Yukon country was the stamping ground of the exploiter under the regime of the ex-Minister of the Interior, who enabled his favourites to come out with their pockets bursting with money, and brought down upon himself the condemnation not only of the Conservative press of Canada, but of the independent press and the press of the mother land as well. But these hon. gentlemen have not confined themselves to the land, but have also given privileges and fishing leases. To Mr. Markey, a lawyer of Montreal, they gave a monoply of the fisheries on the Nelson river and its tributaries for 21 years, not allowing the settlers to take fish for commercial purposes, but only for domestic purposes, for the magnificent sum of $10 a year. In the same way they gave a lease of the fishing privileges on the Lesser Slave lake and Lake Athabaska to Mr. J. K. McKenzie of Selkirk. for nine years for $10 per annum. They gave to Mr. Archibald McNee, a journalist of Windsor, the same privilege in James bay for the magnificent sum of $10 per annum. It comes with very poor grace from these gentlemen to revile their opponents about parcelling out the public domain when they have such a record for the last few years.

The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) may get up and call upon his opponents to make other charges. Why, one would require to have an epidermis like a rhinoceros to stand any more charges. The hon. gentleman should be the very first himself to demand an investigation. He it was who was the Commissioner of Crown Lands, to whom was entrusted the opening of those tenders. And there is a well grounded suspicion in the minds, not only of lumbermen, but of the people generally, that there was, while he was commissioner, the greatest manipulation of tenders. The only way to drive that suspicion out of the public mind, if there be nothing in it, is for the hon. gentleman himself (Mr. Turriff) to go to the First Minister and insist on having this investigation in order that he may be given the opportunity of clearing his own skirts. But he stands on his position as a member of this House. Well, Mr. Speaker, he was not a member of this House during the period when this manipulating of tenders is charged to have taken place. Why did the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), when he was Minister of the Interior, change the officer who opened the tenders? Why did he pass over Mr. Ryley, who used to open the tenders before, and give that work to be done by the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff)? Could he not trust Mr. Ryley, or could he better trust the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) to do certain work? In view of the record, the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) should be the first to insist on an investigation, if he be the honest man he claims to be. The right hon. the First Minister himself (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) cannot afford to take the position on this motion that he has done on others. When an investigation into the administration of the Interior Department was asked before, the right hon. gentleman shielded himself behind the subterfuge that what was wanted was a fishing expedition. But in this instance he is confronted with specified items of charges one after another. Nine reasons have been given by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), reasons have been given by every member on this side who has spoken. Why, in the interests

of good government, in the interest of the members of this administration who are under suspicion in connection with these transactions, the Prime Minister cannot afford to shield himself by any such subterfuge, and the people of Canada will not take it as a sufficient answer, that specific charges have not been made. Any First Minister, who has the honour of the country, the honour of his government and the honour of his officials at heart, would accede to this resolution. If there is nothing to hide, why not go on with the investigation? The people will not be satisfied with any refusal of the First Minister, but will hold him, as the Prime Minister of this country, personally responsible for the conduct of the administration, whether the ex-Commissioner of Dominion Lands (Mr. Turriff) or the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) be implicated, or whomever the investigation may affect. Therefore, I have the utmost pleasure in supporting the resolution of my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), and am confident that the people of this country will not be satisfied with anything short of a thorough investigation.

Mr. E. BRISTOL (Centre Toronto). I am indeed astonished that not one of the members of the present administration or their followers have seen fit to make an attempt at least to reply to the very able, clear and eloquent indictment just made by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche). One would think that in a matter touching the honour of several members of this House, we would have heard from the other side every defence it was possible for them to make. But since no one rises to reply to my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) we must come to the conclusion that the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) and the present minister (Mr. Oliver) have exhausted all the defence that can be offered to this resolution.

Let us examine the line of defence, if you can call it such, which these hon. gentlemen have put forward. It can be very briefly stated. In effect what they say is this: You did it in 1883; we did it when we came into power, but the swag is not nearly so valuable as you think, and in any case there is a lot more of it. Well, I do not think the people are much concerned in what the late Conservative party did or did not do in 1883. Whatever may have been their sins of omission or commission, they have paid the penalty, and the late Conservative government is no longer on its trial. But the government which is on its trial is the present administration; and unless the present administration can offer some better excuse than to say the Conservatives in 1883 did wrong, the people will think it is high time to make a change. What did the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) tell us was the policy in 1883? He said there was no desire to get revenue, but what was desired was to get as many people as possible into the business of cutting lumber, so that the supply of lumber would be cheap and plentiful. Well, if that statement of the position be correct, would it not be better for the western country if there were 1,000 people cutting lumber under proper conditions than if there were only twenty? The more lumber that would be cut under reasonable conditions, the cheaper would be the product. So long as the conditions were fair, so long as the timber lands were open to competition by everybody. I do not see how the fact that one or two or three hundred persons at that time thought they would go into the lumber business and then gave up the idea, affects the situation one iota. The important point is that the interests of the settlers were then protected by the obligation being imposed on the purchasers of timber limits to erect mills within a definite time, to pay certain rentals, and do other things. That is proven by the fact that when the Conservatives went out of power in 1896 there were only 1,700 square miles of limits in the hands of the lumbermen of that day, and these were being practically operated. Had the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) been fair, instead of talking about 21,000 square miles of timber limits having been alienated by the Conservatives, he would have stated that, although licenses to that extent were granted, the amount alienated in 1896 was only 1,700 square miles, which shows how absurd it was to talk of 21,000 square miles and the police court.

We have further elicited from the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) the statement that from 1889 to 1896 the administration of our timber limits was honest and good and in the interests of the country. Surely we could not have any higher testimony. It shows how futile it is to go back to the acts of the Conservative government in 1883, when we have the admission from the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) that not only was that administration on the same lines as at present, but that from 1889 to 1896 it was in the best interests of this country. And the fact that in 1896 only 1,700 square miles of timber lands were alienated proves that statement.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have told us that they followed in our footsteps. Well, we know that in many instances they endeavoured to do so, but their endeavour on this occasion reminds me very much of the Chinaman who was given an old pair of trousers as a pattern for a new pair. Unfortunately there was a patch on the old one, and the Chinaman thought it necessary to reproduce that patch on the new pair. That is the kind of servile imitation which this government have practiced in connection with our timber limits. No doubt if the resolution now before the House had not been brought up, they would have gone on to the end of time distributing timber limits to their favourites quite irrespective of competition.

Now, these hon. gentlemen say that they followed the Conservative policy. But there

are one or two essential matters in which it is quite evident that, not merely did they not follow the Conservative policy, but they materially changed that policy to the detriment of the people of this country. If I am correctly informed, and I believe I am, it was the policy of the Conservative administration of that day to have three people open tenders of this kind. If that was so, and if Mr. Ryley was one of these people, then I venture to say that the change of policy by which, instead of three officials of the department opening the tenders in one another's presence a policy was adopted by which one official alone opened these tenders, may be one of the chief means whereby the country and this administration have got into trouble with respect to this very important matter. I wish to call the attention of the House and the country to what, in my humble judgment, is another very important change that took place and which seems to have been entirely overlooked by this administration. If there is one boast which the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)) makes, it is that he is the head of a business administration. If this is a business administration, I would like to know why it was that they were unable to discover that, since the year 1900, there has been a complete change in the conditions of the west. If they had been a business administration, they should have endeavoured to change their policy so as to fit it to the changed conditions which have arisen in the west since that time. I take it that that which was a good policy in 1880 may not have been a good policy in 1900. I take it that it is the duty of an administration to watch the course of affairs, and to adapt its policy to the conditions as they arise. But these gentlemen now in power seem to have entirely overlooked the changed conditions of that western country in the seven years since 1900. From 1883 to 1900, the country had been gradually filling up with settlers. In 1883 there was no Canadian Pacific Railway, in fact no railway. In 1900, the government had enunciated its policy of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. And, even before that time, the Canadian Northern had been extending its lines through the western country as rapidly as possible. The areas in the United States open for free settlement had been filled up and American settlers had been pouring into this country. Instead of a population of 100,000, with very little railway communication, you had a population of 500,000 and a good railway system over a great portion of the country.

Now, if the government were not alive to the changed conditions of the west, apparently a gang of speculators, very much the friends of the government were very much alive to these changes. And so, we find this particular crowd of friends of the government were able, between 1902 and 1905, to corral what has been stated to be practically all the best available timber limits of that western country. We were told by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) that there were 150,000 miles of merchantable timber in the west. Every Canadian is glad to know it. But it would have been a kind act on the part of the hon. gentleman, if, in giving that information to the House and to the country, he had stated also that nearly the whole of that great timber area is on the northern slope of the continent, that not only is it not now available by the present railway systems, but that it cannot be brought to the use of the present settlers of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba by the rivers of that country, because it is almost entirely tributary to the rivers which flow into the Arctic ocean. What did the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) charge in this House ? He charged that practically all the available timber of Alberta had been corraled by these speculators to the detriment of the people of that province. Was there any answer to that from the hon. member from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) ? Not a word. That hon. gentleman dealt in glittering generalities which have no bearing upon the matter which the House is now considering, and which is of so much interest to the people of Canada. So, I say, so far as this government are concerned, whether through stupidity or through a desire to assist their friends, they absolutely closed their eyes and their minds to the development of this country from 1900 to 1907, and continued a policy, which may have been a good policy when the country was not settled, when there were no railway systems, and when it was almost impossible to get anybody to take timber limits at any price and work them but which was not necessarily a good policy when lumber was one of the most vital needs for a great and rapidly increasing population. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has told us that there was no change in the regulations between 1889 and the present time. That seems a very extraordinary statement, in view of the total change of conditions that has taken place. These gentlemen found that, instead of timber limits being a drug, which it was difficult to get anybody to take and work, applications were being made to have these timber limits put up for sale. And what did they do ? They went through a farce of competition. I am not going, at this stage of the debate, to set forth the various methods by which they tried not to advertise the various limits that were put up, so that their favorites might secure them, but it has been amply shown that the competition was a farce, that it was absurd, that there was no real competition in these important transactions. We have applied since the 4th of December last for some twenty returns of original documents in matters of this description.

After a week of fighting, we did secure some nine documents, but, up to this time, we have been unable to have the motions dealt with that call for other documents which are of vital importance in the discussion of this matter. But what happens? The ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) comes here, and it would appear from his speech that he has been allowed to go through the files of the department and pick up, 'at random,' as he says, any matter that he thinks will help his argument in this case. But, apart from the matters which I have been referring to, the people of this country have their eyes fixed upon this very important point—that there has been a most remarkable closeness of guessing on the part of certain gentlemen who were favorites of this administration, and who have secured for a song valuable timber limits. I venture to think that the people of this country will not be satisfied to be told that, because certain things were done in 1883, when practically there were no settlers in the west and no railways, therefore, even when every evidence of fraud is shown by the documents brought down, an investigation into this department where this fraud seems to exist shall not be permitted. Comment has been made on the two tenders put in in Mr. Fraser's handwriting; in view of the fact that Mr. Fraser himself has thought fit, through the Minister of the Interior, to endeavour to make a statement to this House—a statement, which, I venture to think, is most unsatisfactory, the least that should be done in a matter of this kind is to give Mr. Fraser an opportunity to appear before a commission, to make on oath and under proper circumstances, the statement he has endeavoured to get before this House. The very fact that any gentleman feels it necessary to clear his skirts in respect of the documents that have been brought forward is of itself a sufficient reason why a proper commission should be appointed to take evidence on oath of this gentleman and any others who can throw light on the subject. Quite apart from that, you have the further statement of Mr. Nolan in the newspapers, which seems quite different from Mr. Fraser's.

If there is one matter in these original papers which I think deserves the careful attention of this House and more than any other calls for the granting of an investigation, it is the circumstances surrounding the three alleged tenders put in on December 2, 1903. The two Fraser tenders are marked Nos. 454,689 and 454,689, and they are stamped with a blue stamp: Department of the Interior, Wednesday 9th December, 1903; Timber and Mines branch. The third tender which appears here as an alleged tender by James Curry, dated December 2, 1903, bears no number and no date or receipt stamp to show that the original tender was ever received by the department. Without evidence how can we tell whether or not that is a genuine tender? On its face it is not genuine because it does not appear with the proper number or with the stamp of the department as the other tenders do. It was alleged that the first thousand dollar tender went in first and the other, No. 454,688, last. Yet between these two tenders you will find that other tender shoved in with no number and no official stamp on it. I submit that the people want to know, even if hon. gentlemen opposite do not, how it is that in the only original documents produced from this department we find one that has not the earmarks of authenticity on it. This is a matter which calls for an explanation from the department. Is it because we find these irregularities; is it because we find in the second Fraser tender the figures put in with different ink and different handwriting, that we have not been able to have the original documents in the other 21 instances produced to the House? Would their return to the House disclose the same irregularities? If this department has been regularly and properly run, then in the interest of the people of this country and of the department every suspicion in connection with a matter of this kind, which is vital to the government and to the public interest, should be at once absolutely cleared up.

In view of the charges that have been made in the various speeches during this debate, I declare that the honour of the government is at stake; I declare that the responsibility of this matter does not rest with either the present Minister of the Interior or his predecessor, but that the people of Canada have their eyes on the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). They want to know what the right hon. gentleman is going to do about this. He is the one who is responsible for the administration of the affairs of the country, responsible for the honour of the government and of parliament, and unless he does as he did in connection with the original documents, and lets in the light of day, I am satisfied that the people of Canada will not believe that there is not something to hide in this case, that there is not something which if exposed to the light of day, would bring disgrace and discredit on the administration of the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. H. A. WARD (Durham). I did not intend participating in this debate, but as my name has been mentioned in connection with the granting of timber licenses to friends of the Conservative government, I feel it due to myself, to the House and to the country, that a short explanation of that transaction should be given. When I called the attention of the Minister of the Interior to a matter referred to in his speech and asked him a question, he pulled out from

among the papers that he had ready from his department a statement of my connection with a timber limit granted by the Conservative government in 1883. In 1886 Mr. Charlton, then member for South Norfolk, brought forward the same list that has been produced by the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) during this debate and proclaimed that I, among other members of the House of Commons, had succeeded in obtaining concessions from the Conservative government that would not have been granted had I not been a friend of the administration and that therefore the granting of the concession was a wrongful act by that administration. Mr. Charlton's attention was called by the Hon. Peter White, then member for one of the Renfrews, to the fact that I was not a member of the House when that application was made. Again in 1890 Mr. Charlton brought forward the same list of Conservative delinquents, as he called them, who had obtained concessions from that administration. I desire to read to the House exactly what I said on the second occasion when Mr. Charlton brought this matter to the attention of the House. I made no reply in 1886, but in 1890, after the list had been read by Mr. Charlton, although I was not in the House when he spoke, I made this reply :

Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words with regard to the matter brought before the House by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Unfortunately I was out of the House when he brought forward the list of the names of members who had from time to time made application for portions of the public lands. I read from the hon. gentleman's speech in Hansard that he stated: 'That H. A. Ward, M.P., had received one limit' and further 'H. A. Ward, M.P., made three applications and secured three limits.' The hon. gentleman must have had the returns before him at the time he made that declaration in this House, and he must have known, if he had read the returns and dates on which these applications were made, that these limits in question were applied for two years before I became a member of this House. That, however, is the style of the allegation put forward by the hon. gentleman. I simply wish to say that at that time, two years before I became a member, I was interested with some American and Canadian gentlemen who desired to enter into transactions in timber in the Northwest. They applied through me, and I had one limit granted to myself, and afterwards, about $3,000 was expended in examining and surveying the limits. My friends, however, came to the conclusion that they could not by any possibility be made to pay. Nothing more was done in regard to them and the applications were cancelled. The hon. gentleman's mind must be relieved by the circumstance that the public domain has not in any way been squandered on gentlemen associated with me but he cannot be relieved of the imputation of having attempted on false pretences to assail the reputation of a member of this House.

That was the explanation I made in 1886. I was then a member of the House, but at the time that these limits were granted to me I was not a member of the House. For the information of hon. gentlemen opposite I would state that two of the gentlemen who were associated with me in that transaction were Liberals of the old school. They were not Conservatives, they never were Conservatives before their applications were granted for that limit and they have never been Conservatives since. No inquiry was made as to their political complexion. The limits were granted as a matter of course. Some members of the House seem to lose sight of the fact entirely that conditions were different twenty-five years ago from what they are at the present time and that it was the object of the Conservative administration at that time to secure the manufacture of lumber in the country for the benefit of the settler. It was the intention of those who were associated with me, one of these gentleman being a lumberman, to undertake the manufacture of timber and lumber in the Northwest. But, upon a close examination of the conditions which existed about Prince Albert at that time—these limits were quite close to Prince Albert—it was considered by those who knew a great deal more about the transaction than I did myself, not being initiated in the lumber trade, that there was no chance in the condition of the country at that time to make any money out of these limits. Therefore, they were dropped. That is the whole history of this transaction as far as I am concerned and I am sure that those who hear what I say will do me the justice to admit that the transaction was not entered upon with the object of engaging in a speculation. We found, as I say, that there was no possible speculation in it, either to manufacture or to sell. I would have been very glad to have given the limit I myself took to anybody for the amount I expended on the survey but there was no one who desired to obtain the limit even at that price and I believe that in the case of almost ninety-nine out of every hundred applications that were made the limits were dropped for the same reason. But, the country did not lose anything by these orders in council being passed granting these limits. They were never followed up except as my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) has stated in the case of about five per cent of the licenses granted. But, if they had been the country would have got the benefit. If all these licenses which were granted, aggregating 29,300 square miles, had been taken up, what do you suppose would have been the result to this country ? From that time to the present—I will not weary the House by giving the exact calculation — the country would have taken in ground rents alone $3,500,000. If every square mile of timber which was granted by order in

council had been taken up a great deal better showing would have been made than this administration has made in the years that have followed. Just direct your attention for a moment to what was taken in by the Mackenzie administration in the five years they were in power. The whole amount taken in by that administration for timber dues and bonuses was $6,160. During the five years following that, after the Conservative administration came into power, $539,000 was taken in for timber berths for bonuses and for rents. The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has boasted with great unction that in the ten years of the present administration they have taken in about the same amount, so that upon a comparison of the administrations, both Conservative and Liberal, which have existed since 1872, the Conservative administrations have nothing to be ashamed of. I do not propose to take up the attention of the House any longer as this debate has lasted a long time, but I thought that this explanation was due to myself and I can only say that I shall have great pleasure in voting for the motion of my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake).

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Ward) has said, this debate has lasted for a long time. A great many very able speeches have been made and the matter has been thoroughly, I think, explained and put before the people. It seems very evident that the other side have given up the debate. I do not know whether they are tired or whether they have gone to hear Nordica, but for some reason or other they have given up this debate. I am confident that the only course by which they can justify themselves before the people of the country is to accept this motion and grant the investigation which is asked for. I would not detain the House for one moment were it not for the fact that I believe that the people whom I have the honour to represent in this House would hold me responsible if I did not at least put myself on record on this great question. I would like to say to this House and particularly to those members who represent the eastern section of the country, that Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta are in a somewhat different position from any other province in relation to their timber limits. In the maritime provinces, Quebec and Ontario and British Columbia, you have your timber limits scattered all over these provinces. Not so with these western provinces. As those who have travelled through that country and who are familiar with it know, for hundreds of miles from the international boundary north there is very little timber. There is some but not much. The timber limits lie north, along the Saskatchewan river, running from Lake Winnipeg, Lake Winnipegosis and Cedar lake along the banks and watershed of the Saskatchewan, along the Pembina and the Macleod rivers and north of the watershed of the Saskatchewan. That is where you find the principal timber limits of that country. My hon. friend for Marquette (Mr. Roche) said that lumber was a necessity in that country. Those of us who have been there for the last twenty or twenty-five years thoroughly realize that fact. Many of us who have been practising medicine, or practising our professions in that country for a number of years, have had an oportunity of visiting the homes of the people and we know of what great importance the lumber industry is to that country and how important it is that the farmers should get their lumber at the very smallest possible cost. I had something to say last year in connection with agricultural implements, in connection with machinery, and I claim that the question of agricultural implements depends to some extent and perhaps to quite a large extent on the question before us tonight. I said that it was absolutely necessary for agricultural implements, in order to get the best results out of them, to be in the very best possible condition. It is impossible to keep agricultural implements in good condition because the farmers are unable to get lumber at a reasonable price to provide buildings in which to store this machinery. Therefore, they know by experience how necessary it is that they should get lumber at as reasonable a price as possible. Last year we had a committee of investigation in this House in connection with the lumber combine. What led up to the desire or demand that this parliament should investigate the lumber combine? The investigation was not held because lumber was cheap but because lumber was dear, and because they believed there was a monopoly and because they believed that those engaged in the manufacture of lumber were not selling this lumber to the farmers as cheaply as they should. I would like to say right here that if this discussion during the last few days has done no other good than to bring to this House and keep in this House a few members whom we very seldom see here—with the exception of the member for East Assiniboia who is not quite so much of a sinner in that respect—it has achieved something. I notice also that these same members were very attentive when the lumber combine investigation was going on last year. They seem particularly anxious whenever anything concerning the lumber industry of that country is before the House. Now Sir, last week we were in the throes of original documents and I used that word advisedly because I do not think there is any doubt but that we 'threw' the government. Notwithstanding the fact that we had a good many acrobatic performances on the part of the

Prime Minister, one day saying: You can have the documents and the next day saying, you cannot, I am convinced that the reason we got the documents was because of the stand of the Conservative members in this House who fought for what they believed to be their constitutional right, and because of the aid they received from the Conservative and independent press of the country. And when we got these documents they confirmed the belief that the timber limits in the Northwest are not being administered by the present government in the interests of the people. Let me point out that the chief argument, and perhaps the only argument advanced on the other side of the House against our contention is, that the Liberals have done no worse than the Conservatives did. Hon. gentlemen opposite are continually harping on that throughout the country. I would like to read what the Toronto 'Globe' says, in its attempt to make the people of the country believe that the government had acted properly because they had put these limits up to public tender and given them to the highest bidder. The Toronto 'Globe' of February 4 says:

> Two or three considerations in the case would make them pause. In the first place, it is difficult to understand how the most serious of Mr. Ames' allegations, or rather inferences, can be well founded in view of the fact that no license to cut timber is ever issued except after the invitation of tenders, the license being granted to the highest bidder.

That is the stock argument of the Liberal party and press, but time and time again the fallacy of that argument has been shown up by gentlemen on this side. Believing that on the other side of the House there are men of intelligence, I cannot for one moment understand how they can hope that the farce they have gone through in connection with advertising these timber limits is not apparent to the people of Canada. The late Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) laboured this afternoon to make a defence, for any cause he can make the very best possible explanation and defence that can be offered, but to-day the weakness of his effort was apparent. I believe there is not a Liberal member on the other side of the House who does not feel in his heart disappointment at the defence of the government attempted by the ex-Minister of the Interior. Like all others he resorted to the old argument against the Conservatives: You did it when you were in power. Well that argument has been well and often answered from this side of the House. While everybody has got to admit that conditions were very different during the days of the Conservative government from what they are now, even admitting that the Conservatives did wrong before 1896, the people condemned them, passed judgment upon them, turned them out of power and put in power a set of men who they believed would conduct the business of the country in a better way. It is no argument to say that the Conservatives did what the Liberals are doing, and it is only advanced to-day for the want of a better argument on their part. Now, after the hon. member for St. Antoine introduced this question, the first who spoke on the government side was the late land commissioner, and he had not spoken for two minutes before he got very bold and he declared: Take the manly course of making a charge. Well, that may be a manly course for him to take, but to my mind the manly course for me to take under such circumstances would be that if I am accused or held under suspicion, my manly course would be to justify myself and prove to my friends and my country that I am not guilty. In our battle for the original papers, the government also asked us to make a charge, and they wanted us practically to swear that the copy was not like the original before they brought down the documents, knowing perfectly well as they did that it was absolutely impossible for any one to say that the copies were not like the originals until he had seen the originals. I say it is impossible to make an absolute charge in connection with the late commissioner of public lands, but to my mind there has been brought forth by the different speakers in this House quite sufficient to warrant inquiry, and the First Minister will find it very difficult to deny the motion for an inquiry. I said a few moments ago that the system of advertising these limits by the government was a farce and I repeat that statement. In 1896 when this government came into power all the timber limits that had been alienated were to be found around the Lake of the Woods, the Winnipeg river, and Lake Winnipeg, and a very short distance up the rivers that flow into Lake Winnipeg.

They were all not very far away, and there was not the same necessity of giving a very long time for advertising as in the case of the limits which are under discussion at the present time. These are hundreds of miles away from railways and are absolutely inaccessible. I am not familiar with the way in which the government advertise the limits; but it has been shown time and again in this House since this discussion began that they had simply a small notice of about three inches by two inches placed in a post office in the vicinity of the limits and had an advertisement inserted once in a small newspaper in the neighbourhood, and notices were sent to some, we do not know how many, of those who were supposed to be interested in buying timber lands. It has been shown beyond a doubt that it would take at least two weeks for tenders to go from Ottawa to Dauphin or Prince Albert or Edmonton, or wherever the notices might be placed, and

back to Ottawa—one week going and one week coming. The people who would be most interested in buying those timber limits would not probably live where the notices were placed. We have shown or tried to show that these limits were so far away that it was absolutely impossible, even if those who wished to tender started on the first day on which the notice was given, for them to have made the journey. The peculiar feature of this matter is that the tenders were invariably called for in the winter, at a time when it was absolutely impossible to cruise over the territory. I think it has been fairly well established in this debate that those who asked that the limits should be put up had already cruised over them, and knew pretty well what they were asking for. I agree with some hon. gentlemen who have said that the government should know something about what the limits are worth before putting them up for tender. As individuals we do not sell a house or a farm without knowing something about it. The government are the trustees of this country, and it is commonly agreed that a trustee should take more care and pains in disposing of a property that does not belong to himself than he does of a property he owns. These timber limits do not belong to our hon. friends opposite; they never did.

An hon. MEMBER. They do now.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. They do now, quite a lot of them. The 6,400 square miles which have been disposed of have probably been picked out of a thousand blocks. I do not say that there are not more timber limits in that country; but I do say that the friends of the government have had the first opportunity—why? It has been proven beyond any doubt why—because they had friends at court. There is a quintette—five men who have benefited from these lands. Most of them are in this House, and are from the Northwest. I know these men; I have lived in that country twenty-five years, and have gone in and out among them. If they have made money legitimately, I am glad of it. I am not one to hold as altogether responsible the gentlemen who have secured these limits; I hold the government responsible. I do not agree with the late Minister of the Interior when he says, as he did to-day: I have no responsibility; we put the lands up for tender, and we do not have to consider whether the tenders are genuine or not. What a condition of affairs that was. The Prime Minister has told us that the government is responsible for everything that takes place in the department. I hold the Prime Minister of this country responsible for the alienation of our public lands, not only timber lands but agriculture lands. This is a time when we have party government. The country is ruled largely by the caucus, and the caucus is ruled almost entirely by the First Minister. Hence we have in this country to-day a one-man government, and therefore we must hold that one man responsible.

Now, I have shown that the only argument these gentlemen put up is that these lands were advertised and were sold to the highest bidder. The man on the street at any rate will make up his mind that when you call for tenders, knowing that sufficient time is not given for the inspection of the lands, those tenders are a farce. Then, who opens the tenders? The late Land Commissioner, who is now the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). I am not going to charge that he was responsible for any changes which were made in those tenders; but I believe that somebody at court had something to do with changing the tenders. If not, how is it that a few friends of the late Minister of the Interior were always lucky enough to put in a tender just a little higher than the second one from the last? The country is bound to believe that there is something at least suspicious looking in that circumstance.

I do not think it necessary that I should take up very much of the time of the House, but the importance of this subject, the great importance of our lumber supply to the farmers of our Northwest, makes it imperative that I should not give a silent vote on the resolution submitted to us. The ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has told us that there is the Rainy river district from which we can draw our lumber. True, there is timber there, but it is owned to-day by manufacturers, and to that I have no objection because they are the right kind of men to own the timber. I like the way in which the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Ames) approached this subject when he said that in so far as the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) was a manufacturer of lumber and had his limits in the vicinity of his mills he had no criticism to make. I agree with the hon. gentleman, but the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) has not mills all the way from Lake Winnipeg to the foot of the Rockies, and you may go over that country to the water shed of the Saskatchewan and you will not go very far after leaving Lake Winnipeg before you will see a sign 'keep off the grass' by order of the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows). Go a little further and you will see a similar sign by Mr. Fraser, of Ottawa. A little further on and you will see the same sign by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) again, and sometimes you will see a sign by the Imperial Pulp Company, and we would all like to know who are the members of that company. If we had this committee of investigation—and I do not see how the First Minister can refuse to grant it—we would perhaps be able to find who the Imperial Pulp Company are.

Lumber is one of the most important assets and necessities we have in our northwestern country, and I would like the people from the east and from British Columbia to understand its importance. The farmers of our Northwest believe that these timber limits have been alienated, and not alienated in the interests of the farmers. The ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) told us this afternoon that the timber is still there and the farmers can still have it. Yes, but only on paying what the speculator sees fit to charge them for it. Let me give you an illustration. Take a mill, supposed to cut on a mile limit, and say it cuts 2,500,000 feet of lumber. Suppose the individual who starts that mill pays a bonus of $500. That is a pretty good bonus. Our friends did not get any such bonus, and I claim that is sufficient to cut out speculators. Let us charge a bonus of $500 per square mile, which will be 20 cents per thousand feet, which will have to be added to the cost of manufacture. That charge is so small that, in all probability, it will not increase one iota the cost of the lumber to the farmer. But when the limit goes into the hands of a speculator, he will charge $2 per thousand feet and the price of the lumber is increased to that extent to the farmer, and this is due to the fact that this government has seen fit to alienate our timber limits into the hands of individuals.

As I said in the beginning, I am glad that these men are rich, but I do not want them to get rich on the land which has been alienated from our farmers on the prairies of the Northwest. And it is not only our timber limits which have gone to enrich these speculators. We have had the Saskatchewan land deal, the Galway horse and cattle deal, and what is most wonderful in this connection is that these deals and the Robbins irrigation deal went on from 1900 and 1901 until about 1904-5. All these deals occurred during that period, and it is a very strange coincidence that many of the same men who have benefited by these timber limit sales also benefited by the Galway Cattle Company, the Saskatchewan land deal, the Robbins Irrigation Company and all those other deals which went through during the years I have mentioned. Is it any wonder then that the country is suspicious? Is it any wonder that people suspect something wrong in connection with these matters and with our timber lands in the Northwest? I knew these men when they were no better off than the rest of us. I knew the five of them, and if they have made some money I am glad of it. The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) said he was not a pauper ten years ago. No, he was not. He said also that he was not a millionaire now. I do not know whether he is or not, but I have a very good idea of what he and these other men were worth at that time, and I say again that no set of men could have accumulated the wealth these men have done unless they had very good friends at court.

If this is all right, if these timber lands have been properly administered, why object to an investigation? We on this side are very anxious to clear the skirts of hon. gentlemen opposite, of whom we have what we consider well founded suspicion. Some people do not like the word 'suspicion,' but there is a very strong suspicion throughout the country which these men ought, in justice to themselves, take the opportunity to remove. In the United States, I understand there is a law to which I would refer these gentlemen when they ask us to make a charge. I understand that over there the jury has to make an investigation, and upon this investigation depends whether a charge will be brought or not. That, it seems to me, is reasonable. Suppose I were to make a charge to-night against any one of these men. I am not a lawyer, but there are plenty lawyers here—too many I am afraid—and I would not be allowed in the investigation to go outside that specific charge. No other matters could be brought in. But we do not want an investigation confined to one charge. We want this whole matter of the alienation of our lands in the west investigated, so that we may know and understand what has been done. If it is all right, the people will feel so much better about it, if only they are allowed to know the facts. I am sorry that the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is not here, as I am sure that after the pleading I have done the Prime Minister would rise at once and say: 'Give this commission right off, without further argument.' Now, that is all I have to say. But it was absolutely necessary that I should put myself on record. I have spoken from the bottom of my heart. I believe that our lands have not been disposed of in the best interests of the farmers. I represent the farmers, and I know pretty nearly what they want, what they think and what they believe. If the government want to stand well with the farmers of the Northwest—and they are the people of the Northwest—they will rise and say: 'If you will only sit down we are anxious to give you this commission.'

Mr. MELZAR AVERY (Frontenac). I had not intended saying anything on this question, as I think it has been pretty well threshed out. But there are one or two points which I may briefly mention, and which I think, the government should take notice of. In the first place, the Minister of the Interior seems to have fixed on a method by which the friends of the government could help themselves, and it looks as though their friends had done it. It would seem that the present member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) when commissioner of

lands of this country, had plenty of time to look over the lands that were in his charge, and see what they were worth. Some of these timber lands were very valuable, no doubt, for when you find the price asked by a joint stock company is $500,000, that is evidence that the limit is very valuable. The former commissioner of lands, now a member of this House (Mr. Turriff), in justice to himself, should ask for an investigation. If he is innocent, as he claims he is, he should be the first man to demand an investigation, and not allow this cloud to hang over him. If the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) had been wise, he would have taken a leaf out of the book of British Columbia in the handling of these timber berths. How do they dispose of their timber in British Columbia ? Every holder of a timber limit has to pay $115 per mile annually, and a stumpage of 60 cents for every thousand feet he takes off. At this rate on this 2,400 square miles of timber limits that have been given out by this government under two bids the dues would be $276,000. And, for the three years, during which these timber limits have been held, instead of the small amount that has been paid—$7,500—the amount would have been $828,000, and that amount would have been in the pockets of the people. If the government continue to dispose of limits in this way, they will promote speculation and discourage the people who, otherwise, would take up these limits and put in sawmills and get out the lumber. These limits are held by large stockholders who have blanketed the whole country. They have to make a choice of twenty-five per cent, but they hold the whole area out of use and nobody else can get it. They have secured, in this way, the timber along the streams and in the available valleys, and they hold it because they expect the railroad to go through there and the timber to be made valuable from that cause. This will keep the timber lands there tied up for years. These men, when they put in their mill, will be able to charge their own prices and the people will have to pay them. I think the minister should have considered this matter, and should have taken a leaf out of the book of British Columbia in handling timber limits. The minister says that the government gets so much under every tender on these limits besides fifty cents a thousand feet and the ground rent also. But what does that amount to, especially when you consider that these speculators have tied up the whole country ? It is a mere bagatelle compared with what the timber is worth. I can tell the hon. minister that the people think that it was a foolish policy on his part, when he changed the law, that he did not make the law one for the benefit of the many instead of for the benefit of the few. I sincerely hope that, if there is any timber left, he will try to save it for the people of the country and not leave all for the benefit of the grafters.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). I do not rise for the purpose of making a speech, but just that I may have a few minutes friendly talk with the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am glad he came in just to oblige me. The Prime Minister of this country is responsible, in my opinion, for the management of each one of his departments. He was elected in 1896 as head of the administration of this country. He divided the administration under the charge of superintendents, his ministers. He had no trouble in filling the great majority of the places, but there was one that he found pretty difficult—the Department of the Interior. He had a very knotty problem to solve—the Manitoba School question. He wanted to trade that question off for a head of the Department of the Interior. He sent his right hand man, the late Hon. J. Israel Tarte, up to Manitoba to see if he could not settle the Manitoba school question, and, at the same time, secure for him a man to take charge of the Interior Department. Mr. Tarte interviewed the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), and, I am informed, on very creditable authority, that this is about what took place. Mr. Tarte asked the ex-Minister of the Interior to settle this Manitoba school question, and the ex-minister said : There are three men you have to make terms with and get out of the way before I can carry the matter through in the Manitoba legislature—Mr. Prendergast, Mr. Joe Martin, and you must pacify Hon. Thomas Greenway. The late Mr. Tarte undertook this job. He went to Mr. Prendergast and said : You are fighting for the rights of the halfbreeds here for a paltry $1,000 a year ; throw up the sponge, give up the fight, and we will make you chief justice of Manitoba. The bargain was made ; Mr. Prendergast dropped out and was made chief justice. Then, Mr. Tarte went to the Canadian Pacific Railway and said : We want you to hire Mr. Joe Martin as your solicitor, and remove him to British Columbia, giving him $8,000 or $10,000 a year for five years. The Canadian Pacific Railway said : We will do it, if you will recoup us. Mr. Tarte replied : We will recoup you by increasing the subsidy on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. And that was carried out. Mr. Martin was engaged immediately by the Canadian Pacific Railway and sent out to British Columbia. And the Crow's Nest Pass subsidy, as we all know, was brought down and voted—double the subsidy that had been proposed by the Conservative government. As to the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) he was promised a senatorship which he has not got yet, and which he has kicked for here a good many times. The Manitoba school question was settled as soon as these people were paci-

fied. And the question of the ministry of the Interior was also settled. In what way? The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) said: I will take that department, provided I have full control without being subject to council. Mr. Tarte made that bargain, and the Prime Minister made the announcement here that he had appointed Hon. Mr. Sifton and had given him full control of that department—all the lands, timber, coal, and all the gold in the Yukon; he was to have it to handle as he saw fit.

Mr. FOSTER. Don't forget the whisky permits.

Mr. TAYLOR. Of course, the whisky permits were included—everything. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) accepted the Department of the Interior, and managed it as suited himself. And we saw last session, and we see to-day, as reported in speeches of hon. members in this discussion, what has taken place. I look upon this as the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) did the other night, as a practical, commonsense business man. The Prime Minister occupies the same position as the president of an incorporated company. He is president of an incorporated company for the Dominion and each taxpayer is a stockholder in the company. The Prime Minister assigns the departments to different superintendents. Fancy the president of an incorporated company being informed by one of the stockholders at the annual meeting that one of the superintendents was selling $100 worth of goods for $50, giving a rake-off to the purchaser of $25, and the president saying: No, I have faith in that fellow, I do not believe he did it and I will not grant an inquiry to find out; I will keep him there to run the business. That is the position in which the Prime Minister is to-day; he is charged by a stockholder with having such a superintendent and I expect that when the Prime Minister rises to answer me he will say: I have faith in the management of that department, I committed it to the ex-minister, and I do not believe he did anything wrong while in that department and therefore I will have no investigation.

I am not a lawyer but I have gone through this file and I want to look at it from a practical business standpoint and then I ask the Prime Minister to take the file and do the same. I make the statement that he cannot place that file before a jury of any half dozen judges in Canada who will look at it as I do who will not say: Guilty is the word. I do not think the Prime Minister has examined the file and I want to draw his attention to a few facts in connection with it, and ask him if he thinks any half dozen judges will not pronounce the former Land Commissioner guilty in connection with these tenders for berth 1108.

The first letter on this file reads:

We are instructed by a client to ask the department to put for sale timber berth of 60 miles——

It is typewritten fifty, but that is changed to sixty.

—to be selected from the islands in Moose lake in the district of Saskatchewan, and the land surrounding the lake not exceeding a distance of five miles from the shores thereof, the same to be selected in not more than six blocks. Islands or parts thereof, selected to be considered one block.

(Sgd.) PERKINS, FRASER & BURBIDGE.

The department writes a letter on October 12 to Perkins, Fraser and Burbidge, as follows:

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 30th ultimo in which you make application on behalf of a client for a timber berth of 60 miles on the islands, Moose lake, in the district of Saskatchewan. In reply I inclose herewith a copy of an advertisement which will shortly appear in the newspapers inviting competition for this berth, which has been numbered 1108.

They got busy. On October 12, they notified him that they had complied with his request and the berth would be put up. On October 12, they wrote another letter to the King's Printer, as follows:—

I am directed to request you to be good enough to cause inclosed advertisement calling for tenders for timber berth No. 1108 in the district of Saskatchewan, to be inserted once in each of the following papers. The Dauphin 'Press,' published at Dauphin; the 'Manitoba Free Press,' published at Winnipeg.

This land was in Saskatchewan; was there not a paper in Saskatchewan to send it to?

Please forward 150 copies of this advertisement to the Timber and Mines Branch of this department.

That letter was sent to the King's Printer on October 12. and on consulting the files in the library I find that berth No. 1108 was advertised on October 24, it appeared in the 'Free Press' two weeks after the notice was sent to the King's Printer, so that shortens the usually short notice by two weeks, before anybody knew anything about it.

Then we come to the tenders. The first tender is dated December 2, enclosed and marked to the Timber and Mines branch, tender for timber berth 1108. It reads as follows:

I beg to tender for timber berth No. 1108, in the district of Saskatchewan, surrounding Moose lake, and inclose herewith $1,000 bonus for same.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) A. W. FRASER.

That tender is marked as having been received by the Department of the Interior in the Timber and Mines branch on Wed-

nesday, December 9, 1903, and is numbered 654,688. Next to that comes another tender dated September 2, signed Curry, for $6,420 with one of the little advertisements filed on it. That has not a number on it. As my friend from Toronto (Mr. Bristol) stated a few moments ago, it is not numbered, neither is it stamped as having been in the Timber and Mines branch of that department at all, and yet it is on the file as having been the second received.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there no envelope with it ?

Mr. TAYLOR. No envelope. There are envelopes on the others and the notice calling for tenders asks that they be sealed in envelopes and the envelopes are, according to the rule of the department, to be filed with the tender. There is no envelope, simply this typewritten document. Upon this is a receipt for the return of his cheque for $6,420, signed James Currie, but there is no envelope, no number, no stamp, and it is the second on the file. The third on the file is from W. H. Nolan. It is dated Ottawa, December 2, and is numbered 454,689. The other is 454,688. There is no number left to put on this second tender which is placed between the other two. This tender reads :

I desire to tender for timber berth No. 1108, Moose lake, and inclose herewith $7,000 bonus as per advertisement.

Yours truly,
W. H. NOLAN.

That is signed by the same hand that signed the Fraser tender and here is the $7,000 put in and I am bound to say as an expert in handwriting that the figures of that $7,000 never were made by Fraser, because they do not agree with any other figure, in that document. The figures are not the same, the ink is not the same, it is a different colour ; and the pen is not the same. The hon. member for East Assiniboia said the other night that receiving and opening these tenders locked up in his room alone, he was not a detective. He is familiar with Nolan's handwriting ; he is an intimate friend of Nolan's. When Nolan had a daughter married it was announced that the only outside visitor of any standing or note was the hon. member for East Assiniboia, and the finest gift that was presented to the bride was from the hon. member for East Assiniboia. He knew when he saw this tender signed by W. H. Nolan that it was not in his handwriting. That letter says that Nolan inclosed his cheque. We want to see that cheque. I am prepared to say and I will make good the statement that Nolan's cheque was never inclosed because we have from the hon. Minister of the Interior, Mr. Fraser's statement that he first put in a tender for one client of $1,000 and then he got word from another client asking him to put in another tender and he put in another tender. Whoever heard of a lawyer of any standing acting for two clients? I will make this statement, and I ask the hon. member for East Assiniboia to contradict it, that the letter of Mr. Nolan never inclosed Mr. Nolan's cheque, that it was Mr. Fraser's cheque. Then, when the hon. gentleman saw a tender signed by Nolan and accompanied by Mr. Fraser's cheque, was not that enough? Although he was not acting as a detective he was acting for the people of the country.

Mr. LANCASTER. He ought to have been.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, he ought to have been.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Which tender ought he to have accepted ?

Mr. LANCASTER. He ought to have had an investigation and found out which was the genuine one.

Mr. GANONG. Has the Minister of Public Works acted for two clients ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That does not answer my question.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, I submit these facts to the Prime Minister and I want him to look at them and say whether he will grant an investigation to find out whether that servant of his did his duty. Here we have a tender written out all right in one hand and the $7,000 filled in in different coloured ink and by a different hand, written in by some other man and everybody knows a lawyer's handwriting.

Mr. SPROULE. Why should a lawyer put in a tender for a client without giving the name of the tenderer ?

Mr. TAYLOR. He forged that tenderer's name. He signed Nolan's name, he might have had authority to sign it but he should have put under it 'per A. W. Fraser.' and anybody who is acquainted with Nolan's handwriting knows that this is not his. On December 4 they write a letter to Mr. A. W. Fraser inclosing his cheque of $1,000 as follows :

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of of your tender of the 2nd instant inclosing your cheque for $1,000 which sum you offer as a bonus for a license to cut timber on berth 1108 in the district of Saskatchewan. As your tender was not the highest received, your cheque is returned herewith.

Your obedient servant,

Mr. SPROULE. Who signs that ?

Mr. TAYLOR. P. G. Keyes, secretary. They write another one to Mr. Currie and this is funny :

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your tender of the 2nd instant inclosing

your cheque for $6,420 which sum you offer as a bonus for a license to cut timber on berth 1108 in the district of Saskatchewan. As your tender was not the highest received, it of course could not be accepted. As you are aware the cheque in question was delivered to you at Ottawa.

Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) P. G. KEYES.

Mr. AMES. Where is it addressed to ?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is addressed to him at Ottawa—W. H. Nolan, Esq., Ottawa, Ont.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought he lived in Montreal.

Mr. TAYLOR. The next letter is one addressed to the department on the same date:

We have received a letter from Mr. W. H. Nolan, instructing us to act for him in connection with this berth, and make the necessary payment thereon. Kindly let us know the amount required to be paid for ground rent in connection therewith.

Yours truly,
PERKINS, FRASER, BURBIDGE AND GIBSON.

Mr. FOSTER. Do they inclose that letter?

Mr. TAYLOR. This letter goes to the department and the date is the same—December 12.

Mr. FOSTER. Do they inclose Nolan's letter ?

Mr. TAYLOR. No. Nolan received the letter himself here, on December 11, the day before.

As I do not know the area of the islands included in the berth, I am referring the matter to my solicitors, Messrs Perkins, Fraser and Burbidge and they will look after my interest and pay the ground rent.

This is signed with Nolan's own signature which is as different from the signature on the tender as the moon is from the sun. When the hon. gentleman opened these tenders alone had he any of the other tenders ?

In the time of the Conservative administration no tenders were opened by a single officer of the department. The deputy minister and two first-class clerks opened all the tenders, but here, the right hon. Prime Minister gave the running of that branch of his business, that he was president of, to the Department of the Interior, without being subject to council, they ran it as they liked and they discarded the old and the safer plan. No man should undertake to do this work alone. He would say to himself: If I had two others with me every one would then know that it was done right. Under the old system, however honest an official might be, there was no chance of suspicion. The deputy minister and two clerks opened the tenders and they submitted them to the minister for approval. There is another funny letter here. It is dated the 16th of March, 1904. You remember that they only published this notice in two papers, one published in Dauphin and the other in Winnipeg, and they sent a notice to the Crown Timber agent at Winnipeg. On the 16th of March, 1904 this gentleman writes to the department :

I beg to report that up to the present no advice has been received as to whom berth No. 1108, tenders for which closed on December 2 last, was awarded. Be good enough to inform me as to this, and at the same time state what rental, if any has been paid.

Your obedient servant,
A. F. CROWE.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the date of the transfer from Nolan to the Imperial Pulp Company ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know. That occurred later on. But, this is a funny point; on March 23 the department writes back to Mr. Crowe at Winnipeg :

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 16th instant, file No. 188,193, in which you ask to be advised of the name of the successful tenderer for berth No. 1108, and also what amount of rental had been paid. In reply I am to say that as this berth is within the Prince Albert agency correspondence in that connection is being carried on with the agent at Prince Albert. It was an oversight in forwarding to you a copy of the advertisement calling for tenders for this berth.

Your obedient servant,
P. G. KEYES.

They put the advertisement only in one paper at Dauphin and they sent the notice to a paper published at Winnipeg, hundreds of miles away from Prince Albert. What was the information which they gave in regard to this sale at Prince Albert ? They sent a single notice to the postmaster at Winnipeg and another to the Crown timber agent. In view of these plain facts which are there on that file I ask the Prime Minister to submit them to any jury of five lawyers, or to any jury of five judges, and if they do not bring in a verdict and say that the man who accepted these tenders is guilty, that the department has not been run in the interest of the country, that something is wrong, that he should not have accepted a tender bearing a name that he knew was not signed by the tenderer and accompanied by the cheque of some lawyer, I will be very much surprised. The whole thing is fishy from start to finish, and now that the matter is brought to the attention of the Prime Minister I am satisfied he will give some explanation. Although he gave the ex-minister (Mr. Sifton) full control without asking him to report to council, and although the right hon. gentleman allowed the member for Brandon to deal with these matters as he saw fit, yet, now that he has seen what has been done I am sure he will feel it his bounden duty to the country to say that the whole department must be in-

vestigated. The whole argument has been on the other side to point to what the Conservatives did in 1882 and 1883. What do we care what they did ? If they did wrong they were turned from power and this government was put in power on a promise to the people of Canada that they would administer public affairs in a businesslike manner. It does not matter what the Conservatives did; the people of the country expect the Liberals to do right when they are in power. Now that the Prime Minister has found out that wrong has been committed he should be the first to say: I will have it investigated and as we can cancel their leases if they were obtained by fraud, we will make some of those fellows who get rich out of it poney up if they were guilty of fraud.

Mr. F. R. LALOR (Haldimand). The motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Lake) has been pretty well discussed, and I believe the members of this House and the people of the country generally thoroughly understand the question that is at issue. After having listened to this debate for several days with a great deal of attention, what most strikes me is the silence of the Liberal members, and that I say is to the credit of the Liberal members who come from the great province of Ontario. During this debate there is only one Liberal member from that province who has had the hardihood to stand up and defend this transaction, and he is the member for South Grey (Mr. Miller). He would defend anything. I don't think there is anything that this government could do that the hon. member for South Grey would not defend. He has been the one Ontario member sitting upon the government benches who has defended this timber deal. Why is it that the Liberal members from Ontario are so silent? Is it not that they dare not go back to their constituencies and tell them they have defended this transaction in the House of Commons? They imagine it is bad enough for the Prime Minister to call them in, to ring the bell and have them stand up and stultify themselves by voting, without defending the transaction by word of mouth. And the members from the other provinces are also silent. We have not heard any defence of this transaction from a Nova Scotia member, nor have we heard a New Brunswick member speak on the government side. It is also true that no Liberal member from the province of Quebec has spoken in defence of it, and I am not at all surprised at that, because, if I understand it aright, and if reports are true, Mr. Sifton and his quartette in this House are not very popular with the members from Quebec. They don't feel very kindly disposed towards them ; they remember some of the votes and transactions of these gentlemen in this House, and, remembering, they don't feel like defending them. In fact, it looks very much like as though the Liberal members of this House, outside of those from Alberta and Saskatchewan, proposed to let the quartette who have got rich at the expense of the country defend themselves as best they can. But when the time comes, no doubt these gentlemen will record their votes as good subservient followers of the Prime Minister, although they are not willing to make any attempt to defend this transaction. The only defence we have heard from the Liberal side is that twenty-eight years ago the Conservative party did something which they say is nearly as bad as what this Liberal government is doing to-day. Now, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the great county from which I come, the county of Haldimand, which I have the honour to represent, did not send me to this House to defend the conduct of the Conservative party a quarter of a century ago. They sent me here to find out what is going on at present, to support good measures and to denounce measures that are not in the interest of the people of Canada. That ' you're-another ' argument, which the Liberals are so fond of, is not an argument that will have any weight with the people of Canada. We all know there were mistakes made by the Conservatives twenty-five years ago, and we also know that the Liberal members—some of whom sit in the House to-day, amongst others the Prime Minister himself—were loud in their denunciations of the Conservative party at that time in connection with timber transactions. Although I was a young man then, I remember that the Liberals denounced these timber transactions from the public platforms, and charged that the Conservatives had given to their friends timber limits for which there was no value received.

Mr. LANCASTER. And the Conservative government ordered an investigation.

Mr. LALOR. Yes ; I remember that when a transaction was brought before this House, which could not be compared with the transaction we are discussing to-day, Sir John Thompson expelled that member from the House of Commons. We cannot expect anything of that kind from this government ; we would not expect them to expel one of their supporters for dishonest acts. An hon. member says that if they did there would be none left, but although I will not go that far, I think there would be some expelled if we started investigating the Department of the Interior. The government of this country have disposed of no less than about 6,000 square miles of timber lands in the Northwest. We are willing to admit that some of that has gone into the hands of honest saw-mill men, but there is not the slightest doubt that 2,400 square miles has gone into the hands of speculators. Who are the speculators, and to whom did the limits go? I believe that some of the members of this House are interested in these, and that some of them have passed into the hands of gentlemen who are members of this House, and not only members of this House, but related very closely to the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), the ex-Minister of the

Interior. I notice from the reports that the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) seems to be one of the most fortunate gentlemen in tendering for timber limits, and I also notice that the Imperial Pulp Company is another most fortunate tenderer. You will find that in only one instance was the member for Dauphin outbid, and that was when the Imperial Pulp Company outbid him. This country is anxious to know who is the Imperial Pulp Company. Is it like the North Atlantic Trading Company? Is the government afraid to tell us who the members composing the Imperial Pulp Company are? Surely if they were dealing with a corporation such as the Imperial Pulp Company, the government must have known who that corporation was, and why don't they enlighten us by telling us what gentlemen compose that company? Are they members of this House? Do they belong to the same crowd who have been getting so much graft from this government in connection with timber transactions and land deals in the west? Why don't they give us the names and expose to us who those parties are? The hon. member for East Assiniboia the other night tried his best to defend these transactions. He was the Commissioner of Dominion Lands at the time these tenders were put in; he was the gentleman who opened these tenders behind sealed doors, with no one else present; and the people of this country are very suspicious as to what he did in opening those tenders, and whether he or somebody else in the department did not favour their friends by enabling them to put in tenders just a few dollars above others. Hon. gentlemen will tell us that there was competition in these tenders; but we know from the way they were advertised that the whole competition was a farce, that sufficient time was not given for people to examine the lands, that only the favoured few knew anything of their value, and these few had no doubt every possible means of cruising over the limits long in advance of the time that the tenders were asked for.

Another peculiar circumstance is that the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) seems to have had advance knowledge, before anybody else, as to the route of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and was therefore able to go over the line and select the best timber lands along that route; and then, by a system of bogus tendering, was able to get hold of these lands for himself. How was it that that hon. gentleman was able to get such knowledge? Was it because his brother-in-law was the then Minister of the Interior? I would not suppose that was the reason, but the people of this country look on the matter with a great deal of suspicion, and they imagine that there must have been something due to the close relationship of the hon. member for Dauphin to the hon. member for Brandon. In more than one instance we have had an illustration of the old saying that blood is thicker than water. We have the hon. member for East Assiniboia, the former land commissioner, befriending his brother-in-law, Adamson, not only in regard to timber limits, but in regard to other transactions, like the Saskatchewan valley land transaction, the Galway cattle ranch deal, and the Robbins Irrigation Company. All of these transactions have been with gentlemen occupying seats in this House and relatives one of another, and without the slightest doubt they have received benefits from that relationship which has made them the wealthy men they are to-day. An hon. gentleman representing a Manitoba constituency has told us that he knew these gentlemen some years ago when they were not very well off, but they have suddenly acquired great wealth. We are living in a time when, I admit, it is easy to make money in the Northwest, and many men have made money there. I am willing to acknowledge that there are great opportunities to make money in that country. But I ask if other gentlemen from the Northwest have been so fortunate as these gentlemen. They have probably as much ability, but they have not accumulated as great wealth, nor have they obtained possession of the best timber lands between Winnipeg and the Rocky mountains, and the best wheat lands in that country, as these other gentlemen have.

Some days ago an application was made to the government for original documents. That application, as we all know, was fought in this House, day after day, until finally the original documents were brought down. Those original documents, I think, have been a revelation to the members of this House and to the people of this country. I am not going into them in detail, because they have been already explained. But those original documents show on their face that in the Department of the Interior there was something radically wrong. They show that different tenders were put in, in the same handwriting, by one individual, one filled out for a very small sum and another left blank to be filled in in the department. The question is, who in that department filled in these tenders, and was able to ascertain what the other tenders were?—because the documents brought down show plainly that the blanks were filled in by some one in the Department of the Interior.

As to the value of the timber limits which have been secured by the Imperial Pulp Company and the hon. gentlemen sitting opposite, I cannot give any better illustration than the fact that in one case where $500 was the tender the gentleman who secured the timber limit offered it for sale for $500,000. But the question is not what these timber limits are worth to-day. It is what they are going to be worth in ten or twenty years from now. If they are worth $1,000,000 now, I think the time will come when they will be worth tens of millions.

We can hardly imagine the amount of money that these men are going to make out of these transactions. These timber lands are going to grow in value so much as to bring these men fortunes even beyond the conceptions of the members of this House.

Then, these timber berths were granted on conditions entirely different from those of the old Conservative government. I am not going to defend the actions of that government. It was not a special berth here or there that was tendered for; but this government not only received tenders for a certain area of land, but gave the parties the privilege of selecting the land from the best timber lands in the country. The hon. member for Brandon tells us that there is a great quantity left. I am not prepared to dispute that; I do not know what quantity of timber is there; but I do know that the gentlemen who were successful tenderers were able to select the very best timber lands, and no limit of time was imposed within which they were obliged to operate them. They are able to hold them for ever; whereas under the old Conservative government a sawmill had to be erected and certain other conditions complied with.

When this government came in, they wiped out all those conditions and made these leases perpetual. As long as there is a stick of timber on the limit, the lease continues, and these lands increase in value every year. It is no argument to tell us that twenty-five years ago a Conservative government granted timber lands at a certain price per acre or even farm lands. Twenty-five years ago, 50 cents an acre was a good price for the most fertile lands in the great west, but to-day that land is worth from $25 to $40 an acre. It is the same with timber lands. The conditions have changed entirely within the last twenty-five years, and in the next ten or twenty-five these lands will have doubled or trebled again in value. Who will pay this increased value? It will be the poor settler who wants to build a barn or a house; and the speculator, who has got from the government these valuable and extensive timber areas, will reap the profit. This question is one in which the people are particularly interested. A few friends of the government have become millionaires and multimillionaires and every dollar must come out of the pockets of the people. I do not see how the government can fail to grant this investigation. The resolution is a most moderate one. The right hon. the First Minister certainly owes it to his own self respect and to public opinion to accede to this resolution and allow this investigation to be had. The request is a fair and honest one, and the only reason for not granting it must be that there is something in the department which will not bear the light of day. Why would the First Minister refuse this investigation? Is it because he has something to hide? Is he afraid that the people will find out what has really taken place in the Department of the Interior? It has become a continual scandal from one end of the country to the other that certain members close to the government have made great fortunes out of the country, and it is only justice to the people who have to pay that they should be given the opportunity of looking into the original documents in the Department of the Interior. If the government refuse to grant an investigation, we can only conclude that they are afraid to have revealed what has really been done in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. JOHN CRAWFORD (Portage la Prairie). At this late hour, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to go at any length into details, but only rise for the purpose of correcting some misstatements made by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) took exception to our drawing comparisons between the administration of this government and that of the late government. But it seems to me that it is quite proper we should do this, especially when we see on the opposition benches some hon. members who formed part of the late Conservative cabinet, and who no doubt, if a change of government should take place, would be again in office. That being the case, it is only right that we should draw attention to the record of these hon. gentlemen and judge from that record what we might expect of them should they ever succeed in again winning the confidence of the people.

The charge is made that our timber lands are being administered in the interest of speculators and not of the country. Well, to show how unfounded is this charge, let me point to some sales of timber berths, with the parties interested in which I am well acquainted. Take berth No. 1388. That berth is in the northwest corner of the province of Manitoba, and the tenders on it were $307, $430, $2,000, $6,300, and $8,100. The highest tenderer got the berth. The competition was closed on the 18th of September, 1907. Now let me point to a sale in 1903. Berth No. 333 was put up to tender. It comprised 23 square miles, and the tenders were as follows: $3,025, $4,600, $5,114.44, $7,283, $7,510, $9,200 and $25,225. Surely there is a case which contradicts the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite. Here is another berth which was put up for competition, berth No. 335. The lowest tender was $1,005; the next was $1,111.45 and the successful tender was $3,150. The successful tenderers in connection with these berths are gentlemen whom I know and with whom I have discussed the situation. But here is another berth which was dealt with by our friends opposite when they were in office. Berth No. 410 in the year 1884,

16¼ square miles. I know the gentleman who got it. All he had to do was to come to Ottawa and ask for it, and he got it without price, competition or any thing else. I give you that to show the difference between the operations of the timber business and the administration of the two parties.

Our hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) seems to have been specially selected as the target for hon. gentlemen opposite in this matter. One of them said to-night that Mr. Burrows was never unsuccessful except when the Imperial Pulp Company came into competition with him. Well, I have run over a few of the limits in connection with his operations. I find that he tendered on berth No. 888, $750 and that Knox Bros., of Gladstone bid $850, only $100 more. Berth No. 960, Mr. Burrows' tender was $2,100, and the tender of Thomas Mackie was $10,000. There was no evidence of collusion there, both of these tenderers being friends of the Liberal party. For No. 958, Mr. Burrows' tender was $1,200 and the successful tender was $1,650. For berth 988, Mr. Burrows' tender was $3,500, while the successful tender was $3,769.40. In berth 1050, Mr. Burrows' tender was $6,000, while the successful tender of McDonald & Frith was $13,125. In berth 1281, Mr. Burrows' tender was $5,100 and that of D. A. Robertson was $5,195. This last was a very close one. I am satisfied that if these figures had been reversed and Mr. Burrows had been the successful tenderer at the amount stated, there would have been a charge of collusion and wrongdoing on the part of the administration.

Mr. STAPLES. May I ask the hon. member (Mr. Crawford) a question? Would he tell the House how many timber limits the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) had succeeded in getting from this government?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have those figures here, but I think I will not look them up to-night. There is one thing in connection with the holdings of the hon. member for Dauphin that hon. members opposite were glad to pass over very quickly. That is the hon. gentleman's holdings at Grandview. They take the position that these holdings are all right. There is very good reason why these hon. gentlemen should treat them in a very adroit manner, that is that a considerable portion of these holdings in Dauphin were of timber limits that had been disposed of by the Conservative government at a small price. For instance, there was one limit of 28¼ miles which had been sold by the Conservative government for $800, but for which Mr. Burrows paid $16,000. This constituted a very good reason why these hon. gentlemen did not wish to inquire into his holdings at that point.

I do not wish to delay the House, but there is one other matter I desire to bring before you, Mr. Speaker. That matter is the extravagant statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite throughout this whole debate. Hon. members know the very high estimates of value that have been put on these timber limits which are under discussion. For instance, take the Cormorant lake limit. I have a letter here written by Mr. H. M. McDonald and published in the newspapers which, I think, ought to go on 'Hansard.' It will be seen that he replies to the statements made by the hon. gentleman from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) :

Editor 'Journal.'—As considerable prominence has been given the names of McDonald and Frith and the Saskatchewan Lumber Company by Messrs. Ames, Perley and other members of parliament, on the floor of the House of Commons within the last few days, as reported by the 'Morning Citizen,' I will ask you to give me space in the columns of your valuable paper to correct some of the grossly misleading statements and insinuations made by these gentlemen—statements which put us in a false position, and which I cannot allow to pass unchallenged. Permit me at the outset to say that I have not any objection, on the contrary, I heartily invite the fullest investigation into any timber limit transaction I have ever had with the Dominion government. I have never asked any favours that I am aware of, neither have I received any, and I never had any understanding with Mr. Fraser or any one else, as to tendering or not tendering on any limit, as some of the statements of Mr. Ames would seem to insinuate. So far as I know, either Mr. Ames or Mr. Perley would have had an equal chance with me to secure any of these limits they refer to.

Mr. Ames is reported as having stated that Cormorant lake limit probably contains six or seven million feet to the square mile, and I hope he is correct in his figures, however, I have to say to him if he can find that quantity on it any time before the end of this year of our Lord, he can have one-half of it for his trouble.

For Mr. Perley, who is himself a lumberman, and should know the value of timber, there is even a bigger bargain. He deals in large figures in reference to that 'sacrifice,' as he was pleased to call it, 'of 125 square miles near the Pas,' and which he says is held to-day at $375,000; that very limit Mr. Perley can have for $75,000 without the $300,000 at all, or if too small for his personal consideration, if he can induce some of his friends to buy it for $375,000 he can have that trifling $300,000 (that falls from his tongue so glibly), as a commission. Any one unacquainted with the real situation would, by the speeches of these gentlemen, be led to believe that we were speculators buying and holding limits merely to the prejudice of the settler generally, whereas the truth is, we have for the last three or four years been operating large saw and planing mills, and at the present time are giving employment to over three hundred men. In view of these facts it will be seen that the statements and insinuations made with respect to the McDonalds are, to say the least, unfair, and while appreciating the difficulty that politicians find in locating political capital, I object to transactions with which I

have been connected being so misconstrued and distorted as to convey to the mind of the public the impression that something was wrong.

H. M. McDONALD.

Ottawa, February 4, 1908.

Mr. PERLEY. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crawford) tell us how much was paid for that limit?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know at this time. I am ready to leave the matter as it stands.

Mr. PERLEY. Perhaps I may be allowed a word of personal explanation in reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crawford). I am glad he has read the letter of Mr. McDonald. That letter attempts to show that I have tried to lead this House to believe that this limit was worth $375,000. Of course, I stated nothing of the kind. I know nothing of the value of the limit, but these gentlemen themselves, in their prospectus, asked $375,000 for it. That is all I said—they paid $13,000 for the limit and they asked $375,000 for it. I take it for granted that these business men have some reason for their position when they ask that price for the limit, though I have never pretended to know anything about the value of it myself.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am glad my hon. friend (Mr. Perley has corrected himself. If he would manage to correct his friends I should be perfectly satisfied.

Mr. PERLEY. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crawford) will be good enough to read 'Hansard' he will see that what I am saying now is exactly what I said the other night.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). It is not my intention to detain the House very long. I think that nearly everything has been said that need be said on this subject. But my name has been dragged into this discussion and some effort has been made by hon. members on the other side to make me pass for a millionaire, and in case my creditors should take these representations too seriously, I think it best that I should take this opportunity to explain that I do not possess the wealth with which these hon. gentlemen would endow me. Of course, some of the new members of the House who have spoken do not know that this question was thoroughly threshed out over twenty years ago. But everybody must see that it is a small defence on the part of those implicated in the transactions mentioned in this debate to bring up the tu quoque argument. So far as concerns those matters with which my name has been connected, I have no defence to make. Hon. members have only to read 'Hansard' of many years ago to see that there is nothing whatever in what has been said so far as I am concerned. This whole question should be considered in two ways. First, not only the members of this House but the 'man on the street' will remember that, from the very beginning of the session, documents—original documents—have been asked for. These were refused by the government. Why? Many reasons were given, but it is evident that no good reasons were given, because the government at last brought down these documents. When the government did bring them down we found that in the very case which is now before the House bogus tenders had been given to the Department of the Interior. That is one thing which is now known by the public and the discussion which has been going on for three days past has been on these tenders which were not bona fide.

When the charge was made by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) in his motion and very ably sustained by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) it constituted a very serious accusation against the government, a very serious accusation for men who posed upon the stump as members of an honest government, yet not a minister rose to defend the administration. Who was put up to defend the government? A private member, the hon. member for East Assiniboia who rose to defend himself before anything else; and in doing so, he had the audacity to say that hon. members on this side should be manly enough to bring an accusation against him. We have heard that so often in this House that I think we ought to put a stop to it. Such an argument is childish. Bring an accusation! Could a stronger accusation be brought against a government than the one brought by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) or could stronger arguments be advanced than those used by the hon. member for St. Antoine Division (Mr. Ames)? The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) says: Bring an accusation against me. There is no accusation to bring against him as a member of the House, the accusation is against the Department of the Interior, against the government. The hon. member was not a member at that time, he was an employee of the government and I have no doubt it was on account of that that he thought it was his duty to defend himself.

One statement of his was that when the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) made his tour in the west last summer, he did not dare to accuse either the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) or any of his colleagues implicated in these same transactions in that part of the country. I have heard that before but never thought it was taken seriously. I had the honour to be with the chief of the opposition in that tour and at every meeting we addressed—and we addressed over sixty meetings in the west and in the east—we

spoke of these transactions, and nearly every one whom we addressed in the west knew of them and appreciated them. Why should we have been afraid to speak of those transactions in the west when we had spoken of them in this House in the presence of the hon. gentlemen implicated? Once for all it is childish to attempt to make the people believe that in the west or anywhere else we are afraid to speak of the transactions which have been spoken of in this House; our statements about them are in print and shall go to posterity. But my hon. friend feels the necessity of defending himself.

The hon. member has brought my name into this. What a small business it is for him to talk about members who made application twenty-seven years ago for limits in the Northwest. Hon. members will remember that at that time we did in a very candid and honest way what everybody did not only Conservative members of parliament but Liberal members of parliament, we applied for timber limits. Blanks were left on the table of the House for any one who wanted limits to apply for them. That western country was just opened up, no one knew anything about it, it had not even been surveyed. We knew it was an immense country, it was a kind of advertisement to have as many people in the House or out of the House as possible apply for limits to make it known not only in Canada but in other countries that there was an enormous country there which we wished to have exploited. Over 2,000 applications were made. It has been said this afternoon that 500 licenses were granted. It did not cost the government of Canada a cent for the granting of the orders in council. Over 2,000 applications were put in and five hundred orders in council were passed, but only four licenses were granted. As was said this afternoon the government made money out of all that. The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) knew he had to defend himself and to defend the government, but he has no business to advance that tu quoque argument.

The best and most practical way to bring this to a conclusion is to examine the policy of the two parties upon that question. The Conservative party were in power in 1872. That territory had just been acquired by the Conservative party against every possible opposition that could be made by the Liberal party. It had been bought for a small sum of money against the arguments and the work of hon. gentlemen opposite. The Conservative government passed regulations which were in the interest of the country. No man could get a limit unless he paid, unless a mill was erected and some work was done. The limits brought money into the treasury. The Liberals came into power in 1874 and immediately changed that law, making it easier for their friends to obtain limits or whatever could be obtained in the Northwest without bringing the same amount of money into the public treasury. That has been their policy throughout. They changed the law and then during the time they were in office they granted 605 square miles of timber limits, but not a foot of wood was cut. It was all given without competition, and for ground rent they received only $6,160. That was the Liberal policy, the policy of the party which later on declared that the land was for the settler and that Canada belonged to the Canadians. In 1878, when the Conservatives came into power, they reverted to the law of 1872. obliging a man obtaining a timber limit to erect a mill, to work the mill and to saw the timber. They increased the amount of rent from $2.50 to $5. Any man who obtained a timber limit had to pay $5 a year rent for every mile that he rented from the government. What did that bring to the government? The hon. member for East Assiniboia spoke of these 2,000 applications which he took from 'Hansard' of 1896. Any man who knows how to read can do that. He will find that Mr. Charlton, in May, 1886, mentioned the name of nearly everybody in Canada except members of his own party. Any man could do that. At that time these applications did not cost the country anything at all. The orders in council, as I said a moment ago, did not cost anything. Three or four licenses were granted and how much did the Canadian government make out of them? When the Conservative government was in power they worked for the best interest of Canada, not for their friends and they did not favour anybody. Every man who applied for a license in the Northwest, Liberal or Conservative, was treated alike. No Conservative had any privilege over a Liberal in the House or outside of it. How much revenue did the Canadian government derive from this source? All that the Liberal government got from 1874 to 1878 was $6,160. How much did the Liberal-Conservative government get from 1879 to 1886?—a short period of time? They restored the law to the condition in which it was in 1872. The law had been changed by the Liberal administration in such a way as to help their friends but the Conservative government changed it so as to make it more difficult for any man to acquire a timber limit. Notwithstanding that fact what was the result? The Conservative government received for ground rents from 1879 to 1886, $24,062.27. Where orders in council had been passed but no licenses had been granted the government received $21,226.25, and for royalties where timber was cut the government received $8,587.92. Altogether from 1879 to 1886 the Canadian government received out of timber limits in the Northwest $54,176.44. That illustrates the difference between the ad-

ministration of the affairs of that country by a Conservative government and a Liberal government. This afternoon the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) said : We have not changed anything ; the regulations under which we have administered the timber in the Northwest are the same as they were under the Conservative administration. How can we be blamed ? That reminds me of the remark of a good farmer who said : It is true that there is not much difference between the policy of the Liberal and Conservative government ; they have adopted your policy on pretty nearly everything, but where you committed a venial sin they commit a sacrilege. The government have done it here. Let us take the explanation which has been given by the hon. member for Brandon. While the Conservatives, during eighteen years were not permitted by their government to do anything wrong in the Northwest, Liberal members of parliament or their friends, under the very same rules and regulations, have been allowed by the government to become wealthy by the acquisition of timber limits in the Northwest. The hon. member for Brandon also said this afternoon : We have limits in the Northwest for 225 years to come. That is no excuse. We are here as trustees of the people in charge of the wealth and the assets of Canada. We have no right to give away to our friends in the Northwest or anywhere else wealth that may last hundreds of years. It is no excuse for us to do anything which a private individual would not do if he were administering his own affairs. We have also heard about the length of time during which these limits had been advertised. The hon. member for Brandon said : You have accused us of selling limits on too short notice ; we are giving the same amount of notice that was given by the Conservatives—thirty or forty days. He read a list of all the timber limits which were granted where the time during which they were advertised was no longer than the time which has been given lately. But, what was it that struck me while he was speaking ? How is it that, whether the time was short or whether the time was long, there were men who knew where the good limits of the Northwest were ? These men were friends of the government. They went to the Department of the Interior, they were received in a friendly way, and they submitted tenders for limits in the west. They did not go out and examine them at all. They knew what was in these limits. They knew the amount of timber there. They knew what kind of timber was there and they put in tenders like those we have had before the House. One tender was put in for $1,000. One hon. gentleman says that we do not need any investigation, that we know all about it. We know that a tender was submitted for $1,000. We know that there was another tender for six thousand and some hundreds of dollars. As soon as that tender was put in by what machinery was it that some one else knew that there was a tender for $6,000 and how was it that somebody came over to the department and put in a tender for $7,000—a blind tender, a bogus tender ? A lawyer comes and says : I have clients who want to tender. A man can stay in the city of Ottawa in that way and buy the whole Northwest ; yet we are told that there is no use in having an investigation. A man gets up behind there, a man who has no more to do with that in a technical way than the man in the moon, and protests that there has been no wrong doing. The hon. member for Assiniboia had something to do with it, not as a member of parliament but as an employee of the government. He knew all about it. What is the Imperial Pulp Company ? Who compose the Imperial Pulp Company ? Are we not entitled to know that ? Yes. It may be something like the North Atlantic Trading Company. We may have the very same thing in sight. The hon. member for Brandon, this afternoon, defended his administration, and he would have to work for a year and a half every year to defend his administration. He said it was all right. Did he not pass a contract for a million dollars when he was a minister of the Crown, a trustee of Canada sworn to do his duty ? He passed a contract for a million of dollars with a company that never existed, and that money was paid to a company which never existed. When we wanted to find out to whom it had been paid we were told that we could not know, that we were not entitled to know, and the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was the first man to rise in his place and say : You shall not know if Mr. Preston will not tell you. What is the Imperial Pulp Company ? It is something of the same kind. My impression is that the North Atlantic Trading Company was composed of members of parliament and, it may be, of ministers too, and deputy ministers and nobody can remove that impression from me. What is the Imperial Pulp Company ? Of whom is it composed ? Why should I not believe that it is composed of members of parliament, and why are we not entitled to know? Why is the country not entitled to know ? Why should not this question be investigated ? Who is Mr. Nolan ? He may never have existed.

Mr. TAYLOR. He is a brother-in-law of Gallery's, isn't he?

Mr. BERGERON. I don't know. We heard the other day of a new organization called the Sturgeon Lake Lumber Company. What is that organization ?

Mr. FOSTER. That is easy.

Mr. BERGERON. The Sturgeon Lake Lumber Company is registered at Regina, Saskatchewan, and it is composed of, amongst others, J. G. Turriff. Who is J.

G. Turriff ? Another member is A. Adamson. Who is A. Adamson ? Another is George McCraney. Who is he ? Another is A. J. Bell. Who is he ? There is a gentleman by the name of Dempster whose first name I cannot get, but he is Dominion land agent at Humboldt, Saskatchewan. Who are these gentlemen ? I know some who bear the same names and who occupy seats in this House. Are these the same gentlemen who are members of parliament ? Compare that with the applications made 22 years ago by men who applied like everybody else, and any man had a right to apply inside the House as well as out of it, and a great many did so. But these applicants were told by an honest government that when they wanted to get limits in the west or anywhere else, whether they wanted to make money or not (and it might be a legitimate ambition to make money they were told by the honest Conservative government of these days : You can have a mile of timber limits but you will have to pay $5 a year for it, and you will have to pay stumpage on the timber, and you will have to erect a sawmill and in that sawmill you will have to manufacture so many thousand feet of lumber a day. These were the conditions imposed by an honest Conservative administration. Were the same terms made by this Liberal government, which is now in power ? No. Wherever any of their friends beseeched them as we know they did beseech them they let them have the limits. Mr. Mackenzie, when he was premier wrote to a friend that he had to guard the public coffers night and day to prevent his political associates plunging into it. Is there any one on guard now? But, the Mackenzie government was defeated on September 17, 1878, and on October 7 they passed an order in council, when they had no more right to act in the name of the people of this country, and they gave to two friends of theirs 200 square miles of timber to be selected anywhere in the Northwest Territories, and these two friends had three years in which to make the selection. Was that a proper thing to do ? Let us contrast it with what occurred when the Conservative government went out of power in 1896, when my right hon. friend came into office then he would not allow Sir Charles Tupper to pass a single order in council after his defeat on June 23. Two senators had resigned before the general elections and my right hon. friend refused to allow of their reappointment when he accepted the reins of power. But the Mackenzie government after their defeat by the people granted 200 square miles of some of the best limits to be found in the Northwest to two of their friends. I listened to the speech of the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) with a good deal of astonishment. It struck me that he made a very clever defence of a very bad case, but it occurred to me as it occurred to others that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) had not acquitted himself as well as he has done under similar circumstances in the past. It would appear as though hon. gentlemen opposite share in that opinion if we are to judge by their manner of distributing their applause. Sometimes, before the words were out of the ex-minister's mouth these hon. gentlemen applauded loudly, but at other times when they saw that the arguments of the ex-minister were simply absurd, they were not able to muster up courage to greet him with applause. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) told us that when he came into the department in 1897 he simply carried out until 1905 the line of policy adopted by the previous Conservative administration. Now, the Liberals have always declared that the Conservatives were bad and that all their acts were bad and that when they got into power they would change everything. We have it now from the mouth of one of their own ministers that in his department he did not change anything, just as we know that the government as a whole have changed nothing of the policy of the Conservative party in other respects. The ex-Minister of the Interior told us that he had nothing to do with the opening of tenders. What does the Prime Minister think of that ? The Prime Minister is responsible for the acts of his ministers; the others do not amount to much because they will do what he wants them to do, but the right hon. gentleman is responsible for what is done. And yet, here is an ex-minister of the Crown, a sworn representative of the government, who deliberately states that in his department he had nothing to do with the opening of tenders, but that he relied altogether on the member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) who opened these tenders alone in his office. I never knew before that tenders were to be opened unless there were at least three officers of the department present. Surely the government must have an immense amount of confidence in the integrity and the wisdom of the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff)) to have allowed him when he was commissioner of Dominion lands to be the sole arbiter in the opening of tenders. I shall not detain the House any longer, Mr. Speaker. I trust, after what I have said that if I have the pleasure of sitting in this House for twenty-five years longer there will not be some kids who will get up and accuse me of having obtained limits in 1882. That question has been settled long ago. It is no defence for this government to say that the Conservatives did wrong when they were in power. It is not sufficient for the member for Brandon to state that the rules and regulations of the department had not been changed between 1879 and 1905, and that what the Liberal government has done since 1896 was done under the same rules and regulations

as obtained when the Conservatives were in power. What harm can come of granting an investigation into this matter? What danger is there to the public interest in granting it? When my right hon. friend was in opposition he was very fond of asking for investigations, and investigations were granted him by the Conservative administration. When these hon. gentlemen opposite were in opposition the Conservative government gave them all the investigation they asked for, even to the extent of paying the lawyers they employed to go through the books of every department and to examine and cross-examine witnesses. To-day we do not ask that the government should pay lawyers to help us, but if we were granted such an opportunity as the Conservative government gave the Liberal opposition; if we had the privilege of bringing up for investigation the books of the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Marine, and of two or three other departments before the Public Accounts Committee, what do you think would happen? If, only, the government would not prevent us from investigation by obstructing us in the Public Accounts Committee, what grand findings we would have there, and how the people of this country would be convinced that investigation was necessary. My right hon. friend may refuse investigation in this case but if he does the people of this country will not long stand for it. After all the people are our masters; we are only here as their representatives, and the people will not long endorse an administration which refuses investigation into their acts, but will place the affairs of the country in the hands of men who will administer them in an honourable way as they should be administered. I shall vote for the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Lake).

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM (East Huron). Mr. Speaker, once more we find the Minister of the Interior and his department in trouble. It seems as if the time of the House is to be continually occupied with discussions in regard to this department. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) has admitted that a certain timber limit can now be sold for $75,000. I understand that that limit was bought from the government a short time ago for $1,840, so that there would be a clear profit of $73,000 in that transaction. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite think that that transaction and many more like it do not need investigation. Why, Sir John Macdonald's government was driven from power because he sent a telegram asking for $10,000. Here is something acknowledged by the very last speaker on the other side of the House, and that of itself shows that we should have an investigation.

Then we have heard evidence piled up against the old Conservative government of Sir John Macdonald, evidence which applies with equal force against the government of Alexander Mackenzie. You would think, to hear hon. gentlemen opposite talking, that they were accumulating evidence and intended to move a vote of want of confidence in Sir John Macdonald's government. Now, what is the use of applying all this hot wind to Sir John Macdonald? He is not here; his government was put out a considerable time ago; and surely men of fair intelligence are not going to be influenced by these tu quoque arguments.

This timber question is one of the points on which the two parties differ, and differ very materially. In the Halifax platform we have it laid down that the timber, the minerals and the lands are to be given to the provinces, while the Liberal party contend that they should be retained by the Dominion government, and it would appear that they are to be used for the benefit of the political friends of the Dominion government.

Now, this is a very important question. In regard to timber we know that there has been a great change in the last thirty years. In my own constituency thirty years ago tenders were asked for burning or cutting up beautiful maple timber; people paid for getting it put out of the way; yet now they are paying as much as $25 a tree for timber that is no better than the timber they paid people to destroy at that time. What is the use of drawing a parallel between timber to-day and timber twenty-five years ago? The thing is perfectly absurd to any one who has ever lived in a new country.

There is one point which I think should be seriously considered in connection with this matter. All who have been in the Northwest territories know that the country may be divided into three districts. The southern district is a dry district, much of it requiring to be irrigated; then there is a belt between it and the timber district which receives a sufficient amount of rainfall and does not require to be irrigated. This is the valuable part of our Northwest Territory, and if the policy of the government is to be such that, according to the hon. member for Brandon, in 220 years all the timber in that country will be gone, everybody who knows anything of the forest knows that it conserves moisture, and the arid belt of the south will extend over the whole of the fertile valley of the Saskatchewan, where there is so much valuable agricultural land at the present time. The timber should not be sold en bloc at all. There should be an arrangement made whereby the large trees would be cut and taken away carefully, and the others left to grow. In that way we could have a continual supply. When the provinces take over the lands, as we expect they will after the next general election, they will derive a much larger revenue from them than the $375,000 which they are getting now from the Dominion government. To destroy all

the trees is very much like a farmer killing both his young cattle and his old cattle. We know that when a farmer wishes to dispose of his cattle, he sells or kills only those which have grown to maturity, leaving the younger ones to grow up, and in that way he keeps his revenue going. But this government is giving away not only the large timber, but the small, and in that way is destroying the whole supply. There was no need of hurry in disposing of these timber limits. We are told that the lumber yards in British Columbia and the Territories are overflowing at the present time. It does not appear that we require the money, because with the large surpluses that are so much boasted about, certainly $1,840 was not a great consideration for giving away a timber limit which hon. gentlemen opposite are now boasting will be sold at a great bargain for $75,000.

If the land be given back to the provinces, as it will be after the next elections, they will be able to make proper use of it. It will furnish the provinces with an immense income. There are about 1,000,000 acres not occupied in each of those provinces. If they would continue to give away the even numbered sections, as this government has been doing, for homesteads, there would still be 50,000,000 acres left in each province for sale. If that were sold by public auction—I would not suggest that it should be sold by tender—if it were sold by public auction like the school lands, it should bring at least $10 an acre. That would give each province $500,000,000, which, at 3 per cent, would furnish an income of $15,000,000 a year. Not to mention the mines and coal lands, just see what the people could do with $15,000,000 a year. The first thing they could do would be to follow the example of the province of Ontario. That province has built the Temiscaming Railway and are continuing it to James bay. The people of Ontario will own that railway; why should not these new provinces also build railways? It would be a great advantage to them to own railways, just as it is to Ontario. That would create competition with the other three great systems in that country. These three systems might very easily combine. Corporations have very little regard for the people; and if they could combine and thereby make more money, no doubt they would do so. But if the people of Saskatchewan and Alberta had each a railway, owned by themselves, extending from the southern to the northern boundary in each of the provinces, if they had besides, from Edmonton, a double track railway extending to Fort Churchill, on the Hudson bay, see what an advantage that would be. They could also build any number of necessary branch lines. It costs a cent to carry a bushel of wheat 60 miles, but this would shorten the land carriage of wheat by more than 1,000 miles. That would mean that every settler would have 15 cents more a bushel for his wheat than he has at present. Not only that, but he would get $10 or $12 per head more for his cattle, and by means of competition with the other systems of railways he would get his goods in cheaper. The settlers could come in easier, passenger rates would be reduced, and the people of those two provinces would be benefited to the extent of twice the profit they are making now from their farms.

Surely, under these circumstances, an investigation should be granted. If this investigation be not granted, the people of the west, when they understand the great loss they are suffering at present, when they consider that they have been freezing with hundreds of thousands of government-owned acres of coal land within a hundred miles, when they consider that they have been paying from $30 to $40 per 1,000 feet for lumber when there are government-owned limits of spruce and other timber within a hundred miles of settlement—when they consider these things, they will understand the imperative necessity for a change. If these provinces could get their lands and dispose of them as I have described, and build and own their railways, as the Temiscaming Railway is owned by the Ontario government, they would be independent in these matters. They could go to the north and get their firewood and lumber. They would get their lumber at $8 or $10 a thousand feet instead of having to pay $30 or $40. They would get their firewood laid down at Saskatoon and other places along the line at $3 a cord instead of having to pay $5 or $6. The fact of the matter is that these provinces are treated very unfairly by the Dominion. Surely hon. members on that side should be willing to grant an investigation. If there be nothing wrong, no harm can come to them. If ever there was a chance in the whole history of Canada for a man on the government side, some man with a conscience, some man of honour, who respects himself and the people he represents, it is now. If there be such a man on that side, let him rise when I sit down and support this motion for an investigation.

Mr. J. B. MORIN (Dorchester). A great deal has been said regarding the administration of both governments and parties of these timber limits, but I am afraid that so long as these limits are administered in the way they have been, we will have the same trouble. The government pretend to sell, but in reality they are giving away the timber to party friends. When the government dispose of these timber limits they give a lease, and the lessee pays so much ground rent and so on. What does that amount to by the thousand feet? The government gives a lease for $2 or $3 per square mile. Well, a square mile consists of 640 square acres of land, and each acre cuts 30,000 cubic feet. We all know that lumbermen can buy timber and pay $4 or $5 per thousand feet stumpage; yet, although a

square mile has 30,000 feet per acre, you sell it for from $4 to $10 per mile. When you do that, you are not getting the best price for your property. If you were to sell that property for what it is worth, you would base your price upon the quantity of lumber that is in it and not sell at so much per square mile. The timber should net, in that country, $150 or $160 per acre, based on the value per thousand feet of lumber. It is very easy for the government to hire estimators to go through the woods and estimate how much timber there is. I have done it time and again, and I could do it yet. Without boasting, I could take a square mile, or ten or fifty square miles, and, even if there was 300,000,000 feet to the square mile, I could make an estimate of it within half a million feet. Let the government sell the timber to whoever wants it, not give a lease of it to their friends who will hold the property for speculation. We all know that there are lumbermen in this country who have been holding leases for over fifty years, and the government gets very little out of it.

Mr. WM. D. STAPLES (Macdonald). Since I have had a seat in this House, I have never risen to argue for or against any resolution unless I thought it was my clear duty to do so. I feel that if I were not to rise and say a word or two in support of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) and seconded by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) and so ably supported, I should not be doing my duty to the constituency I have the honour to represent or the province from which I come. I shall not go into details at this late hour, but if I cared to go into details, I think I could bring to bear upon the question some little knowledge of the lumber business. But, while I have had a mill or two in that western country I could not see that there was any thing left for me to manufacture, owing to the way in which the timber was being dealt with by this government. I concluded that it would be wisdom on my part to let the big fellows have it all as already they have so great a portion of it. Now, let me give a little incident which will illustrate the opinion of the people in that country of the manner in which their timber has been dealt with by this administration. Last summer I had occasion to take a drive for a considerable distance. As I journeyed driven by an old pioneer of that country, and by the way, he was a supporter of this government—he called my attention to one lonely tree standing on the prairie, and said 'Staples, do you see that tree?' I said, 'I do.' He said, 'That is the only tree in this great western country that has not passed into the hands of the Big Four.' With natural curiosity, I inquired, 'Who are the Big Four?' 'Why,' he answered, 'I am surprised at you, an M. P., who has been there for three sessions and do not know the Big Four—Turriff, Burrows, Adamson and Sifton.' Now, I have been a resident of the western country for a long time. I went there pretty nearly at the same time as did the hon. gentlemen whose names I have mentioned, and I have known them for many years. I knew them when they were plodding along with very little substance, trying to make a living on a farm, or out of different professions, until the present government came into power. But, after this government came into power, did we see them long in that western country? No, Sir, they came here, close to the treasury benches in close proximity to where they could get their hands into the people's money. And, if we are to judge them by the way we see them sailing through this country at the present time, we must come to the conclusion that they have been successful. I knew these gentlemen, as I have stated when they had but limited means. And what have they to-day? Go about the streets of Ottawa; and you will see their beautiful horses and fine equipages. Sail upon the St. Lawrence river, and on its shores you find their immense summer residences. When they came here, had they anything of this kind? In order that you may see what one of the Big Four at least has secured, let me refer to a return brought down to this House. We find that the hon. member for Dauphin has got—I was going to say twenty or thirty different timber limits; but instead of giving the number, let me just read a list of them, giving the area of each:

Limit No.	Area, sq. miles.
814	15
827	44
966	50
992	40
1000	5
1001	6
1002	4
1046	40
1047	50
1054	1
1068	5¼
1073	20
1095	12
1094	27
1099	44
1120	15
1191	50
1192	50

I do not know whether that is all that the hon. member for Dauphin has succeeded in getting, but it seems to me it was quite a quantity. Well might one of the journals on the other side of the ocean say, as was shown by an hon. member on this side, that the Big Four I have mentioned are making a gorgeous and vulgar display of wealth.

I shall not go further into detail. I only say that the people of that western coun-

try, the people of the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba—yes, and the people of British Columbia also—want a thorough investigation into this department, and they hold the Prime Minister responsible. Member after member on this side of the House has tried to draw the right hon. gentleman to his feet to state whether or not he will allow an investigation. He is the man who can permit or deny an investigation, who can throw the doors open. In every campaign in which I have participated, on every platform, I have heard supporters of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) laud him as a big man, an honest man, a man who would not allow such transactions or manipulations as have been charged to go on without granting a thorough investigation. I ask the Prime Minister if he will allow this vote to take place without proving that the eulogies we have heard pronounced upon him are correct, by stating that he will allow a thorough investigation into this department. The people ask for it, and look to the right hon. gentleman for it.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is late, or rather early, but at the same time it seems to be impossible to let the hour pass without saying a word or two upon this question. First let me express my surprise that in a debate of two or three days upon one of the most important questions which we could have in the House of Commons, involving one of the gravest charges ever brought in the House against a department, a debate which has been pursued in a moderate, reasonable and painstaking way, in which enough evidence has been adduced to arouse the interest of people outside of this House and in this House, no member of the government apart from the hon. gentleman who to-day is the head of the department, the responsibility for which he disavows in the matter we are discussing, has spoken. The Prime Minister cannot disavow the responsibility for what has taken place in that department. The minister gives as his excuse: I was not minister when these acts took place and I am not responsible for what did take place. The Prime Minister cannot say that; he was the man who chose the late Minister of the Interior and put him in undisputed and almost absolute charge of the department, as the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) stated to-night. The right hon. gentleman who leads the government made the opportunities for that gentleman and placed him in charge of that department; he must be held responsible for that department and its administration under these two ministers. Yet, no word of defence or explanation from him after three days of a debate in which the speeches from this side of the House cannot be characterized as other than reasonable, temperate, cogent and fact-full, from that of the hon. gentleman who introduced the motion (Mr. Lake) to the gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Staples)—every one of them had certain facts to adduce, every one had documents to support his facts and every document opened up a new avenue of thought, disclosed new methods of exploitation, and added a new idea of the administration of the work of that department during the last ten years. Analyze the speeches made on the other side of the House in defence of the former employee of the department. Fancy a government sheltering itself when it is attacked behind an employee of its department, a man to whom it has paid daily wages. The second defence was made by the hon. gentleman who is to-day at the head of the department, but he was careful to say that he did not know much about what was going on at that time and was not really responsible. The third defence was made by a gentleman who has left the department and he comes before the House to-day not to defend the government but to defend his own action and glorify himself—and that is all he did in his speech to-day.

But the country will not be satisfied until it hears from the right hon. gentleman who leads the government. That right hon. gentleman pledged his honour to the people in 1896 and declared it to be a constant principle and one that he would carry into effect were he given power in this country, that honest administration should be kept, that the land should be kept for the settler and not given away or sold to the speculator; he pledged himself in Toronto and other cities that whereas public life and administrative life had not been as pure and straightforward as it should have been, if he were put in power he would purge the political atmosphere and see that administrative works were carried out properly. What more enormous scandal could you have to-day in parliamentary life than to have four men sitting as members of this House, every one of them the beneficiaries of the favours of this government and the franchises of this country? The right hon. gentleman appointed a Royal commission ostensibly to probe into matters connected with insurance companies. He and his Minister of Justice, when they got their commission—and a star chamber commission it was—followed like sleuth hounds two or three members of parliament who bought lands in the Northwest—not from this government; they did not go hat in hand, stealing by crooked ways and by back doors, asking favours from the Minister of the Interior; they did not fee lawyers to put in bogus tenders in order to get something secretly which they dare not go like men and ask for themselves; they are men on whom there is not a breath of suspicion that they had any collusion with any employee of any department of this govern-

ment, but who went, as they had a perfect right to do, and bought lands from companies in the west. Yet what do we find? That right hon. gentleman's Minister of Justice, with his paid attorneys and counsel, following these men like sleuth hounds; where to? In all their meandering through the Northwest when they were making their negotiations with independent companies with which the government had nothing to do, and were purchasing at a fair price lands which they had a perfect right to purchase. And yet, who is there in this House who has not heard from the Minister of Justice down to the furthest back bencher on the opposite side in the last two years the statement that the independence of parliament was grossly violated by these gentlemen buying land from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and other companies, that, forsooth, they wisely got some idea of what route the railway was going to take and they bought lands somewhere along the possible route of that railway. The servile, paid, bonused, organs of the right hon. gentleman, paid two prices, as he knows well, with hon. gentlemen behind him on the other side of the House and with their supporters throughout this country, hounded these men and declared that they should not be in parliament, because they were not independent men, that had actually found out the route that the railway was going to take and that they had invested money in lands along that prospective route. Mr. Speaker, what have we brought out to-day? Does the right hon. gentleman know it? Does he sense it? Has he a conscience?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, hon. gentlemen may say 'Oh,' but before we get through we will have a little more to say about that. The right hon. gentleman heard that to-day. What is it? What are the cold facts? The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway his own creature was bounsed by the credit and the dollars, to the extent of millions, of this country. Almost before it had received its charter and in the charter the very spots were indicated which would mark the route of that company, almost before the thing had been consummated, before the charter had dried almost from its ink, members supporting the right hon. gentleman were on the scent, coursing the proposed line of railway, turning up in the end at Dunvegan, Yellow Head pass and at every prominent place along the line, the possessors of large timber limits through which this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway when it is surveyed, will pass and through which its cars will run. These timber limits were not bought from the Canadian Pacic Railway, were not bought from the Hudson's Bay Company-; they were bought from this government through negotiations which are no credit, on the face of the papers, to this government. These gentlemen to-day the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows), with his hundreds of square miles of timber limits, the hon. member for Humbolt (Mr. Adamson), with his lots here and there of timber limits, the hon. member for East Assiniboia and others, in this House, sit behind the right hon. gentleman and vote for him. Great heavens, how could they afford not to vote for him? Would there be anything of human gratitude in their souls if they did not vote for him through thick and thin? They get their franchises from him and the people of this country have to pay the price. Where is your Minister of Justice? Why do you not get a royal commission, why do you not instruct him to follow these four men in all the devious paths that they have taken until they have become the possessors of the people's franchises got from the Department of the Interior, as the documents show—why do you not follow these men out by a royal commission and hold them up to public scorn? The independence of parliament Act, forsooth, is violated when a member of parliament buys from the Canadian Pacific Railway at any price that may be agreed upon a lot of land! The independence of parliament is spotless in its purity and splendid in its effulgence if he can only go to the back door and get the people's land from the government at small cost! They do it and the right hon. gentleman knows they do it. We look to him to fulfil his pledges and to give to this parliament a chance to know what is going on in that department. But some one says—I believe it is the Minister of the Interior: Why do you need to give a commission or a committee to investigate the policy of the Department of the Interior for? The policy of the Department of the Interior, he says, is well known; it is written on the records. Nobody asks for a commission or a committee to investigate the policy of the department. It is the practice of the department we wish to examine. The Minister of the Interior and the ex-Minister of the Interior thought they did everything that was necessary when they spent two hours defending the policy of the department. What we want to investigate is the bad practice of the department and the bad practice of the department has been apparent from the time that it passed into the hands of my right hon. friend's government up to this time. This is no isolated case. You must take this in connection with other things. The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) is not in his place and I wish he were. Wagner will be coming to us the next thing and asking us to prefer charges against him. Joseph Nixon will be trotting out here some of these days and saying: What are you men talking about me for; make your charges like men and then we will talk

about it. What have we to do with the hon. member for East Assiniboia in this matter as a member of parliament? We have nothing to do with him at all except as we are investigating the practice of the department where he was an employee. He forgot himself. He forgot the past. He had the audacity to stand up in this House, to look us in the face and say: If you have anything to say about the administration of the department when I was there bring your charges against me. We do not usually formulate charges against paid officials of the departments. That is all the hon. gentleman was in the dealings we are trying to investigate. I have a word to say to that hon. gentleman or to his vacant seat. He was very brave the other day. He stood up in this House and declared that he went down to Stanstead and that the moment he went on the platform and spoke we did not dare say a word. Members from this House were there but they were dumbfounded, they stood in awe of the hon. member for East Assiniboia. He spoke and he expected them to meet him but nobody dared meet him. Well, Sir, it is not necessary for me to give history but on two occasions he was invited to attend my meeting, he was in the neighbourhood and he did not. Does anybody in this House think that my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) was cowed and made to tremble in every limb in his body because the hon. member for East Assiniboia was on the platform down in Stanstead?

Mr. BERGERON. He did not come to our meeting at Magog.

Mr. FOSTER. No, he did not. I want to say in reference to the hon. member for East Assiniboia that as an employee of the government his course in Stanstead and his course here have made me have less faith in him as an employee than I had before he took that course, because he went to Stanstead and he stood up here and absolutely misrepresented the facts of the case in order to gain an advantage against an opponent. What did he say in Stanstead?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman can hardly say that a member of the House misrepresented the facts.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, he did not state them correctly, if that is better. It is a very fine point to tell what is the difference. If I had said he had deliberately misrepresented the facts I might have come under the rules of the House, but it was a misrepresentation which means that it was not a proper representation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The ruling was: That to say that an hon. member had misrepresented facts is out of order in the opinion of the chair. If the hon. member (Mr Foster) thinks that ruling is not correct his proper course is to appeal from it and not to proceed to criticise it after the ruling has been given.

Mr. FOSTER. I have something more important to do now than to have an appeal and so I will put it in the other way, withdrawing that, and I say that he did not correctly represent. Am I in order, Mr. Speaker? Then, he did not correctly represent the facts in Stanstead. What I meant there as having been said by the member for East Assiniboia was this: What are these men talking about, why, the Liberal-Conservative government when they were in power gave as a free gift to Liberal-Conservative members and senators 29,300 square miles of land. In this House he stood up and made the same incorrect representation. He declared here over and over again that the Liberal-Conservative government made a free gift, and that they alienated 29,300 square miles of timber limits. Is it true, Mr. Speaker? Is it true, I ask the right hon. gentleman who leads the House? Is it true that it was alienated? The ex-Minister of the Interior made the same statement. Do these gentlemen know the meaning of English words? Will any man now stand up on his feet and say in the light of the facts that the Liberal-Conservative government alienated 29,300 square miles of timber lands?

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. gentleman is asking me, I will say that they certainly did all that lay in their power to alienate.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I am afraid that if my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) was down in Stanstead county, or any other county, he would be guilty of the same incorrect representation. What is the meaning of the word 'alienate'? When is property alienated? It is alienated when by legal title it passes into possession of another. Does the Minister of the Interior; does the member for East Assiniboia dare to get up in the House and state that these 29,300 square miles of timber lands ever passed into the possession of any one outside of the government, by title? Never. The right hon. gentleman the other day answered a question, and the Minister of the Interior the other day answered a question. They were a little apart but not enough for practical purposes, and what the Minister of the Interior himself said in answer to the question was: that the total quantity of lands alienated by the Liberal-Conservative government from 1878 to 1896 in the way of timber lands was 1,720 square miles. The right hon. gentleman answered the question the day before and he put it at about 1,800 square miles Now, there is the truth of the whole thing. These gentlemen say that 29,300 square miles were alienated when the fact is that all but 1,720 square miles has been in the absolute possession of the government, and,

if it has not been otherwise alienated is still in their possession. Now, the Minister of the Interior says the Conservative government alienated it as far as they could. Did the Minister of the Interior say that?

Mr. OLIVER. That is what I said.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well.

Mr. OLIVER. And I want to repeat what I said before, and what my hon friend discussed with me when I was speaking: that for the whole of that 29,300 square miles the people who were given the rights on that land exercised these rights as rights of possession.

Mr. FOSTER. Now I will argue this matter with the Minister of the Interior. First he said that the government alienated it as far as they had the power to do? The government could have given the absolute title to every square mile of this land. Does the Minister of the Interior deny that? Of course not. Then he is wrong in the first statement. Does his second statement rest on any better basis? He says that the government gave to every one of the holders of that 29,300 square miles rights of ownership, and that they exercised rights of ownership. Now, Sir that is just as incorrect as his first statement. I put questions to the Minister of the Interior the other night and he struggled with all the records of the department to answer them, and he only could give two instances, and what were they? He says that Mr. Tisdale exercised rights of possession and ownership. Well, let us see whether he did or not. Under a wide open regulation (and I am quoting the Minister of the Interior), under a policy and regulations which he declared to be just and proper (I am quoting him again)—by the way just there let me remind the House that the ex-Minister of the Interior tried to correct the Minister of the Interior today and said that the Minister of the Interior did not mean to say that. But the Minister of the Interior now says that he did mean to say it and he sticks to it.

Mr. OLIVER. I said it was a proper policy but it was not properly administered.

Mr. FOSTER. That is right, the hon. gentleman said that. But I point out that there is a wide difference of opinion between the ex-minister and the minister as to that. The clear headed ex-Minister of the Interior did not want to be bound by what the Minister of the Interior said. The Minister of the Interior in his characteristic western language said: the policy was good but the administration was rotten. Now as to the acts of ownership. Under a wide open policy which is approved by the Minister of the Interior, under regulations approved by the Minister of the Interior, David Tisdale, Esq., a member of parliament, exercised the same right that any inhabitant of this country could exercise, and he made out an application for a timber limit. His application was received, was filed, and an order in council was passed which simply gave to David Tisdale the right under certain conditions to exercise rights of ownership on that property. But David Tisdale, until he performed the conditions could not sell a stick of timber off that, could not cut a stick of timber on it. And what were the conditions? Before that could be done and the right of ownership could be exercised he had to pay his ground rent, he had to put up a mill of a certain capacity, he had to make a survey at his own cost and charge if it were in unsurveyed territory. Then when he had done all that he could receive a license to cut. Then he had rights of ownership and could exercise them, but not one single hour before. How did the Minister of the Interior prove rights of ownership exercised by Mr. Tisdale? In this way: Tisdale found that after a certain time the limit for which he had applied had no timber on it. He came back to the government and said: I don't want that one; let me have another. The government cancelled the first, and he put in an application for a second, and they accepted it. Is that the exercise of a right of ownership? It is the exercise of the right of surrender. There was no trade; no consideration passed.

Mr. OLIVER. Might I ask how Mr. Tisdale could surrender something he did not own?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that is difficult, if my hon. friend will put his keen and acute mind to it for a moment. Mr. Tisdale had a right which he could not exercise except under conditions; he got that right from the Dominion government; he brought it back and surrendered it. That very moment, under the regulations, he had the right to apply for another limit, and he did apply for another and received it. My hon. friend did not show that he had any right of ownership, nor can he do it.

Mr. OLIVER. Might I ask my hon. friend was the right of Mr. Tisdale cancelled upon his non-compliance with the conditions as to time upon which the right was granted?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has the advantage of me; he has the documents and I have not; but I have the order in council, which recites that about a year from the time that he put in his first application he wrote to the department that there was no timber upon that limit and that he did not want that, but that he would apply for another; and the first was cancelled and the second was given. As to the order of time, I cannot tell exactly. That is all I know from the documents. It was not a right of ownership. The right of ownership

came into force only when he had fulfilled the conditions. The conditions were not fulfilled, and consequently no power or right or act of ownership could be carried on by the person applying.

Now, let me go a little further. I was arguing about the correctness or not of the representation that the Liberal-Conservative government, from 1880 to 1896, had alienated 29,300 square miles of timber land. I think I have made my case. Only 1,720 miles were alienated, according to an answer of the Minister of the Interior, given the day before yesterday, which I have in 'Hansard' of that date. An hon. member of this House goes into the county of Stanstead and trades upon his position as a member of parliament, and as a former trusted employee of the department, about whose inner workings in that business he says he knew everything, and stands up before an audience and declares to them: The Liberal-Conservatives, who say that we are doing badly, alienated 29,300 square miles of timber lands and gave them to their supporters. Why, Foster got 50 square miles, Colby got 50 square miles, and so it went through the list. And what did the honest farmers and other people who listened to that conclude? They saw a member of parliament, a man who had been in the department, they trusted that his reputation would convey honesty and correctness, and they went away and said: The Liberal-Conservatives cannot say anything; they alienated 29,300 square miles, while these people only alienated 6,400. There was absolutely not a word of truth in that statement. And that gentleman was formerly the trusted employee who went into his own private room, locked the door, kept all inconvenient witnesses away, and adjudicated upon the application of his brother-in-law and other relatives and party friends. I say, and I do not fear to say it, that the exhibition he made of himself in this House and in Stanstead for the advantage of his party, stamps him as a partisan who, in the inmost recesses of his unwatched room, would not be beyond doing something for the good of a party supporter in the matter of tenders. A man who is honest is honest all the way through. He is as honest when he makes a statement to confiding people as he is in the transaction of his business. If he is not honest in the one, I would not trust him in the other. There is where the member for East Assiniboia stands as far as I am concerned.

I said this was not an isolated circumstance. This exploitation of the public domain began in 1900 or before, when the late Minister of the Interior brought this gentleman down from the west, and the two of them sailed in through the golden gate and entered into the paradise of the Interior Department. Immediately this thing began. Your ex-Minister of the Interior stood there to-day and said, with a calm face and unruffled voice: 'I made no changes in the regulations or practice of the Department of the Interior, not a single one.' Did my right hon. friend hear him? Did he believe him? 'I found,' he said, 'that in 1898 the Liberal-Conservative government adopted a policy and based their regulations upon it, and this went on till 1896, and there was no trouble about it. I found the regulations there in 1896 and I carried them on until 1905, and there was no trouble about it. I made no changes, not a single change.' Now, to the law and the testimony. Who was the man who looked over the tenders and gave the adjudications under the Liberal-Conservative government, whom he found there when he came into that office, and to whose uprightness and probity he paid a high compliment to-day? Mr. Ryley; and Mr. Ryley and his associates opened the tenders and gave the decision. He says he made no change. The man he brought from the west was put in a position of authority, and instead of the tenders thereafter being adjudicated upon by Mr. Ryley and his coadjutors, they were given into the private side pocket of Mr. Turriff; and when hundreds of thousands of dollars and partisan considerations were pressed upon him from the man who made the application, from interested friends who backed him up, from lawyers who had their fee to gain and their charges to get—when all that took place, a strong partisanship dyeing every fibre of his body, he was put into a darkened and secluded room and given the full power of decision in reference to those matters. Did not make a change? Why, he made the very change which, if he wanted to, gave him the opportunity of carrying out the most nefarious schemes in respect of the administration of his department.

Make no changes! My hon. friend will know now, if he did not know it before, that when Mr. Clifford Sifton became Minister of the Interior he took the right which, up to that time had been in the power of the Governor in Council with reference to irrevocable and revocable grazing leases, out of the council and invested it in himself as minister. And what did he then do? He turned yearly leases into irrevocable twenty-one year leases. Who was advising him when he did that? It was Mr. J. G. Turriff, the present member for East Assiniboia. He was there when the minister let the bars down and let Hitchcock and McGregor in and the Galway Ranching Company and H. B. Brown and the other five or six animals who got over the bars. Mr. Turriff was there as the advising officer and he advised and recommended it. Who was the man, when a sufficient number of them got in, who went to work and put up the bars again in order to keep any one else from getting in and thus immeasurably enhancing the value of the leases that had been given?

He made no changes! He made other changes. Up to that time the law stated

what price should be paid for land, but the Minister of the Interior of that day (Mr. Sifton) took power to sell to lessees of those grazing lands, land selected over the whole lot, at $1 a mile to the fortunate men who got through the bars and were given irrevocable leases, and these men availed themselves of that privilege, and purchased the land at $1 an acre and sold it shortly afterwards at $12 an acre to an English company.

Has made no changes! Up to that date the man who held a timber limit license, held it at the pleasure of the government. It could be revised and after a little notice could be revised again. The settler alongside had the right to his firewood and lumber, and if it became necessary the lease could be cancelled and the land taken back for settlement. Well, one of the first things the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) did was to so change the conditions that as long as merchantable timber was standing on the lands that went to his brother-in-law first and his other pets afterwards, the leases could not be revoked and were thus made practically perpetual. What did the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) say to-day? The great thing, he said, to do is to preserve the forests. So it is, but do you mean to say that a wide-awake man who gets a lease revocable on a two years' notice and suddenly, with the help of his brother-in-law, finds it is made irrevocable—do you think he is not wise enough to cultivate his lease and keep merchantable timber always growing on the limits so that it will be a perpetual source of income and profit to himself? And this is the ex-minister who tells us he made no changes.

And all the while J. G. Turriff was the man who aided and abetted him in making these people rich. What did Hitchcock and McGregor ever do for their country that they should get 100,000 acres on an irrevocable twenty-one year lease? Does history record anything that they ever did for their country? What did they do for good government? Do the annals of government show any great thing ever done by them? Men go to South Africa and risk their lives to help the empire, and this government does not even go to the expense of giving them a medal. But Hitchcock and McGregor get 100,000 acres on a twenty-one year lease, and inside of two and a half years these dear middlemen sell that lease and bag $350,000 profit.

I am told that we make insinuations. We hear that from the small fry everywhere. Well, I am now making statements of fact as they have been made before in this parliament. I am making them to the right hon. gentleman. They are not insinuations, but statements of fact. What did Hitchcock and McGregor do that they should get all this wealth at the expense of the country? But J. G. Turriff was in another transaction, not so large, but even more reprehensible. Who was H. P. Brown? Did he ever exist? Will the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) tell me, if he knows? He does not reply. It is a conundrum. I know that the department were for two and a half years hunting for H. P. Brown, or represented that they were. While they were hunting for him, they let his arrears run up. They gave him an irrevocable lease, and while they were still hunting for him and he had not signed his lease or paid his money, the real Brown turned up in the person of A. J. Adamson, M.P. Mr. Adamson had an assignment from Brown who never had the lease. He exercised the right of ownership.

Mr. OLIVER. Exactly as the 450 beneficiaries of my hon. friend's administration were able to do under those orders in council.

Mr. FOSTER. If any man be simple enough to think these things are alike we shall not quarrel.

Mr. OLIVER. They were exactly the same.

Mr. FOSTER. On the eminent authority of my hon. friend, whose logical factory is one of the most wonderful things in nature, I shall have to take it as being so for the moment. H. P. Brown did not turn up and never paid his arrears. He never signed the lease, but afterwards Mr. Adamson, M.P., turned up with an assignment of that lease, which he had held in his pocket at least a year and a half. While the innocent department, under the leadership of the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) and the present (Mr. Oliver), was hunting up and down for Brown, beseeching him to appear and pay his arrears and sign the deed, Brown was all the time hidden away in the trousers pocket of Mr. Adamson. Mr. Adamson had the assignment of the lease, that never was signed, to a company which, when the assignment was taken, had not been incorporated. And at the last Mr. Adamson got a 60,000 acre lease by paying six months of the fee and agreeing to take it as a revocable lease. The minister made an agreement with him. He took it as a revocable lease. He found it was not so valuable as he thought. So he and Mr. Turriff collogued together, Mr. Turriff at that time being an M.P. And Turriff, the former employee, and Adamson, the M.P., after having made a solemn engagement with the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) by which they paid less money for a revocable lease, collared the obstinate, but not very strong, Minister of the Interior, and with hands at his throat actually compelled him to turn that revocable lease into an irrevocable twenty-one year lease for the same amount of money and no more. Then Adamson, M.P.,

sold it out at a fine profit, though he is too modest to tell us here just exactly how much.

Mr. NORTHRUP. And that's what happened to Brown ?

Mr. FOSTER. That's what happened to Brown. Now, Sir, J. G. Turriff, the employee of the department, was the man who followed that all through. 'I am not a detective,' he says. What was he getting the people's money for ? Is there any theory more thoroughly established than that every public employee, is, to the extent of his powers, the trustee of the people of this country ? Was this gentleman drawing his salary simply for making his pen and pencil marks ? Is that all that J. G. Turriff was doing as the responsible head of the department ? 'I am not a detective,' he said—I have no right to think; mine is simply the mechanical work, and I do it. But this mechanical work ran swiftly in the direction of carrying out behests of Mr. Adamson and J. G. Turriff, who is Mr. Adamson's brother-in-law. Could a scandal be greater ? And is there to be no royal commission to follow up things like this ? Why, you set your royal commission to work, under your Minister of Justice, and pay the people's money to that commission, under the guise of a royal commission on insurance, to follow up members of parliament who bought lands from private companies in the Northwest, and you do it on the plea that these members had done an improper thing and were infringing the Independence of Parliament Act. And I can go further with reference to Mr. Turriff. Mr. Turriff was good enough to hand me, at my request, a statement which is marked 'certified.' When he gave it to me, I asked him : 'Is that an authenticated document from the Interior Department ?' He said : 'I got it from the Interior Department ; it is certified.' And I looked at it and found it marked 'Certified correct.' Now, had I gone over to the Department of the Interior and asked the present Minister of the Interior to allow me to see the back files showing the timber leases and license transactions, I should have been turned out of doors. But Mr. J. G. Turriff, the former employee, now member of parliament, walks right in at the open door, and gets a certified copy, if he does not look through the files himself. And from that certified copy he reads in this House. And it is false. And if the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) had listened, as he, no doubt, did, to what went on in this debate, he would have known that it was an incorrect representation. It showed that 310 square miles was the quantity alienated by the Mackenzie government during their time in power. And yet when I looked at that certified copy I called his attention to the fact that 200 square miles granted to Cook & Sutherland was not included in that certified copy. And the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) read in this House, the order in council which, in the Mackenzie government's name, and in the dying hours of that government, made a gift, so far as it could under the conditions, of 200 square miles of timber lands, to Cook & Sutherland. But there was the certified statement. That is what he crammed down the Stanstead people's throats; that is what he crammed down the throats of members on the other side of the House; that is what he tried to cause members on this side of the House to accept as true. But it is not true; the account is incorrect, though it is certified to, presumably, by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) allow me to ask him a question ?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER. Was the land covered by this grant to Messrs. Cook & Sutherland alienated ?

Mr. FOSTER. I guarded myself by not using the word 'alienated.' I have a sense of what English words mean, and I am in the judgment of the House if I did not say that the Mackenzie government gave to Messrs. Cook & Sutherland, so far as the conditions allowed, this 200 square miles.

Mr. OLIVER. Exactly what I desired to say to the House in regard to the 450 cases of similar transactions by the government of which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was a member.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, it is a pity the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) did not say it. Now, what more ? The ex-minister (Mr. Sifton) told us that he did not change the system. Does my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) know of another act that his supporters outside call an insinuation ? Has he read the history of the Blairmore town site ? Does he know that while Mr. J. G. Turriff was commissioner of Crown Lands, and Hon. Mr. Sifton, Minister of the Interior, a supporter of the government by the name of Malcolm Mackenzie got from a man named Montalbetti an assignment of a right which Montalbetti never did have which Mr. Chief Justice Wetmore declared fraudulent and false, and meant to be fraudulent and false from the first—and got it without giving anything to Montalbetti for it ? And does he know that when those who thought they had a right to claim it put in their claim, this same commissioner of lands got a speed on that never had been known before in the history of the department ? One day the application came in, and the next day a Dominion lands inspector was telegraphed to to make an inquiry. But before that telegram was cold, a second thought struck—whom ? Most probably the commissioner. And, instead of allowing his

own authorized inspector to make a report, he telegraphed to have Joseph Nixon go up and make the report; Nixon, of fraud fame, Nixon, who altered the stubs of his cheques, embezzled the money and stole the property of this country; Nixon was told to supersede the regular inspector. And Nixon did his work. He and Mackenzie both went up to the place, Nixon made his report, showed it to Mackenzie and sent it here to Ottawa. And, in almost less than no time, the then commissioner of Crown lands in Ottawa had that case up and tried and gave his decision within six or seven days, adjudging Mackenzie to be entitled to that property. Then, a protest was lodged by Lyon's attorney, who asked for time to prove that this transfer was fraudulent. But the answer was : No, no; I cannot stop the wheels of time;—Malcolm Mackenzie will not wait; I give my decision, and Mackenzie is to have the title in the land. But a higher court intervened. A less pliable gentleman was, for the time being, in the department of Justice; and when Lyon's lawyers put the case to David Mills, David Mills said : Whatever happens, you shall have your fiat. He gave them the fiat, and they took the case before Judge Burbidge. Chief Justice Wetmore was asked to make an examination and report, and Judge Burbidge was ready, on that report, to vacate the assignment as fraudulent, in which case the land would have gone back to the Crown. He made no changes ! But what did he do ? He stepped into the court of Justice, withdrew the case, and gave the land to Malcolm Mackenzie for $3 an acre, a townsite worth $100,000 at least.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to say that this matter was before the House last session and the record as placed on the table of the House does not bear out my hon. friend's statement.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a matter of opinion. If any hon. gentleman opposite except the Minister of the Interior, with his curious logic factory had made that statement I would pay some attention to it, but I have thoroughly studied that case and I know what I am saying. This is not insinuation, this is a statement of fact for the benefit of my right hon. friend. And more than that, the government instead of asking this man to pay the costs actually paid about $2,500 costs of the action, and gave him the land for $480.

Do I need to go any further than that ? We have had discussions of these tenders that went before Mr. Turriff and his sole adjudicating upon them, but he is not a detective. Here is a limit of 90 square miles. A. W. Fraser got possession of information as to the Cedar lake limit and applied to have it set up. It was set up by an insufficient notice, and nobody else had any chance to see that limit or appraise it ; Mr Fraser paid in $500 and got the sixty square miles for which he applied. Mr. Turriff was not a detective ; he was not to say to himself : Well, this is an awful waste of the lands of this country, that immense area of sixty square miles to be selected out of about 300 square miles ; that seems to be altogether wrong, and I will not accept that tender. The ex-Minister of the Interior and the Minister of the Interior seemed to think that they had no right to refuse the tenders. The government is never obliged to accept a tender; they may call for tenders and the people may tender, but the government at any time until the award has been made may say : That is not a sufficient price. That is what the Whitney government does, that was their example in the case of the Kerr Lake mining rights, where they refused an offer of $51,000 and by asking for new tenders, obtained $187,000 besides the royalty. But this gentleman was not a detective ; what did he care as to the price, what did he care as to the rights of the people in this land ? His not to reason why, his not to ask any questions, but simply to do and die—that is, to put in the mechanical marks that gave Mr. Fraser this limit. I want to know what my right hon. friend thinks of this. Then Mr. Fraser went to Mr. Turriff and Mr. Turriff granted him thirty miles in addition to the sixty, picked out of the same area ; never had it put up to tender again and never charged him another dollar besides the $500. Does my right hon. friend think that is fair dealing ? Oh, but, says the ex-Minister of the Interior, what is the matter, we have lots of it left ? The same argument was made by the minister of the Interior. When the beneficiary who intrusts a gentleman with a property to manage for her comes to him afterwards and says : Will you give me an accounting of your property? Yes, he says, I have alienated—absolutely this time—one-third of your property. What did you get for it ? Oh, but a paltry amount. Well, you have not treated me rightly, you have really given that away ; you have trifled with my property. Is she answered and justice satisfied when he says : But, my good woman, there is quite a lot of it left ? And so the Minister and ex-Minister of the Interior think it is all right so long as there is lots of it left. It is no palliation at all ; the trust has been violated unless it has been executed solely in the interest of the beneficiary. The Minister of the Interior says : Our policy has been a success. And he defends it on that ground amongst others. He says that their policy is a success compared to the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party because, forsooth, in 1896 there were fifty-five mills in the Northwest whilst in 1907 there were eighty-nine mills ; because in 1896 a certain quantity of lumber was manufactured, and in 1907 a far larger quantity was

manufactured. There is no need to elaborate that argument; every man sees in a moment that the only way to test a policy is under like conditions. You manufactured more lumber in 1896 than in 1881 and more lumber in 1907 than in 1896 because there were more people, better facilities to get the lumber to the people and a greater demand for lumber by each settler, because in the early days they were satisfied with poorer buildings, but now were able to put up new and better ones. I ask the Prime Minister whether or not, disabusing his mind of the idea that we want any inquiry into the policy of the governmetn or the department at this particular time, and knowing that all we ask is an investigation into the practice of the department based on the facts that we have given from the authorities in the last three days in this debate, he is going to throw himself across the front door and prevent the representatives of the people from seeing how their property is being managed. The Liberal-Conservatives in this House represent 3,000,000 people in this country. These lands are the people's property. We are sent here to represent our people's rights in these properties. These properties belong to the people and not to the right hon. gentleman or to the Minister of the Interior. Representing three millions of people we declare we believe that there has been malpractice and I do firmly believe it. We come up to the gates of the business house of this Dominion of Canada and as representatives of three millions of people interested equally with the others of this country in that property we demand to be shown inside the door.

We demand an accounting. Why, was the like of this ever heard of in a private business? The idea that people who have a one-half interest in it could not ask to see the inside of their own business to see whether it was badly managed and to go through the records! Fancy the directorate in a bank or a company; five out of nine of them saying to the other four, or to the shareholders of the whole company when they come to the door and say: We have grave suspicions about such and such an officer and the doings in the bank or business corporation; we want to know the truth—fancy the majority of directors rising up and saying: You shall not see the original papers! It is absurd. Now, what is the statement that we are met with?—Make your charges. That is what we are met with. Make your charges. What kind of charges? Personal charges? I decline, as a member of parliament, to make personal charges against the hon. member for East Assiniboia. We are investigating the work of the Department of the Interior but not that hon. gentleman as a member of parliament, but as a paid employee of the government. What personal charges do you want? Must we go and swear out a warrant for murder or theft before we can get an inside look into our own business? On what rule or by what reason can you deny the right of investigation when we have shown what we have shown? You have tried to make it impossible for us to show anything. Your Minister of the Interior turned us out of his doors; your Minister of the Interior refused to give us original papers. You, yourself, Sir, refused to give us original papers until the sentiment of outside people made it so warm for you that grudgingly you brought down one set of these papers? There are four sets of these papers yet that you have not brought down bearing on this very question. Do you propose to bring them down? May I ask the right hon. gentleman if he proposes to give us these originals? Having brought down one set will he bring down the others? He has it in his power to prevent it. The orders are well back on the order paper. It is quite impossible to reach them in the regular order for many and many a week and may be not at all. We have been held up four times when he tried to pass these as unopposed motions. What is the policy? Does the right hon. gentleman propose to hold still that his Minister of the Interior shall shut the door and refuse us the documents? I think he should be better advised. I think he will find that there is a sentiment outside of this House. Sometimes it has seemed to me as if the First Minister, in utter hopelessness shuts his ears and his eyes to all that is going on around and about him for fear that if he attempts to defend it he will get himself into a worse box than if he said nothing. I tell you that the people of the country are aroused. I tell you that there will be an investigation of the department as sure as there is a God in heaven. You may, with your majority, perhaps, vote down this motion. There are members looking forward to offices which they know they will not get unless they maintain their hold on the coat-tails of the right hon. First Minister; 102 members, senators and ex-members have already been rewarded by public offices paid for by the money of this country. How many men sit behind you who are not loking forward to some like reward? You will be supported if you keep the lid down. If you refuse an examination, if you refuse a committee you will be supported here, but you may depend upon it that the time will come sooner or later when the Department of the Interior will be gone through from top to bottom. The people will have their undoubted right to see how their own business is done and they will ultimately bear down all opposition. What objection is there? Who will be hurt if we get this committee? There is a simple question. What interest would be injured? The Minister of the Interior says he is ready for it. The hon. member for

East Assiniboia says: Come on with your charge, and all the others say: Make your charges; there is nothing wrong; you are simply a set of insinuators. Who will be hurt if you give it? You will be helped if all is proved right. The suspicion of this country which is lowering down upon you like a cloud will be lifted. What would the hon. Minister of the Interior not do to lift the cloud of suspicion which is lowering down upon you in this country, the suspicion which is in many men's mouths and upon many men's tongues, the open assertion which is borne out by the vulgar display of wealth by men who, but a short time ago, came into these public departments as bare as the rest of us of the means of living, or of existing? The public is talking, the public is comparing notes, the public will demand an answer from every member who refuses to open the door upon the practice of this department and sooner or later the door will be open. Who is to be injured by it? You say you are innocent. Nobody will be injured if that is true. In a political sense if we make these charges and cannot prove them it will rebound upon us. We are the ones to get the backwater, not you. What can be injured? The mere inconvenience of making an investigation should not stand in the way for a moment. Again I ask: Who will be injured and what would be injured because of an investigation being granted? Nothing been proved? Nothing but insinuations? Let me show you what has been proved. It has been proved that no investigation into the value of these properties has ever been made by this government before they were sold. Fancy a business undertaking or corporation with things for sale selling them without apraising the value of them and without knowing their value! Oh, but says the Minister of the Interior, you had no valuation. That does not count the weight of an acorn. That is not your business. The business of the late government was had with the people and the late government settled with the people. It has been proved that no upset price or reserve bid was ever set up. You took whatever was offered. If it was $10 you took it, if it was $1,000 you took it, if it was $10,000 all the better, but you absolutely sold it for whatever the highest bid was no matter how small of a bid it was. There was no public, open competition. That was a farce drawn over the eyes of the people so as to blind them; it was the pretence of competition but these papers before us show that there was no competition. Was there competition for the Fraser limit or for the large limit alongside of it? It is farcical to talk of that as competition. There was no discrimination as to what should be reserved and what should be alienated. The Minister of the Interior had the argument: We wanted to get rid of our lands and what we did was to sell them to people who would operate them. Were they sold to people who would operate them? Is Alexander Smith going to operate these? Alexander Smith operating timber limits up in the Peace river country! Think of it! I could go over a list there running up to 3,000 square miles where there is no pretense of operation, and no prospect of operation maybe for a decade or a score of years at the very shortest. And so that argument is taken away. We have proved that now there is no critical examination of tenders at all, no limit fixed, and that it goes through as a matter of course. In all that was read with reference to the Liberal Conservative government, the limits ran from 3 up to 50 square miles, and it is altogether an exception if more than 50 square miles was given to any one person. But now, a man may get 50 miles, he may get 250 miles, he may get 500 miles as Mr. Burrows has, and as others have who are holding speculative limits. On the same principle they might get 1,000 square miles or they might get 6,000. But it is all right, says the ex-Minister of the Interior, there is plenty left. He has placed a limit on the age of the country of 220 years when that timber will be exhausted, and then Canada may die, for die she will when the timber resources of her great Northwest are exhausted. And so for all these reasons which have been given, and which have been proved, we ask: Why not an investigation?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, I have listened on various occasions to addresses deliveed by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) both upon the stump and in this House of Commons, but I think that every hon. gentleman here to-night whether he sits on this side of the House or on that will agree with me that this was the most peculiar utterance that he has ever made upon a public question in this country. The hon. gentleman seems to be smarting under the recollection of two things, one of which is the result of the recent by-elections. Our friends opposite having formulated a platform called the Halifax platform, found when they got before the electorate that there were none among the people of this country who cared tu'pence for their Halifax platform, and so they were compelled to resort, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was compelled to resort in Stanstead, to this business of insinuation and of statements without proof which he and his followers make about hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. These hon. gentlemen opposite have flattered themselves into the belief that because they had hounded the Ross government out of power in Ontario, by a system of calumny and abuse in this federal arena they might be able to throw enough mud to make it stick against the

reputations of certain honourable people in this House. But the verdict of the people in the by-elections given a short time ago, was an intimation to my hon. friend of the failure of tactics of that kind and he is smarting under the recollection of his defeat. And hence it is that we have had this wonderfully exhaustive product of his verbose vocabulary which we have heard to-night. Hence it is that we have had these wild declarations, these peculiar utterances and gyrations in which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has indulged; this talking about things which have no relation whatever to timber berths and this retailing to the House all the old tales of the Tory party contained in the book called 'The Sessions Disclosures.' My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is doing that because in the first place he is smarting under the recollection of the fact that the people to whom he went a few days ago defeated him, and decided there was nothing in that kind of talk. He thinks to-night that by going a little further and by speaking a little stronger and by indulging in language more extreme than in the past, that probably somebody may believe him. But my hon. friend—and I am sorry to say it—when he struck this question of timber berths recalled another unhappy instance in his career. I am one of those who. after hearing last year the terrible arraignment of that hon. gentleman by the Minister of Justice, would be inclined to say to that hon. gentleman: Go and sin no more. My hon. friend cannot complain of any hon. gentleman on this side of the House recalling to his recollection or to the recollection of hon. gentlemen present, that incident which seems to smart in his own mind and which prompts him to the peculiar utterances which we have heard to-night. My hon. friend as an old parliamentarian must know and does know, that the argument which he has presented here to-night as an alleged reason why a committee should be granted to investigate the Interior Department during the past ten years is an argument which from every standpoint of parliamentary usage and constitutional government is absolutely and wholly untenable. My hon. friend knows, and I am sure he ought not to wish any one of us on this side of the House to be called upon to remind him, that if we hark back to 'Hansard' we will find him laying down during the years when he sat on the treasury benches the conditions under which committees should be granted and investigations held. For what purpose to-night, when we have to deal with a concrete resolution moved by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle in which we are asked to investigate certain dealings in regard to timber berths, does my hon. friend trot out these stories about the Blairmore site, H. P. Brown, and all those old stories of which the country is sick and which my hon. friend well knows, can form not the slightest warrant for arguing to this House or the country why a committee should be granted. My hon. friend is a marvellous special pleader; he belongs to that tribe of hon. gentlemen who

> Can a hair divide
> 'Twixt west and sou'west side.

I heard my hon. friend with his marvellous ingenuity attempting to argue that all his old friends could take of a title which they got without having paid any money for it in the days when their friends were in power—did not amount to anything and that the lands were not alienated to them. I am not going to follow him into this artistic feat of hair spliting which sits upon him so easily, but I submit that any one who studies the records in regard to this matter will come to the conclusion that these gentlemen had a right to the title of these timber berths, which they could have exercised at any time during these years. It is too late to split hairs on that question, because it was tacitly admitted by my hon. friends in the days when they were in power, and when the then premier of this country, Sir John Thompson, discussed this matter he did not venture to make the argument which my hon. friend has, but attempted to justify it on another ground. The motion which has been presented by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) demands that there should be an investigation into the affairs of the Interior Department during the past ten years. Now, is an investigation into a department or an investigation into anything else a proposition so simple and natural and easy that parliamentary usage and constitutional rights entitle any gentleman in this House to stand up and say: I suspect somebody of doing something and therefore we must have a committee of inquiry. In the mood in which hon. gentlemen on the other side are in just now we would be doing nothing but having committees of inquiry from now until next Christmas, if that were so. If there is one thing that does characterize my hon. friends on the other side over and above everything else, it is that they have forgotten all the old traditions of their party, all the old policies, all the old shibboleths by which they used to swear in the old days. They have forgotten even the Halifax platform, and there is only one thing that these hon. gentlemen set themselves to do now, and that is to look about and see if they can suspect their fellowman. I am sorry my hon. friend from St. Antoine is one of these gentlemen who have forgotten the injunctions which are laid down in Holy Writ, about thinking evil of no man and doing unto others as you would that they might do unto you. My hon. friend (Mr. Ames) has forgotten all these injunctions, and if he has one occupation since

he has come into this House it is to go about suspecting his fellow members, and employees of this government, and suggesting these insinuations, and intimating to the House and to the country that there is some evil thing which he has in the back of his head but which up to the present day he has never been able to get out.

There are some people in this country who hoped that my hon. friend, when he came to the House of Commons, would stand for some principles which meant the advancement and prosperity of this country; but during the four sessions that he has sat in this parliament, at no time has his name been identified with any proposition making for the advancement and prosperity of this country. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether or not you believe in the science of phrenology. I do not know that I believe very much in it myself; but I have found in some of the books that I have read that the professors of phrenology claim that one of the bumps to be found in the heads of certain gentlemen indicates that they are destined to become accusers of their fellow-men, and I think that an examination of the head of the hon. member for St. Antoine would show that particular bump to be abnormally developed. When did my hon. friend come before this House and make any announcement of policy or suggest that in the administration of public affairs during the last ten years there has been any error of policy which he proposed to remedy? Those who have listened to his utterances, or who have read them with care, will fail to find anything of the kind. Has he laid down a policy himself? If there is anything to be gathered from his vague suggestion about retaining the timber berths for some indefinite time in the future, so that the country might have the advantage of the unearned increment, it is that he, coming from the city of Montreal, where the good Conservatives take no stock in the talk about the public operation of utilities, is casting his eyes sideways towards the socialistic theories of the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) as adopted by his leader, and is thinking of the time when a Conservative government will be in power, and, in addition to operating many other things, will operate these timber limits themselves.

I submit that if this motion for a committee of investigation is seriously intended, we should have some evidence. According to all authorities, the parliamentary practice is that the gentleman who asks for a committee should make out a prima facie case to warrant the House in granting that committee. What have we in this case? Instead of evidence, there is incorrect representation of facts; instead of proof, there is an unwarranted and unreasonable suspicion; instead of a frank statement of the case, there is ingenious and unfair reasoning and plausible but wholly impossible conclusions.

You would think, to hear hon. gentlemen opposite, that this government were dealing with timber berths in a different manner from that of any other government. In the older provinces the timber berths are controlled by the local legislatures, and how are they administered? What has been the rule in the province of Nova Scotia, from which I come? For the past fifty years it has been open to any man who desired to obtain a timber berth to go to the office of the provincial secretary and by paying $40 per 100 acres get the title to the land and the wood as well. I am sure that the souls of our hon. friends, if they did not happen to know that, must have been terribly shocked at such a policy on the part of the government of Nova Scotia, which would let Tom, Dick and Harry buy all the land they wanted at 40 cents an acre. Our hon. friends opposite a few years ago had as their leader Sir John Thompson, who, while premier of Nova Scotia, carried out that policy. Yet these hon. gentlemen talk about a policy in regard to timber lands in the Northwest, which requires every man who gets a timber limit to pay $5 per annum for each square mile and 50 cents on every thousand feet of lumber he cuts. No matter what occurs, that payment must go on or he loses his limit. And this policy has existed under both governments. In addition, there is to be paid the amount of the bonus, which is determined by public competition. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of the Interior this afternoon read to this House a statement of the results of sales of timber limits in the province of Quebec during the past ten years, and it was found that the proceeds of those sales were exactly similar, so far as the bonuses were concerned, to those of the sales by this government in the Northwest during the same period. I am not familiar with the conditions in the other provinces; but I cite these conditions in these two eastern provinces to show that in this matter hon. gentlemen opposite are simply attempting to deceive and delude the people of this country.

Some of our hon. friends declare that it was a frightful statement that was made by the ex-Minister of the Interior this afternoon when he said that the same policy was carried on now as had been carried on under the late government. What are the facts? If you turn to chapter 55, section 170, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, you will find among other things this laid down: That the Governor in Council may from time to time order that leases of the right to cut timber on certain timber berths shall be offered at public auction, and may authorize the lease of the right to cut timber on any timber berth to any person who is the sole applicant for such lease. Mark you, this legislation, put on the statute-book by hon. gentlemen opposite, authorized the Governor in Council to lease the right to cut timber on any berth

to any one who was the sole applicant for such lease, the bonus to be fixed in the application, and without putting the berth up to public competition at all. But here comes a section under which the council could authorize the minister, when one or more applied for the right to cut timber on the same berth, to invite tenders and to award the lease to the person tendering the highest cash bonus. That was put on the statute-book in 1884 by hon. gentlemen opposite and was there down to 1896 and is still there. That is the law which was enforced when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power and when they gave Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann 500 square miles of timber land in five separate berths in Swan river, an inaccessible part of the country, after giving only fourteen days' notice. Just imagine how the souls of my hon. friends, which seem to be terribly wrung over the short time allowed in advertising berths by the present administration, must be wrung when they think that only fourteen days' notice was given by the good Conservative government with regard to the disposition of five timber berths on Swan river. But I do not suppose that any one of them, except the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) will worry about the question at all. Because they are only playing the game. Everybody knows that this whole thing is a farce. Everybody knows that these gentlemen are attempting to startle the country with these allegations, which they are making indiscriminately on the stump and in this peculiar literature which they are circulating all over the country. They come to parliament and say that somebody informed them about something. Another says that the man on the street told him something. So they go on retailing all these slanders and ingenious misrepresentations and are going to ask the people to believe them.

I am not going over the story of what occurred under Conservative governments, but I want to show you one fact with regard to the question as to whether a statement of the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) this afternoon was correct or not. We have heard some discussion about Mr. T. Mayne Daly, former Minister of the Interior. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) read from a speech delivered by him in 1894. I turned up that address and I find this is what Mr. Daly said and as to which the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) said nothing :

I may say for the information of the House that the Department of the Interior has sold the timber over which it has jurisdiction in Manitoba and the Territories and in the railway belt in British Columbia by public competition. That is by public tender and not by auction sale, it having been the opinion of the officers of the department, in contra distinction to the views of the hon. gentleman who has last spoken, that better prices could be got by tender than by public auction.

That was the policy of the Conservative government in 1894 under the statute which I have read and that policy has obtained down to the present time under the administration of the ex-Minister of the Interior and the present minister.

This resolution asks us to investigate what was done since the 1st of July, 1898, and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) gives nine reasons why an investigation should be had. Seven of these refer to matters of policy which could be regulated by a Bill, if the hon. gentleman wished to assume the responsibility of introducing one. I make the statement, following in some respect that made by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), that seven of these alleged reasons relate to matters of law, and either the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) or the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) could have had that law amended at any time during the past ten years if they wanted to, or if they belonged to that class of men who might be dignified with the title of initiative statesmen, who would stand by some definite policy which they would ask this House to accept. What is there to investigate? What is there for the committee to deal with so far as regards seven out of those nine reasons?

But we are told that the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) changed the terms of the holdings, so that a man who had invested his money in a timber berth could obtain a title to it. Well, if the end to be desired is to have the wood cut by mills, what an absurd proposition it would be to say to a man who was willing to invest say $40,000 in the erection of a large mill: We shall only give you a title which may expire the 31st December in any year. The ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) did what any sound business man would have done. We had a similar proposition in Nova Scotia some years ago. Our coal lands were held under twenty-one year leases, renewable at the end of each term. A gentleman came along who said he wanted to develop the coal mines on a large scale, but could not do so unless he got a lease for ninety-nine years so that capitalists would have some security and permanencey for their investment, and he pointed out that in consideration of this they would give the Nova Scotia government more yearly by way of royalty for the coal than they would under the twenty-one year lease. Well, the government of Nova Scotia gave them that lease for ninety-nine years, and they did it as a business proposition. And the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton would deserve to be condemned if he declined to give the lumber operators, who were willing to put money into a mill and cut lumber, the permanencey they desired and to which they were entitled.

Oh, but they say, look at the close bid-

ding. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) made that one of his reasons. What a terrible ground for attack. But what kind of bids would you expect to have when people put in tenders? Did you expect that the bids should be $10,000 apart? Would you expect that those who are tendering had not some intelligent appreciation of what they wanted? And because the bids were $500 apart on a timber berth, our friends say that this is a terrible ground for suspicion and we must have a committee. Well, I venture to say there is not among them a business man who has had to do with tenders who does not know that under ordinary business conditions, you will find tenders coming close together at all times and under all conditions.

Then the only other ground given by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle is the fact that one person opened the tenders in the department. You would think that these gentlemen, in the olden days, with all the virtues and glories which they possessed, when they were in power, would, before opening tenders, summon a conclave of all the honest and dignified men in the department and a secret convention prepared with the greatest possible solemnity. I am sorry the ex-Minister of Railways is not here because he is the only gentleman opposite who has any experience in opening tenders, but I venture the statement that when he was having tenders awarded in his department he did not have any conclave assembled, but one man only opened them in the days when John Haggart was Minister of Railways. And such was the case in the other departments, and in a great many instances they dispensed with tenders altogether and gave the contracts to their own friends without any public competition at all.

And, let me say again, it is purely a matter in regard to which the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) and the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), if they were responsible public men and were here to take the initiative in regard to matters in the interests of the country, would have introduced a Bill in this House and had it put on the statute-book which would have provided that the practice of their friends when in office should not now be followed, but that tenders should now be opened under certain conditions. Incidentally, I would congratulate hon. members on the other side on one fact. I listened with a great deal of interest to the eloquent reference made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) the other night to glorious old England. I do not know whether the House can recall the incident, but my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) and I were much interested in a little touch of eloquence which the leader of the opposition threw into the statement that over in England, his hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) told him, they did not open tenders as they opened them here.

My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) is not much given to looking to England for precedents. For instance, he was never very enthusiastic about the British preference. And, the other day he might have gone to the mother country to take a lesson from the diplomacy of the great mistress of the seas, that diplomacy which has done so much to make her the guardian of the world's peace, and in discussing the Japanese question, he might have learned from Great Britain's diplomacy a lesson which would have done him and his followers good. Now, what kind of a function will have to be performed in order to suit my hon. friend from St. Antoine in the opening of tenders? So far as I can gather from the utterances of that hon. gentleman and others on that side, I think the first thing required would be a microscope. Then you would have an expert on handwriting. And in the third place you would have to have a person who was an authority on pedigrees and family history. But even all this would not be sufficient. You would have to have a man to watch the handwriting expert and another man to watch the authority on pedigree and family history. But even after all that, you would need a man to watch the microscope, for otherwise you would never satisfy my hon. friend from St. Antoine. Now, though it is rather late, I would like to say a word or two in regard to the hon. member (Mr. Ames). We have heard a great many exaggerations in this debate. The hon. gentleman for St. Antoine started out in his discussion of this question on apparently, very good grounds. He was, apparently very ingenious about it; he sought to lead the House to believe that he wanted to be perfectly fair. He went on to say that he had no criticism to offer of the practical timber operator. The timber operator called forth every admiration that he was willing to express of anybody. He was even disposed to admit that the genuine lumber manufacturer would be justified in making a capital outlay for the purpose of securing reserve supply. The man he was after was the man who had no mill and no intention of having one. Now, we have heard talk here about the Big Four and about my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Burrows). That hon. gentleman was a lumber operator before he came into this House—just as honest and capable a lumber operator in all respects as my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley). As a lumber operator, he had a perfect right to get timber berths from this government as my hon. friend from Argenteuil has to hold timber berths under the Ontario government. Though that hon. gentleman does not happen to sit in the Ontario House, he is a prominent member of his party. Why should he criticize my hon. friend from Dauphin for holding timber lands in the Northwest, a bona fide timber operator in the Northwest who grew up in the business and has been just as honest a timber operator

since he entered this House in 1902 as he was before. What did these hon. gentlemen expect Mr. Burrows to do? Is the penalty of his being a member of this House to be that he shall throw aside the business of a lifetime, give away his property, and retire from business life altogether? The hon. member for St. Antoine thinks it is all right for Mr. Burrows to hold the land he works. But some members on the back benches rise and talk about the Big Four and about men who are rich today and were poor ten years ago—and all this miserable innuendo and insinuation. Any one in the western country will tell you that Mr. Burrows is a capable and successful business man, a man who attended to his affairs honestly and properly, a man who had a right to hold that property now as he had then. What do hon. gentlemen opposite mean by the criticism they direct against my hon. friend from Dauphin? That hon. gentleman has friends who are near and dear to him as other members of this House have. He has been an honest gentleman in his own business affairs. The hon. member for St. Antoine concedes that he has a perfect right to hold 235 square miles of timber in the Northwest without criticism. Is it upright or fair, I submit to this House and this country, for hon. gentlemen opposite, simply because they are out of power and wish to get back, to attack the good name of a man like Mr. Burrows, and pillory him before the country as a grafter, simply because he stands in the way of the peculiarly illegitimate criticism they are making of the public affairs of this country? Here is Mr. T. A. Burrows, a legitimate lumberman, owning 235 square miles of property conceded by that peculiarly correct spirit, the hon. member for St. Antoine, to be all right. But my hon. friend from Dauphin, owns, in addition, 228 square miles which, as a bona fide operator, he will some day operate. But, because, for the moment, he is not actually cuting down timber on this limit, therefore he is to be represented to this country as a man to be condemned and despised, and vilified. If, on March 1, 1908, he were to start to build a mill on that property, then according to my hon. friend from St. Antoine, he would be a very estimable and proper man. How about Mr. J. R. Booth, of Ottawa, who, I am told, owns some 5,000 square miles of timber land which at present is not working? What about Messrs. Price Brothers, of Quebec, friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, who, while they operate one or two mills, have no less than 4,000 square miles of spruce lands in the province of Quebec. Did anybody ever hear my hon. friend in his own province, either publicly or privately or in the public press declaring that the Messrs. Price should not be respected and should not hold up their heads in the community because they happen to have some timber berths which at the present time they are not working but which they might work at any time.

The Conservative party during the time they were in power gave away 511 timber berths without competition for which they received nothing. The Liberal party during the time they have been in power have sold by public competition on the same terms and under the same conditions as were laid down by the Conservatives as the proper rule, 309 berths for which they received for the country $528,878. Yet they tell you that there is no use in applying the tu quoque argument. We have, of course, seen some peculiar developments of that allegation that you should not use the tu quoque argument; when you hear these gentlemen speaking of the Cook and Sutherland claims they are using what might be called a tu quoque quoque argument. We do not need any tu quoque argument to defend our position, but when our friends go on the stump and talk about the glories of the Conservative party and their achievements in this country, the bringing about of confederation, the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the accomplishing of everything that has been done in Canada, they cannot take all the glory they claim without having a word or two of criticism; we must point out some of the things they have done which they ought not to have done, and some of the things which they left undone which they ought to have done. In Stanstead the other day the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) waxed eloquent over the proposition that the Conservative party were the natural rulers of this country. He likened them to a dear old mother who had brought up her children and had reached the time of life when she had disappeared and a step-mother came into the family and he indicated that the Liberal party was the step-mother, and were abusing the children and doing all kinds of things. He was hardly fortunate in his simile. If he had said that there was an unfortunate widower who had got into the clutches of a housekeeper, who after being there eighteen years had come to think that she owned the whole establishment, frittered away all the resources, and took nearly all the money of the old man; and in addition to that fought with the neighbours and became such a nuisance that the whole community demanded that she be turned out, he would have come nearer the true case. The ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. (Haggart) tells us that times have changed and we have changed with them. I know my friends opposite would like to persuade the country that they have changed quite a bit since 1896, but I am afraid they have hardly reached that stage at which they will be able to convince any large portion of the people of this country that their change has been of any radical character; we see the same people in the front

benches, the same people controlling the destinies of the party, except that the new leader has supplanted the old, and the people will recognize the old faces the next time the party appeals to them.

Let me examine some of Mr. Ames' statements. He said that 365 licenses were in existence covering 6,402 miles. Fifty-six of these licenses had been granted under the Conservative government, and were still in force; fifty-six licenses at fifty square miles a license is a fair estimate. Applying these figures you will find that twenty-eight hundred square miles were chargeable to our friends before this government came into power.

Mr. AMES. The minister told us the other day 1,840.

Mr. E. A. MACDONALD. I remember that. I was going to say that we could even take them at twenty-five square miles per license.

Mr. AMES. Take them at what they actually are.

Mr. E. A. MACDONALD. 1,800. That would mean that this government would be responsible for something like 4,602 square miles. The Conservative party granted 29,322 square miles. My hon. friend said that 2,400 square miles was in the hands of speculators. I take the proportion before 1896 of the fifty-six square miles that had then been granted and I find that if you make that proportion properly, of the quantity granted by the Conservative party 343 square miles would be in the hands of speculators. In addition to that I submit there should be deducted from this calculation the 228 miles which belonged to my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) which I submit to any fair-minded man should be classified as belonging to a bona fide mill operator and not a speculator. The hon. gentleman from Dauphin had a right to hold these lands and should not be classed as a speculator.

In another of these statements prepared by the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) and given to other gentlemen who have spoken, the statement used by the hon. member of Calgary, I find one or two little errors which might well be taken into consideration. The hon. member at page 2430 of 'Hansard' purported to give the number of square miles which apparently were applied for but he did not give correctly the number of acres which were surveyed. For instance, if you take berth 1907, advertised September 14, 1903, on the application of J. & M. Young, the amount he puts there is 100 acres, but the description in that lease shows that only twenty square miles were actually alienated. Again with berth 1031 in the same document we find that whereas 118 square miles are alleged to have been alienated, as a matter of fact only 51½ were alienated. Going through the statement accurately you find an error of 137 square miles in the statement of the hon. member (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) which should be deducted from the number given by Mr. Ames. Then you heard the hon. member for Portage la Prairie to-night read a statement made by Messrs. McDonald of Ottawa in regard to the allegation made that they were speculators. My hon. friend has included in his statement the 125 miles which should be deducted. I think the positive statement made by the Messrs. McDonald is one which my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) if he is fair at all, will be bound to accept. In a public leter Mr. McDonald says:

> Any one unacquainted with the real situation, would by the speeches of these gentlemen, be led to believe that we were speculators, buying and holding limits merely to the prejudice of the settlers generally, whereas the truth is, we have for the last three or four years been operating large saw and planing mills, and at the present time are giving employment to over three hundred men.
>
> In view of these facts it will be seen that the statements and insinuations made with respect to the McDonalds are, to say the least, unfair, and while appreciating the difficulty that politicians find in locating political capital, I object to transactions with which I have been connected being so misconstrued and distorted as to convey to the minds of the public the impression that something was wrong.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, in the face of that statement that you must take this 125 square miles of the Messrs. McDonald out of the category of speculation and put it in the list of bona fide operators. Then I find that my hon. friend has only made a mistake—a slight mistake—of 833 square miles. So that after our hon. friends have grown eloquent and their souls have been vexed about the alienation of 2,400 square miles, we find, after deducting these mistakes that we have been enabled to correct, that 833 miles of these timber berths belong to real operators. I fancy that if we kept this debate open for a day or two we would find that almost all, if not all, of these allegations as to speculators would disappear. I venture to make the statement that if a careful examination of these holdings were made it would be found that not more than 500 square miles were in the hands of men against whom it might be said that they were speculators. As to even these, what are the real facts? The hon. Minister of the Interior has notified these men that any one who has had a limit for a reasonable period of years must at once proceed to erect mills and cut lumber and thus take it out of the category of limits in regard to which it might be alleged that they were held for speculation. After all this tempest in a teapot, as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister said the other day, after all this wild tearing of hair about 2,400 square miles of timber lands in the North-

west, we found there are not 500 square miles or the one three hundreth part of available timber lands involved in the whole question. Oh, but the souls of these hon. gentlemen are vexed about the fixity of tenure and the time of the advertisement. I do not need to go into those points, as they have been fully answered. They want to know who the members of the Imperial Pulp Company are, and they drag in the old North Atlantic Trading Company fad, a thing that was explained long ago, and nobody but an antediluvian Tory orator ventures to discuss it in this House to-day. They attempted to drag this in. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, knows very well that the Imperial Pulp Company was incorporated somewhere in Canada, either in the Dominion or in one of the provinces. The hon. gentleman can go around insinuating, and if he does not know who compose the company he can find out if he wants to. They tell us that Governor McMillan, of Manitoba, is one of the gentlemen composing that company. Is not that a frightful thing? Just fancy a gentleman, who, in his long career in that western country, has won the respect and confidence, not only of Liberals, but of those belonging to the party with which these hon. gentlemen are associated, being made the object of attack and innuendo, and having it said that he was connected with a transaction that was improper. I venture to say that there is no man who occupies any position in this country against whom they would not cast insinuations for the purpose of playing their game of defamation. Responsible men, they say, will tell you that there has been no use of tendering for timber limits except through some one who is a favourite with the government. After all the wealth of insinuations that we have had given to us in this debate, did these hon. gentlemen venture to say that there was any man who was proscribed on account of his politics in regard to the selling of one of these timber berths? I watched very carefully, after the statement my hon. friend made, to see if any of these hon. gentlemen would make that assertion, but the perusal of the debate shows that not one of these hon. gentlemen has ventured to make the statement that any man was prevented on account of his politics from having the same fair treatment in regard to the timber lands of this country as is accorded to any man by this government. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior cited the case of Mr. Cowan, of Prince Albert, as to whose political proclivities there does not seem to be much doubt. Why insinuate about it? Why talk about what people are alleged to be saying on the street? Has this House come to this, that every old wife's story, and all the tittle tattle of the corner grocery is to be lugged in here and made the basis of charges against public men? That is the depth to which these hon. gentlemen have descended. They say that so-and-so is talked about the street. What man who has any respect for the position of the representatives of the people in this parliament will descend to such depths in the serious discussion of a public question, and yet we have come to this pass in Canada that there is nothing that these hon. gentlemen, who have been so long out of office, will not do in order to try to get back again. Need I discuss further the question of the values of these timber limits to which my hon. friend referred? My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, at the time that this absurd statement of value was made, stated there and then that the valuation which the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, placed upon these limits was 500 per cent in excess of the price at which the same character of timber was being held in the province of New Brunswick. The statement of my hon. friend, which appears in 'Hansard,' shows that he talked about the settlers in the Northwest, about the injury that is being done to them; and in that connection, just let me quote, in passing, from the Regina 'Leader,' a despatch that shows how things really are:

> Vancouver, British Columbia, January 24.—At a large meeting of lumbermen representing both coast and mountain manufacturers held here yesterday an important reduction in the price of lumber was agreed upon. Rough lumber goes down $3 per thousand, clear $2, and shingles 75 cents. There are immense stocks of lumber on hand at present and nine-tenths of the mills in British Columbia are closed. The situation was undoubtedly forced by the banks clamouring for a reduction of the overdrafts and insisting that the present large stocks be sold off. There is the additional reason that the American mills will cut prices, and sell heavily in the northwest provinces just as soon as the season opens. The wages of mill hands are from twenty-five per cent to fifty per cent lower than a year ago and logs are worth three to four dollars less per thousand. There are approximately three hundred million feet of lumber now on hand, while last year's entire output was not more than five hundred.

That is in reference to the lumber conditions in the Northwest. As to the value of these limits, the only evidence that is submitted to us is the evidence of a real estate agent in Manitoba, anxious to inflate the value of some property that he may possibly sell, anxious to get big commissions. That is the only evidence that my hon friend seriously puts forward in this House, and he asks us to believe it. Let me say right here that the statement of Mr. McDonald to-day directly contradicted the statement of the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) as to the value of the property secured by them, and I find that the hon. gentleman tried to-night to get out of this statement, which will be found in 'Hansard.' Let us see what he did say:

> I do not know who comprise that company, but I am informed that this company have

offered their limits at $3,000 a mile, which would make the price of this one berth $375,000. I am passing no comment on the value of that berth as I have no means of knowing it, but these limits cost by the way of bonus $13,125, or $105 per square mile, and I infer that the company which bought it for $13,125 must have some reason for now asking $375,000 for it.

He stated in his utterance the other day that that was the statement made by the Messrs. McDonald. That hon. gentleman also stated that he did not know who comprised the company, but that he was informed that the company had offered the property at that price. Mr. McDonald positively contradicted that statement, and with regard to these exaggerated values that these hon. gentlemen have stated in the hope of influencing the country, he has given the lie direct to them and put them to the proof. I venture to say that instead of these timber limits being worth $5,000,000, 500 per cent of that amount would come nearer to the correct value, and I venture to say that hon. gentlemen in dealing with this question as regards the values have been quite as unfair as they have been in dealing with other phases of the question.

I was amused at the way the chief whip of the Conservative party conned these papers; he is one of these gentlemen who can smell a scandal further than any one else; next the member for St. Antoine he fairly revels in it. The hon. member for Argenteuil complained that these people in the Interior Department would not accept tenders by telegram, but I venture to make the statement, having some slight knowledge of business in this country, that neither the hon. member (Mr. Perley) himself, nor any other well regulated business man would accept a tender of this kind by telegram. And yet that is a charge which is brought against this government. We know that if a man approaches the consideration of any question with a poisoned mind and with a desire to look suspiciously at even the most proper thing, he can find wrong-doing in almost any thing. When my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) put on his microscope and gathered his experts around him and approached the matter in this spirit, he was bound to find something wrong for if he did not there was something sure to go. I say that any honest man sitting down in his office whether in a department or in a counting house in this country who has to do with the disposition of a property in regard to which the only question for him to determine is how much money he is going to receive from the highest tenderer, could not do otherwise than the official of the Interior Department acted in regard to the tenders. I asked my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) what he would do in regard to this matter of the tender and he said he would call for new tenders. Just remember that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) went and looked at this paper and although he knows nothing about the change at all, he is dead sure there is something wrong. I say that any honest man attending to his business which is to get the most money for these timber berths, would never have questioned this transaction; and, there was nothing in it to question. All that the official of the Interior Department had to do was to report to the minister that a certain amount had been paid by a man who was the highest tenderer and that he did. Talk about collusion. What was he going to collude about. This idea of collusion is suggesting a thing which it is perfectly ridiculous to suggest in connection with this proposition. Could any two men collude against the whole world. With forty-two days notice in newspapers, and notices scattered all over this country, what sense would there be in any two people colluding. But as this debate went on, one hon. gentleman got up and he talked about Mr. Turriff locking himself in his room, his iron clad chamber I think the excited member for North Toronto said. How do they know anything about it? We have not heard anything about secret chambers. One hon. gentleman opposite said they had suspicion in their minds, and because they had suspicion in their minds forsooth, the right hon. gentleman should dance to their whistling and appoint a committee to suit one of the back benchers on the other side. Let me say that if these hon. gentlemen would carry out the golden rule that other people in this world are just as honest as they are, and refrained from going around suspecting wrongly and unfairly their fellow men, they would not be bothered so much about suspicion. Now, where do we stand with regard to this question. We have the same system in dealing with timber berths that was adopted by our opponents; there is not a single case of complaint on record from any tenderer of unfair treatment in this department during the whole ten years of its administration. My hon. friends opposite have gone far in innuendo and suspicion, but they have not been able to produce to this House or to this country a single man who wanted to tender or who had tendered in the Department of the Interior, who had ever alleged he had not received fair treatment. And if there are no complaints of that kind these hon. gentlemen are worrying themselves unnecessarily.

Let me ask: Is there any instance of any sale of any of these timber limits at any of the fancy prices which hon. gentlemen opposite allege they are worth. There is not one tittle of proof in that respect, and when the minister tells us that whenever a possible objection might be taken about holding timber berths without operating mills upon them, notice has been given to these holders of timber berths that mills

should be provided, every possible shred of the case presented by these hon. gentlemen falls at once to the ground. All that my hon. friend from St. Antoine could say was: that at least in the case of one timber limit disposed of it had aroused his suspicions. My hon. friends opposite, after all their declamations after all the excited language they have used, the very best their leader upon this question could say is, that in the case of one limit he thought it was disposed of under circumstances that might be characterized as suspicious. Is not that a great case to ask for a commission upon ? And when we happen to have in this House in the person of the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turiff)—a gentleman who has as much right to be treated as an honourable man as any one who sits at the left of the Speaker—and when he stands up in this House and declares that so far as regards these tenders there was no wrong-doing, is there one man who has in his make-up the slightest scintilla of fairness who will not say that the statement made by my hon. friend from St. Antoine, that the circumstances in one case might be characterized as suspicious, falls to the ground. If there should be any suspicion created by the hon. member (Mr. Ames) would it not be removed by the word of an honest honourable man, and is there any fair minded man in this country who need worry about suspicions. As I have said, if a man approaches a proposition of this kind, intending to misconstrue, intending to misrepresent, intending to think evil of his fellow man, it is very easy for him to find circumstances which are suspicious. But if any one considers all we have heard as a judge or a jury should do, desiring to do that which is fair and right and to render to every man his due, I say that from all we have heard in this House during the past three days discussion there is not the slightest scintilla of evidence to warrant this motion being granted by the House. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether you ever have read the story called 'Ten thousand a year,' but if you have you will recollect that it describes the efforts of a firm of lawyers called Quirk, Gammon and Snap, who were engaged in the task of promoting the claims to the peerage of a gentleman known as Mr. Tittlebat Titmouse. These gentlemen laboured long and wearily and Mr. Quirk was very wise and very suspicious, and Mr. Gammon was as smooth and as oily as any gentleman of that particular type could be, and Mr. Snap was aggressive at every stage of the case as it went along and they won at some stages and people thought Titmouse would get the peerage. Now my hon. friend from North Toronto is the Quirk of the Conservative party, my hon. friend from St. Antoine is the Gammon of the opposition firm, and there are so many Snaps that I could hardly number them. Mr. Speaker. But just as the firm of Quirk, Gammon and Snap failed to land this peerage for Tittlebat Titmouse, so will hon. gentlemen opposite fail to impress this country with the message which they are now attempting to send forth and will never reach office by these methods.

Just one word in conclusion. I find that a distinguished gentlemen who sits on the front benches on the other side once used this language in this parliament :

> I think it is time that the hon. gentleman dealt more fairly with his fellow members in this House who are endeavouring to discharge their duties here as faithfully and honorably as himself. I think it is time that we settled down to business and endeavour to do something useful for which the country gives us our indemnity. I think it is time that we endeavoured to carry through legislation which will be beneficial to the country instead of taking up the whole time of the House in fishing and alleged scandals, in making allegations that cannot be substantiated and in trying to create the impression in the country that there is something wrong at the seat of government in the hope of destroying the feeling of confidence in the government which prevails throughout the country to-day.

My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) used that eloquent language some years ago in this House. I commend to my hon. friend as an old parliamentarian the task of impressing on his friend the member for St. Antoine and some others who sit behind him, the virtue of this beautiful language.

Mr. SPROULE. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the circumstances were as different from the present circumstances as day is from night.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I am sorry that my hon. friend is not growing mellow with advancing years, because if he were he would know that his words are just as true to-day as they were in 1891 when he uttered them. I apologize for trespassing on the attention of the House at such length at this late hour. I ventured to do so because I felt that my hon. friends opposite were not dealing fairly with this House and this country, and I submit that their apparently sincere appeals to the right hon. gentleman who leads this House for a committee are not sincere, and the right hon. gentleman would not be justified for one moment in paying any attention to them. This motion should be defeated.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I fancy that when the Premier to-night lays his head upon his pillow, with the terrible indictment of the hon. member for North Toronto still ringing in his ears, and with the full knowledge of the fact that not only the eyes of the members of this House, but the eyes of the people of this country as a whole, are upon him, he will not take much consolation from the stump

speech and the attempted comical stories that have been perpetrated by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). This is not a time in the history of Canada for frivolous stories. It is not a time to indulge in buncombe. It is a time when not only the eyes of Canada, but the eyes of the whole world, are on the right hon. gentleman. Why, Sir, what does the great English press to-day say of the position the Premier occupies ? The right hon. gentleman has been fortunate in the past few years ; he has gone to England on more than one occasion and has been treated there with a great deal of adulation and flattery, and has been thrown into contact with the best people in the mother land. There has been a time too in the province of Ontario, that greatest province in this whole confederation, when the right hon. gentleman thought well of the people there and of their opinion. What does the right hon. gentleman think to-day of the opinion of the English press of himself and those by whom he is surrounded ? The 'Economist' says

> The worst his opponents can allege is that he has been remiss in not ordering an inquiry in the Interior Department and not dismissing those about him who make a vulgar display of riches, acquired no one knows how, unless by official malversation on a grand scale.

And the right hon. gentleman has sat there all day long, consulting notes, and has time and again picked up from his desk a file of papers, intending to reply to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who he knew was going to speak ; yet so strong has been the indictment made by the hon. member for North Toronto that the right hon. gentleman dare not rise in his place and reply. So, forsooth, what has been done ? Something had to be done, and so my genial friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), ever on the alert to deliver a stump speech or to repeat a funny story, has filled in the breach. Yes, the right hon. gentleman will go home to-night, but there will still be ringing in his ears that terrible indictment against his government. There have been times when the right hon. gentleman has awaked to the emergency of the occasion. There was a time when he stood up and said that the stories of the immorality of members of his cabinet were so strong that he had to listen to them. He heard those stories on the street, and I venture to say that they came to him in letters from all parts of the Dominion ; and what has he had to do? He has had to drive the unclean element out of his cabinet on the score of immorality. What has he done in regard to these charges against colleagues who have acquired riches, 'no one knows how unless by official malversation on a grand scale.' I need not tell the right hon. gentleman what stories are repeated from one end of this Dominion to the other, or give him the names of the gentlemen who have been implicated in these scandals. I will not use the word scandals ; I will say the statements of facts. It is idle to say that he has not heard the stories of the suddenly-acquired wealth of the four gentlemen whose names have been on the lips of every man in this House and of many people throughout this whole country. What is he face to face with to-night ? A week ago, knowing exactly what was in the documents—for no one will believe that he did not know, until he got up and made the statement that he never looked at that file until it was laid on the table of this House the other day——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I never did.

Mr. BENNETT. I will accept the right hon. gentleman's statement that he never looked at that file until it was laid on the table the other day ; but I will say that it was passing strange that he did not. Then, why did he refuse day in and day out to allow it to be produced? It is not because it was against a rule of the House, because he had allowed before official files to be brought down. We accept the word of the right hon. gentleman that he never saw that file until it was laid on the table, but he must imagine that the people in the country are very credulous if he thinks they will accept that statement. It must be however accepted by the House. The record was brought down and what was presented? The only thing presented was this, and it is a statement that never will be accepted by any sane man as a truthful one. When I speak of the truth of the statement, I am not attacking the statement made by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) who gave the story as told him by Mr. Fraser. What is the statement of Mr. Fraser? It is that he wrote out the tender and, as he says was the custom, filled in the figures at the last minute before closing it and sending it to the department. But where was the necessity of Mr. Fraser leaving the amount in blank when he had instructions to bid a positive sum, namely $7,000? Mr. Fraser's statement is that he had received instructions to tender at $7,000. Why then did he leave the amount blank?

Mr. OLIVER. I might say that Mr. Fraser told me it is customary, in preparing a tender for submission to the department, to have it written out without the figures being filled in, leaving a blank for the figures, so that there will be no opportunity for any one to know what the figures were, as Mr. Fraser himself would be the only one who would know and he would write them in himself.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Fraser wrote the tender out himself. He wrote it out in his own office and placed it in his own pocket and walked up to the department with it.

Will any reasonable man accept the explanation that he was afraid to mark in the figures in his own office when he had placed the document in his own pocket and handed it to the minister himself? Such a statement is absurd and incredible. Take all the elements that go to mark out this piece of strategy, and strategy of a poor kind, and it is only on a par with the original files exhibited to-day. Here are men supposed to be rival contractors, and the one man writes out the two tenders and the other signs his name to one of them. Does the right hon. gentleman know what is going on to-day in the Department of Public Works? Does he know that that kind of thing is going on? I tell him it is. I would like to see the right hon. gentleman visit the Committee of Public Accounts next Tuesday, and he will see my statement verified. Why was the other tender made out in different coloured ink and why did not Mr. Fraser bring that second one up? Has the minister an answer to that?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Fraser said that having received an order from his client to put in a tender at $7,000, he knew that the tender at $1,000 would have no value, but he was compelled, by the understanding he had with his associates, to put in that tender.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER. I am giving the information as it is asked for. He put in the tender, as he had agreed to do with his associates, knowing that it was of no value, and therefore it was not of importance whether anybody knew or not what the amount was.

Mr. SPROULE. Why did he withhold the name of the tenderer?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know.

Mr. BENNETT. If the second tender of $7,000 was an honest tender, why did he not write it on his own office paper as he did the first? Can the minister explain that? No one can. Why is the First Minister afraid to single out this case and have an investigation? In my opinion he takes the charitable view that not to give an investigation will prevent perjury. That is the only reason which can at all satisfy his mind.

Talk about suspicions regarding the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). Why, the evidence is uncontradicted that he opened those tenders in his own room and alone. The First Minister does not know what is going on around these departments. Does he know that one of the principal officials in that department has the goods in his house under a chattel mortgage to the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff)? Does the right hon. gentleman know that? Will the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) deny it? He cannot very well deny it, because it is a matter of record in the chattel mortgage office in this city. This man who comes here and says that his hands are clean has got right in his clutches, down to the last chair in the man's house, a chattel mortgage on the property and on all the belongings of one of the principal clerks in the Department of the Interior. There will be no difficulty in the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) getting all the information out of that department which he wants, so long as that clerk is there. Where are these two gentlemen, Mr. Nolan and the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff)? Are they on friendly terms? Why does not the First Minister say he must clear the skirts of Mr. Fraser who is a prominent Liberal; I must have him go into the witness box and swear that that tender, when he handed it to Mr. Turriff, was in the condition in which it is to-day. Every circumstance of time and place is against that contention. Look at the figures, written without doubt by Mr. Fraser, giving the dates, and look at the figures that stand there for $7,000? They are as different as day from night. If Mr. Fraser were ever placed in that witness box I do not believe he would swear, in the face of the damning evidence, with the figures all different, that he inserted those figures of $7,000. Who did, that is the question. There is one point that is uncontradicted and that is that one man alone looked at these tenders when they were opened and that was the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). These hon. gentlemen want charges made. Would it not be foolish for anyone on this side to say that the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) filled in those figures? What reason have we to make such a charge? I cannot make it. What reason have we to say that some clerk under the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), perhaps the unfortunate victim, who is writhing under his chattel mortgage, filled in the figures. I do not know who filled them in, but I do know that there are two papers standing there to-day that bear on their face most damning proof of being fraudulent, and the public will never believe that they are not fraudulent until the oath of the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) is pledged, and the oath of Mr. Fraser is pledged. But, let me go a little further. There is a charge made here that no $7,000 cheque was inclosed with Nolan's tender? And, in the case of Currie, also, the insinuation is that this tender was not properly made. This thing can be probed to the bottom. If Nolan placed in that envelope a marked cheque, you can find out from his bank that, on that date, a cheque for that amount was charged against his account.

Every business man knows that, and if Currie did not place a cheque in the envelope, that too can be proven by his bank account.

The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has fallen on stormy times. Let him remember that that which brought about the fall of the Ross administration in Ontario was scandals about their timber lands. Let him remember that that government gave to its friends and favorites properties that were worth thousands for a mere bagatelle. The public mind is keenly alive to these wrongs. The public do not believe that there has been straightforward selling to these men, who, from comparative ease in life, have reached a state of affluence that is known throughout this city—and, as an hon. friend suggests to me, throughout this whole country. The time has arrived when speeches such as that of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald)—and I say it in no disrespectful way—are not sufficient answer to such charges as those made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). It is not too late for the right hon. Prime Minister to accept the proposition made; it is not too late to move an amendment that, in this case, there be a searching inquiry. That will meet the wishes of hon. gentlemen on this side. But better than that in the hon. gentleman's eyes, it will meet the wishes of the right hon. gentleman's friends throughout the country—and he has many friends not only on the Liberal but on the Conservative side, friends who believe in his honesty of purpose and believe that he has stood out against the influences by which he is surrounded. These people read carefully what has been brought to light in the Public Accounts Committee. Let me remind the right hon. gentleman of one pitiful exhibition made in that committee last year. A man stood there giving his evidence who had been employed at $3 a day to watch the loading of a dredge. He had never gone near the dredge, but had simply gone to another employee of this government and paid him half the fee he was getting to do his work. And that witness stood there, unabashed, and said: I believe a man has a right to defraud the country as things are now. Is not that a terrible state of affairs? It is not too late for the right hon. gentleman to move an amendment that there should be a thorough investigation. I think the right hon. gentleman is uneasy in his conscience. I think he feels that it is due to his Liberal supporters and admirers throughout the country that there should be an investigation. For, whilst he listens to the flatteries of fawning sycophants amongst his supporters, he must see also the stern faces of men whose respect he would sooner have than the loudest flattery of some of those behind him. Let him remember the words that Shakespeare has placed in Wolsey's mouth:

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Give them to us.

Mr. BENNETT. I am not appealing to the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. A. Johnston)—Shakespeare is above him. Let the hon. Prime Minister remember the words.

I feel within me
A peace above all earthly dignities,
A still and quiet conscience.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Lake).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Ames,	MacLaren,
Avery,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Barker,	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Bennett,	Marshall,
Bergeron,	Martin, (Queens, P.E.I.),
Blain,	Monk,
Boyce,	Morin,
Brabazon,	Northrup,
Bristol,	Owen,
Broder,	Perley,
Chisholm (Huron),	Pringle,
Christie,	Reid (Grenville),
Clements,	Roche (Marquette),
Crocket,	Schaffner,
Daniel,	Smith (Wentworth),
Foster,	Sproule,
Ganong,	Stanfield,
Henderson,	Staples,
Herron,	Taylor,
Hughes (Victoria),	Walsh (Huntingdon),
Jackson (Elgin),	Ward,
Kemp,	White,
Lake,	Wilmot.
Lalor,	Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Lancaster,	Worthington,
Lefurgey,	Wright (Muskoka)—55.
Lennox,	
Leonard,	
Macdonell,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adamson,	Lapointe,
Archambault,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid).
Aylesworth,	Laurier (L'Assomption),
Beland,	Lavergne (Drummond & Arth.),
Bickerdike,	LeBlanc,
Black,	Logan,
Bole,	Lovell,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Macdonald,
Bourbonnais,	Maclean (Lunenburg),
Boyer,	Macpherson,
Brodeur,	McColl,
Brown,	McCool,
Burrows,	McCraney,
Caldwell,	McIntyre (Perth),
Calvert,	McIntyre (Strathcona),
Carney,	McKenzie,
Caron,	McLean (York, C.),
Carrier,	McLennan,
Cash,	Marcile (Bagot),
Clarke,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Conmee,	Mayrand,
Copp,	
Crawford,	

Cyr,	Michaud,
Delisle,	Miller,
Demers,	Oliver,
Desjardins,	Pardee,
Devlin,	Parmelee,
Dubeau,	Paterson,
Dugas,	Parent,
Dyment,	Pickup,
Emmerson,	Power,
Ethier,	Proulx,
Fielding,	Pugsley,
Finlay,	Ratz,
Finlayson,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fisher,	Rivet,
Fortier,	Robitaille,
Galliher,	Ross (Cape Breton),
Gauvreau,	Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Geoffrion,	Rousseau,
Gervais,	Savoie,
Girard,	Schell (Glengarry),
Gladu,	Schell (Oxford),
Gordon,	Sifton,
Guthrie,	Sinclair,
Hall,	Sloan,
Harty,	Smith (Nanaimo),
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),	Smith (Oxford),
Hunt,	Talbot,
Jackson (Selkirk),	Templeman,
Johnston,	Tobin,
Knowles,	Tolmie,
Lachance,	Turcotte,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Wilson (Russell),
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Wright (Renfrew),
	Zimmerman.—111.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Telford,	Tisdale,
Law,	Lewis,
Greenway,	Haggart,
Lemieux,	Borden (Carleton),
German,	Osler,
Meigs,	Clare,
Watson,	Elson,
Kennedy,	Alcorn,
Graham,	Barr,
Bureau,	Paquet,
Stewart,	Porter,
Carvell,	Fowler,
Loggie,	Cockshutt,
McCarthy (Simcoe),	Armstrong,
Tourgeon,	Forget,
Martin (Wellington),	Seagram,
Grant,	Maclean (York, S.),
Turriff,	Beattie,
Roche (Halifax).	Thompson.

Amendment negatived.

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

Mr. FIELDING. If the hour were not so late I would ask the attention of the committee to the special estimate concerning seed grain in the Northwest, but I think the committee will hardly wish to proceed to-night.

Progress reported.

Mr. FOSTER. What business will be taken up this afternoon ?

Mr. FIELDING. Supply, the first estimate to be that regarding seed grain.

Motion agreed to and House adjourned at 3.25 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 7, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—OPENING OF TENDERS.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I am sorry I was not in the House last night when the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) was speaking, but I notice from the report of his speech that he made this statement :

> I am sorry that the ex-Minister of Railways is not here because he is the only gentleman opposite who has any experience in opening tenders, but I venture to submit that when he was having tenders awarded in his department he did not have any conclave assembled, but one man only opened them in the days when John Haggart was Minister of Railways.

Let me assure the House that I never was present at the opening of any tenders in my life when I was Minister of Railways, and furthermore by an order of the department it was absolutely necessary in the opening of the tenders that the deputy head of the department and another official should be present. It was they who opened the tenders and upon their report the contracts were awarded.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the orders of the day are called I ask the Minister of Public Works when I may expect a return that was ordered by the House on the 15th of January with reference to the erection of a breakwater in Prince Edward Island. I will send over a memorandum. I would like to have the return as soon as possible.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The returns are being prepared as rapidly as possible by the staff which is at the disposal of the department.

SUPPLY—CANADIANS ENTERING THE UNITED STATES.

The Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto) : Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the government, and particularly the attention of the

Minister of the Interior, to a practice which has grown up recently in the United States of turning back Canadians who are passing the international boundary line without any just cause or reason. I have before me a case in which some residents of Toronto—in this instance they were chiefly Macedonians—had left Toronto to go to Europe and on returning to their home in Toronto, together with certain friends whom they were bringing out to Canada, and having return tickets to the city of Toronto, they landed at the port of Boston and were refused permission to proceed to their destination. They were deported without reason, were sent back to Liverpool, and they had to return subsequently at great expense, delay, and discomfort to themselves. I have received a letter from a Toronto firm of solicitors who act for these people, and as it summarizes the facts I shall read it. It would appear that the American authorities considered apparently that the Canadian authorities did not want these people in Canada. I think this is a proper subject for inquiry by the Minister of the Interior. I shall read the letter and leave it to the minister to take action.

Mr. OLIVER. Give me the name of the firm of solicitors so that I may communicate with them.

Mr. MACDONELL. The solicitors are Allan, Cassels & Defries. The letter reads :

A client of mine has interested me in the hard luck of some fourteen Macedonians. Most of these men were at one time residents of Toronto and had gone back to visit their friends and relatives in Europe and were returning to Toronto with some of their friends when they were stopped at Boston by the American commissioner and without being given any opportunity to communicate with their friends or to establish their right to proceed to their destination in Canada (whither their transportation tickets read) they were deported. The ship in which these people were expected arrived in Boston about December 23 last. On the 24th their friends here telegraphed to the commissioner at Boston to ascertain why they were not allowed to proceed on their journey. They received in reply a number of telegrams to the effect that these parties were 'debarred as likely to become a public charge; Canadian authorities do not want them in Canada.' Subsequent inquiries showed that they had been shipped to Liverpool. I got into communication with the department here and they cabled the Dominion government agent at Liverpool to return these parties. This was done and they are now in Toronto. I have received an account for their transportation from Liverpool. It appears to me that the American commissioner at Boston, one George Billings, acted in a very high-handed and arbitrary manner with the result that these people were put to a great deal of unnecessary discomfort, annoyance and expense. I do not know how to obtain copies of the instructions issued by the Department of Immigration to their officers, if any, at American seaports or to the United States officials. I thought perhaps you might oblige me by asking the requisite papers to be brought down and laid on the table of the House. The matter is one which may call for some attention on the part of the government, as it will be highly improper to permit without protest American officials to debar persons from entering who had tickets through to Canadian points and who had every right to proceed.

I notice that the very same thing has taken place at Buffalo lately where on two occasions parties from the city of Toronto having business to do in the United States were turned back and subjected to annoyance and delay without any apparent reason. It would seem from the letter I have read that the American authorities had some information that the Canadian authorities did not want these people in Canada. I hope there is some mistake about that. The facts are simple and I trust the Minister of the Interior will make proper inquiry to see that justice is done to these people who have suffered at the hands of the American authorities without any apparent reason.

THE PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of the right hon. the Prime Minister to the fact that in the year 1900 the government decided to build a bridge at Hillsborough, P.E.I. The matter was brought up in this House, and Mr. Martin, the member for Queens, P.E.I., asked the following question :

1. When are tenders to be called for the construction of the Hillsborough bridge at Southport in Prince Edward Island? Are the tenders to be called for the work as a whole? If not, what division of the work is proposed to be made?
2. What limit of time is proposed for the completion of the work?
3. Does the government provide for the safety of foot passengers and other persons using the highway portion of the bridge?
4. What is the estimated cost of the bridge now proposed to be built? What was the estimated cost of bridge proposed to be built under section 2 of chapter 4 of the statutes of 1899?
5. What proportionate share of the cost of the bridge is the province of Prince Edward Island to contribute under the agreement for construction entered into on the 18th day of April, 1899?—capitalizing the half-yearly subsidy from the province at current rate of interest.

The reply to that question was as follows :

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Preparations are being made for inviting tenders for this work, and hope in a few days to send out advertisements to newspapers. The work will be di-

vided into two sections, the substructure in one, and the superstructure in the other.

2. Not yet fixed.

3. I asked the hon. gentleman to allow that to stand. The answer I have received does not correspond with my own recollection of the facts.

4. The estimated cost of the bridge is $750,000. The original estimate was something less than $1,000,000.

5. The provincial government shall contribute annually towards the interest on the cost.

I want to draw the attention of the right hon. First Minister to the fact that on the 23rd January last I asked the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in regard to an item published in the press, as follows :

Mr. Collingwood Schreiber has been appointed sole arbitrator in the claim for extras of Mr. M. J. Haney, of Toronto, who was the contractor for the bridge across the Hillsborough river, Prince Edward Island, and which cost the government $1,500,000. Mr. Haney is claiming $300,000 as still due him. The investigation will last all this week.

To that the Hon. Mr. Graham replied :

The item may be correct. I am not sure as to the details. It is true that Mr. Schreiber has been appointed arbitrator to settle a claim made by Mr. Haney against the Department of Railways and Canals.

In January 22 the question was asked of the Minister of Railways and Canals, as will be found on page 1751 of 'Hansard' : What was the total cost of the construction of the Hillsborough bridge ? Reply given was : $1,363,085.57. It was also asked what claims are outstanding, and the reply given was : $393,821.04. So that if this claim is paid the total cost of the bridge will have been $1,756,906.61 or $1,006,906.61 more than it was originally estimated to cost. The original estimate of the cost of this bridge was prepared by Mr. Schreiber, the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals, and the work of construction was done under his direction. It indicates a very strange state of affairs that a gentleman occupying the position of Mr. Schreiber should have made an estimate of that kind; and now to have a claim for extras equal to half his original estimate of the whole cost seems to me to show a state of affairs that warrants a thorough investigation. I have understood it to be the practice for many years, both under the previous government and under the present government, when a claim comes before any department, particularly a very large claim as in this case, that it is referred to the Exchequer Court. That court was established for the purpose of investigating claims of this kind. It does seem very strange to me that the man who prepared the original estimate and under whom the work was done should be appointed sole arbitrator to decide how much should be paid for extras. On the face of the matter it would seem as if some grave mistake had been made, either in the original estimates or while the work was under construction, by which this government has paid more than it should have paid. We had a sample of Mr. Schreiber's work before the Public Accounts Committee last year, when it was shown that accounts were presented to him by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railroad Company for $165,000, and he certified and passed those accounts, and if it had not been for the action of the hon. Minister of Finance this country would have paid a large amount which it was not entitled to pay. I think the government should explain why this claim was not submitted to the Exchequer Court where it would have been thoroughly investigated. In face of the fact that the contractor was paid twice as much as the original estimate of the cost of the bridge, it looks to me as if this were a matter that would not stand a proper investigation before the Exchequer Court, and therefore Mr. Schreiber was appointed to cover it up so that all the facts would not come to light. I think the Prime Minister should at once cancel the arbitration and send the case to the Exchequer Court, or else give the people of this country some explanation of why this particular course has been taken. A case of this kind, in which there is a possibility of suspicion that matters are not all right, should certainly be sent to that court. From what I have heard, there is a grave suspicion in Prince Edward Island that this government have paid for this bridge much more than they should have paid, and the course the government have taken in appointing Mr. Schreiber as sole arbitrator of this claim, instead of sending it to the Exchequer Court, convinces me that they do not want to let all the facts come to light. I think therefore that we are entitled to an explanation from the government for having singled out this case and put it in the hands of Mr. Schreiber. For my part I have not any confidence in Mr. Schreiber's investigation of that matter in the interests of this country after what was brought out in the Public Accounts Committee last session.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am sorry that my hon. friend did not give me any notice of his intention to bring this matter to the attention of the House. Had he done so, I would have taken some precaution to have the information laid at once on the table, which he desires, and I shall give instructions at once, in the absence of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) who is unfortunately detained by illness at his house, to have all the papers brought down at the earliest possible moment. The hon. gentleman will realize that it is impossible for me at this moment to discuss this matter, which is a technical departmental matter. The hon. gentleman is, however, entitled to all light on the subject and will be given

every information possible, but I think that his remarks are in bad taste, to say the least, in so far as they refer to Mr. Schreiber. Mr. Schreiber is only human and like all of us subject to err, but no one has the right to challenge his intentions. motives or honesty. He has been selected to this work and will be quite prepared at the proper time to give an account of his service, and in the meantime the hon. gentleman has no reason to make the assertions he has done.

Mr. FOSTER. It is only fair for me to explain that about ten days ago I informed the Minister of Railways and Canals—soon after, I think, that question was put in the House—that at the next time the House was moved into Committee of Supply, the matter would be discussed and I asked him if he would be prepared to make a statement then. Since then the minister, as we all regret, has not been able to attend our sittings; but in the meantime, as I understand it, the arbitrator has been appointed and the arbitration is going on. This morning I wrote the Deputy Minister asking him to consult his minister and have a statement sent by his minister to one of his colleagues so that the latter could answer the inquiry in the House. Every precaution possible therefore was taken in order to give the minister, or some one for him, due notice and an opportunity to reply.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have just received the card of Mr. Butler this very minute.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Butler was busy in the Public Accounts Committee all morning.

Mr. FOSTER. I saw the letter go into his hand. I sent it by special messenger.

Mr. EMMERSON. He was on the witness stand and not able to attend to any of the affairs of his department.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be, but the Prime Minister was under the impression that we had not been sufficiently courteous to give notice. We did give notice, and that it did not result in the statement being made here is due to the fact that Mr. Butler was where my hon. friend says he was. That is the position. I would not mind the thing going over until the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) can be here, but in the meantime the arbitrator has been appointed and the arbitration is going on. It is important that we should have a full explanation before the House before the matter goes too far.

On January 22, my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) moved for an order of the House for copies of all papers in connection with Mr. Haney and the Hillsborough Bridge, also copies of papers re the proposed Intercolonial workshops and sidings at Moncton. These papers have not yet been brought down. My hon. friend gave that notice so that we might have the papers before us when discussing this matter. It may not be true that the arbitration is proceeding at present, but I would not like the matter to go irrevocably until the House has had some chance to discuss it. Under the circumstances. I do not think we can carry it any further until the proper information is brought down, and I hope the minister will have that by Tuesday next.

Mr. EMMERSON. In justice to Mr. Schreiber, it is but fair to say that the original estimate referred to was prepared by the chief engineer of the Intercolonial, Mr. W. B. McKenzie, and not by Mr. Schreiber. Subsequent to that, the character of the bridge was changed very materially.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the ex-minister (Mr. Emmerson) answer this question Who was it that certified to the final estimates on the bridge?

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. W. B. McKenzie, the chief engineer of the Intercolonial.

Mr. HAGGART. Who was the officer in the department here? It must be certified here.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is done by the official at Moncton who has charge of the work.

Mr. FIELDING. There is a difficulty that it may be as well to mention at once. These contracts with the Railway Department leave matters very largely to the ultimate judgment of the chief engineer of the department, as the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is aware. It so happens that at the time when Mr. Haney was pressing this claim, the chief engineer of the department was Mr. Butler, who in former days was Mr. Haney's engineer in charge of the Hillsborough bridge. Having been in that way associated, on behalf of Mr. Haney with the work, he could not undertake to act on behalf of the government in certifying to the account. Inasmuch as for that reason it was impossible to have the ordinary machinery of the department applied, it was thought well that Mr. Butler should stand aside and that Mr. Schreiber should be deputed to act in his place. The present Deputy Minister of Railways, Mr. Butler, was Mr. Haney's engineer in charge of the bridge, and Mr. Butler would not wish, nor would the government permit him, to act at present in the judging of Mr. Haney's account. That is the reason he was put aside.

Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand that Mr. Schreiber is simply put in the position of Mr. Butler for the purpose of certifying to the account ?

Mr. FIELDING. More than that. Mr. Schreiber has been given full power to determine the whole matter.

Mr. A. MARTIN. This question is not very new to me. I have brought it to the attention of the government on more than one occasion. I think, however, that at pre- these additional extras are now claimed after that bridge has been completed and in operation for two or three years, there is strong ground for suspicion. It is a very suspicious circumstance that Mr. Haney should be coming to-day with a claim for extras amounting to nearly one-half the original estimated cost of the bridge. There is one thing I want to bring to the notice of the First Minister and that is that the bridge is not a new one by any means. When it was first proposed, it was estimated to cost $500,000. The next estimate was $700,000. The next $750,000. The superstructure is an old bridge which has been on the Intercolonial for thirty years, yet it was supposed that a new bridge was built there. It is not the first time that I have stated in the House that that bridge is a second hand one, which had been in use on the Intercolonial thirty years, and was then brought down to Prince Edward Island, and the cost of that bridge, which was estimated at $750,000, at present amounts to nearly $2,000,000. These extras have excited suspicion in the minds of the people, and that suspicion has been excited not only with regard to that bridge but with regard to the few miles of railway which the government built there a few years ago. The estimated cost of that railway was $12,000 a mile, but when the road was completed it was found that the cost was $31,000 a mile. And I have no hesitation in saying that somebody has raked off three-quarters of a milion on the bridge and another three-quarters of a million on the railway.

Mr. GANONG. Who was the contractor for the railway ?

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN (Queens). Mr. Kitchen, a friend of the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson). The old road was built in Prince Edward Island in 1873, when rails were worth $90 a ton and labour was as high as it is to-day, and when there were not nearly the facilities that there are to-day for the building of a road. Yet they built that road equipped it complete at a cost of $16,500 a mile. How is it that when this road was finished it cost $31,000 a mile, particularly when you consider that the rails used on it were rails that had been on the Intercolonial for thirty years and were removed to Prince Edward Island and charged against the contractor of that bridge at $20 a ton ?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question ? When he speaks of this being an old bridge, I suppose he is referring to the iron?

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN (Queens). To the superstructure—that is what I said, and I thought the hon. gentleman would understand.

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman did not use the word 'superstructure.'

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN (Queens). I used that very word. But what I complain of, and what, I think, I have good reason to complain of, is that hon. members stand up in this House and tell us of the large expenditures made in Prince Edward Island, though we believe that more than a million of it is pure graft. The ex-Minister of Railways stands up here and quotes the railway report, showing that over $7,000,000 was expended in Prince Edward Island. There is not a word of truth in it. Why, take this very railway report itself and see how one page contradicts another. I would ask the hon. gentleman to turn to page 127 of this railway report, where it is stated that $7,000,000 was expended by the Dominion government in Prince Edward Island. Then turn to page 49, and you will find that the amount spent for railway construction by the province before Confederation was $3,144. Then, on the next page, it is stated that the amount expended by the province of Prince Edward Island previous to confederation was $3,144,000. These statements are distinctly at variance. Then, further than that, does the ex-Minister of Railways, when he speaks here, take into account that the local government is paying the interest of half the estimated cost of that bridge ? The province of Prince Edward Island is taxed $10,000 a year as its quota for the construction of that bridge. That is, they pay half of the $800,000 which it should have cost. However, this question can be more fully discussed on a resolution of my own which is to come up before long, and I shall have an opportunity to discuss it more fully. Had I known that this matter would be brought up to-day, I should have been prepared to discuss it. Now, I may say that if the government wish to gain the confidence of the people of Prince Edward Island, they will not allow this $393,000 for extras asked for by Mr. Haney, to be referred to one person as arbitrator. Let it go to the Exchequer Court to which all such claims are sent. The presumption is, down in Prince Edward Island, that all these claims will eventually be paid. I have read over the contract, and I would like to give the House a sample of what I found. According to the specification, the contractor was obliged to furnish galvanized spikes, and yet there is a charge of $5,000 extras for galvanized spikes. Of course, it is quite true that $5,000 would not go very far in election times. They want the money. I am a little suspicious about where the greater part of this money is to go. But as I said, I should have an opportunity to discuss more fully the expenditures made in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings). The hon. member (Mr. A. Martin, Queens) is in error in saying that the railway recently constructed in Prince Edward Island cost $31,000 a mile.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN (Queens). I said distinctly that I spoke of the branch between Murray harbour and Charlottetown.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings). I understood that, but I say that is an unfair statement. The original railway cost $16,500 a mile. In order to make up the amount he has given, the hon. gentleman had to take in the cost of the bridge—a very expensive bridge on a short piece of railway.

Mr. A. MARTIN. If the cost of the bridge were added to that railway, the total would represent not merely $31,000 a mile but over $60,000 a mile, for the bridge and the railway each cost about the same figure.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong, as the figures will show. The railroad cost about $22,000 or $23,000 a mile, and it is easily proved. It is a different character of railway altogether from the original railway. It was built to the standard of the Intercolonial, while the original road was of a very inferior character, so that there is no fair comparison. There is a difference of statement between myself and the hon. gentleman, who says that the railway actually cost $31,000 a mile. I have not the figures, but I can get them, and I am quite satisfied the hon. gentleman is mistaken unless he adds the cost of the bridge.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I am sure that people living in or near Toronto, who are at all interested in matters political, will be astounded when they hear that an arbitration is to be undertaken under such circumstances. It is notorious in Toronto that Mr. M. J. Haney is the head and front of the Liberal party in Toronto to-day. If I mistake not, he is president of what is known as the Liberal Association of the city of Toronto, the head and front of the whole party organization there.

Mr. CALVERT. An awful crime.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not say it is at all a crime for Mr. Haney to be president of that association; but I do say that when the government of Canada is going to engage on behalf of the people in an arbitration with a contractor who stands close to and is a very warm friend of the government, it is high time that every safeguard should be thrown about that arbitration.

I have not a word to say about Mr. Schreiber as an old and tried servant of the Dominion of Canada; but there is this to be remembered, that if Mr. Schreiber's time is not fully occupied with the work he has in hand as chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Transcontinental Railway, it should be. That project involves the expenditure of millions and millions of dollars, and it demands the whole time, the best service and all the talents that Mr. Schreiber can give in the interests of the country. For what have we an Exchequer Court if it is not to deal with arbitrations, especially where such enormous sums are involved? The hon. gentlemen think that a trifle of $365,000 or $400,000 is a bagatelle. The people are suspicious of these arbitrations, and expect that every safeguard will be thrown about them. It is to be regretted that Mr. Justice Burbidge is ill, but the government had secured an eminent judge to act as a substitute, Sir Thomas Taylor. Is there any reason why Sir Thomas Taylor could not undertake that arbitration and why Mr. Schreiber should be withdrawn from the service of the country for which he is paid a very handsome salary, delegating his duties to another, and taking part in this arbitration?

The Minister of Finance stated that a close relationship had existed between Mr. Haney and Mr. Butler, the present deputy minister; that Mr. Butler had been Mr. Haney's chief engineer. Is there not even a closer relationship between Mr. Haney and Mr. Butler?

Mr. FIELDING. There is not to my knowledge; it may be so. Mr. Butler acted as Mr. Haney's engineer, and therefore could not properly advise the government in this matter. I do not know anything about any other relationship.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not vouch for it, but I have heard that there is a close relationship existing between the two gentlemen. I do not know if that is so or not.

Mr. FIELDING. What harm would there be in that?

Mr. BENNETT. I would have thought, after the discussion of the last two or three days, that relationships would go for something.

Mr. FIELDING. If Mr. Butler has not acted in the matter, what difference does it make what relationship there is?

Mr. BENNETT. That is what I am coming to. On behalf of Canada some one must act in that arbitration; Mr. Butler is the head of the department under the minister. In the Public Accounts Committee Mr. Butler stated that he is the supreme power in that department, that things were different when he took it in hand and changed about the whole control of the Intercolonial Railway. Every one knows that Mr. Butler is a man of great authority in the department. Time and again when matters have been brought up in this House in connection with that department the defence of the government has been: We can do only one thing, employ a man in whose honesty and skill we have every confidence, and rely on him and on him alone. The government is going to rely upon him for the proper conduct of

that arbitration on the part of the people of Canada. The minister says it will not be Mr. Butler. Very well then, who is it to be? Why does Mr. Butler hold the position he does? Is it not by reason of the fact that the government have every confidence in his probity and ability? No one is attacking that, certainly I am not; but you are going to delegate the duty of looking after this large arbitration to whom? Not to Mr. Butler, because the Minister of Finance says he will be excepted because of the relationship hitherto existing between these two gentlemen, and so, perforce, it must go to some subordinate in the department.

There is another reason why it should not be conducted by Mr. Schreiber. Mr. Schreiber is only a creature of this government. His dismissal or retention in office depends on their sweet will. Why should Mr. Schreiber be made the sole arbitrator in an adjudication of a claim by a most prominent friend of the government? Why should he not be free from such an entanglement, and the matter be relegated where it should be—to the judiciary of the country?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does the hon. gentleman imply that Mr. Schreiber is subordinate to Mr. Butler?

Mr. BENNETT. No; the right hon. gentleman mistakes me. I say that Mr. Schreiber is in the employ of the government, that he is a creature of the government, to go or to stay at its bidding, and you are going to place him in a position where he is to be the sole arbitrator upon a matter involving such an immense amount of money. The hon. member from Prince Edward Island has stated that this claim is not a meritorious claim, and that it should be brought up, not before an arbitration such as this, where the arbitrator is an employee of the government, but before the judiciary. The Exchequer Court has been organized at great expense to deal with such matters and is to-day presided over by Sir Thomas Taylor, a man of eminent worth and undoubted standing in the judiciary; then why should not these duties devolve upon him rather than upon a man who is an employee of the government? All men have human feelings, and Mr. Schreiber may not care to run against the wishes, if he thinks there are wishes, of the government in that regard.

But here is the main point. If this work is a work of a great kind as this claim is a large claim, you are going to be debarred in the arbitration from enlisting, on behalf of the people of Canada, the active support of the present deputy minister, Mr. Butler. The Minister of Finance will admit that if this arbitration goes on Mr. Butler will be debarred from giving to the people of Canada, through his department, any suggestion, any advice or the benefit of his ability. Why should that be? When an arbitration involving upwards of $400,000 is brought on in his department, Mr. Butler can, I think, give all the advice necessary for the benefit of the government if a judge acts as arbitrator. It will be manifestly different if the arbitrator is one of the departmental staff. I think the right hon. First Minister should announce to-day, on behalf of the government, that this arbitration, whether it has been commenced or not, shall be entrusted to a judge of the Exchequer Court.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP. I wish to subscribe fully to everything the right hon. the First Minister has said in regard to the honour and integrity of Mr. Collingwood Schreiber. I am sure that no person on this side of the House has the slightest desire to reflect upon Mr. Schreiber's honour or integrity. At the same time, it does seem to me that if the government had exercised all their astuteness to select the one man in the Dominion of Canada who was peculiarly unfitted to discharge the particular duty now assigned to him, they would have selected Mr. Collingwood Schreiber. The history of this bridge is such that the government could not have considered it for one moment before selecting Mr. Schreiber as sole arbitrator in respect to these contractors claims for extras. The original estimate of the cost of the bridge was $750,000, then it was increased to $900,000, later on the Minister of Finance stated to the House that it would be completed for $1,100,000, subsequently the estimate got up to $1,500,000. It appeared that somebody had blundered and blundered very badly. The Minister of Finance, explaining why the original estimate was so much exceeded, said that the bridge was to be 630 feet longer than it was at first expected to be. We all know that Mr. Schreiber was the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals in the days when this bridge was constructed, and was responsible to the government and through the government to the people for the proper doing of the work. When it was decided to enlarge the bridge further tenders were not called for, but practically a new contract was given to the old contractors. Under these circumstances it seems to me that one can well say, without casting any reflection on Mr. Schreiber's honour or integrity, that he is personally interested in showing that everything was reasonably and properly done. The most honest man in the world is the man whose judgment is liable to be influenced when unconsciously he has a personal interest in the decision. Besides, Mr. Schreiber was removed from his position of deputy minister and placed in another position, in which it has been made his duty to revise certain accounts which are sent in. We remember that last year an account of some $160,000 was sent in by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and was certified by Mr. Schreiber, although the officials of the railway company refused to exhibit the vouchers for the account, and withdrew $50,000 or $60,000 of their claim rather than exhibit them

to show what the money was really spent for, and it was only owing to the astuteness and integrity of a subordinate official that the country escaped paying that $50,000 or $60,000, and it has not been paid up to this day. In view of this fact, it seems to me, without reflecting on Mr. Schreiber's integrity in the slightest degree, that he is hardly the proper person to select as sole arbitrator in this case, when the government goes out of the ordinary course to remove it from the courts, where all parties would have to acquiesce in the justice of the decision, no matter which way it went. Therefore I think, in justice to Mr. Schreiber that he should not be asked to discharge duties which, to the sight of many people, he could not fairly and properly discharge.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the Minister of Railways if the arbitration is now going on ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That makes the matter a little serious as we are asked to discuss a question that may be disposed of. It seems to me that it might be as well not to go on with the arbitration in the meantime. I would like also to ask the minister if when the matter comes up again he will be prepared to state the price at which this second-hand bridge was sold to the contractor, and bring down the papers in connection with that sale. I understand that the superstructure was second-hand and was bought from the Intercolonial Railway at a certain rate.

Mr. FIELDING. It was a bridge across the Miramichi river which was transferred and became a matter of account between the two roads.

Mr. GRAHAM. I must acknowledge that I do not feel much like making a speech on this or any other question.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not do it if I were you. We are going to take the question up again next week.

Mr. GRAHAM. I want to make an explanation which, if it were known to my hon. friend would have prevented his saying what he did. The hon. member for North Toronto wrote me a note some days ago stating that he was going to bring this matter up. In that note he asked me one or two questions. One was the total amount paid to Mr. Haney under his contract. The answer is $1,066,491.96. He also asked the amount paid to Mr. McDonald. The answer is $64,749.61. I am not conversant with the history of this bridge from its conception. I understand that it was discussed and passed on by the House, as a work of necessity. The question I wish to answer more definitely is this : Why was Mr. Collingwood Schreiber the one man appointed as arbitrator to settle the outstanding claim ? The first reason is because it was the most efficient and to my mind the most practical way to settle that claim. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) will understand perhaps better than any one else that in the Railway Department there are continually arising additional claims made by contractors.

The form of the contract is such and the engineer's certificate can only be made absolutely in accordance with the letter of the contract. Even though the chief engineer knows and will say that the government owes a contractor a balance in equity for work done, he cannot as chief engineer give a certificate if it is outside the form of the contract. These things are not new ; they have been coming up day after day and year after year in the department as I find from the records. I want to say further that if there is anything wrong in appointing an engineer as single sole arbitrator, that wrong has been perpetrated ever since there was a department, and I merely followed the precedent which was time and again laid down by the preceding government. I did not make the precedent of appointing a sole arbitrator to settle such claims. I find that time and again under the former government not only was it an ex-chief engineer who was appointed but that the actual chief engineer of the department was made sole arbitrator in regard to a work over which he was chief engineer at the time.

Mr. HAGGART. Since the appointment of the Exchequer Court ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think so. The late Mr. Page was in scores of instances appointed sole arbitrator.

Mr. HAGGART. That was before the Exchequer Court was established.

Mr. GRAHAM. Since there has been an Exchequer Court the late Walter Shanley, was appointed sole arbitrator, and made his award and the government accepted it. That is a matter of fact, it is not a matter of opinion. In the case of the claim made by the late Hugh Ryan in connection with the Soo canal which was constructed when my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) was minister, the claim of the contractor was referred to the late Walter Shanley as sole arbitrator and he decided between the late Hugh Ryan and the government. I followed the lines laid down by my predecessors in office, and even though these gentleman may repudiate it now I say that these were lines of common sense and of absolutely business principles. This is not the only case, there are dozens of others, and if hon. gentlemen will investigate these cases they will find that the only possible way to arrive at a practical solution by which both the contractor and the government will get fair play is to appoint an arbitrator who can in a measure lay aside technical impediments and

investigate these claims in a business-like way. Let me say that I am trying to apply to that department and the work in it the same business principles that I have always tried to apply to my own private affairs. I do that where the law does not prevent me, but in some cases I find that I cannot arrive at a conclusion as expeditiously and as fairly as I would like to in the settlement of these claims. I might say to my hon. friend that there are in the department several claims that should be settled, and I further say that no government, because it is a government, has the right to defraud any contractor out of a dollar it owes him in equity. I think that is an honest position to take, I think it is a position the country will sustain. The government, of which my two hon. friends opposite were members, followed that line and did in many cases exactly what I have done in this case, and what I would like to do in other cases. Now, I would have preferred to select the present chief engineer and thus to follow absolutely in the footsteps of my predecessors, but the present chief engineer of the department was chief engineer for Mr. Haney at the time the work was carried on and it was too delicate a position to put him in—he would not accept anyway and I would not ask him. As it was not possible to do that I appointed Mr. Schreiber, who is ex-chief engineer, and notwithstanding anything that has been said I believe that Mr. Schreiber is absolutely honest and perfectly capable of carrying on the arbitration that has been entrusted to him and of bringing in an award which while fair to the contractor will be absolutely just to the government and to the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. HAGGART. Years ago, as the hon. gentleman has said, the chief engineer of the department sometimes sat in review over his own final estimates. That was in Mr. Page's time but the anomaly was pointed out and the absurdity of the chief engineer sitting in judgment to review his own report was so apparent that parliament thought it well to appoint an Exchequer Court and give it jurisdiction over all these matters of disputed accounts. The Minister of Railways cannot show that it was the practice of the department to appoint the chief engineer to such a position after the Exchequer Court had been appointed. We thought it improper to appoint the chief engineer and to give him power to judge of the equities of the claim of a contractor against the department. and in that view the Exchequer Court was established. If there are equities in a claim against the government, it is for the government itself and not for its chief engineer, to decide that these equities exist, and as has been done over and over again the equities of the case as well as the law may be referred to the Exchequer Court. It is true that the estimates in reference to this particular bridge were made by an engineer of the Intercolonial Railway but the responsibility lies with the department and with the deputy minister who reports to the House as to what is necessary for the purpose of carrying on the work. What we object to is that any officer of a department shall sit in review upon his own work, and if there are equities in the case the government should set forth these equities in an order in council and empower the Exchequer Court judge to inquire into them. Therefore, I must protest that in the management of the department, ever since the creation of the Exchequer Court, there has never been, that I am aware of, any such reference to an officer of the department for the purpose of making inquiries such as the Minister of Railways and Canals explained to the House to-day.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am authorized by Mr. Butler, the chief engineer, to state absolutely that there is no foundation for the assertion that he and Mr. Haney are related in any manner whatever.

FRUIT INSPECTION.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel). Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to an article that I will read to the House. It is headed :

Apples wrongly marked— Trade Commissioner in England complains to department.
(Special to the 'Mail and Empire.')

Ottawa, February 4.—Mr. Jackson, Canada's trade commissioner at Leeds, writes the department that the Fruit Marks Act is not being observed, and that all kinds of apples are being put into a barrel and wrongly marked. This, he says, should be remedied. In one case a dealer paid seventeen shillings for a barrel and had to sell them for fifteen shillings. There were some very fine barrels sent from Ontario, but because of the dissatisfaction which arose from defective marking the price was not realized.

I wish to say that there have been articles of this kind appearing in the newspapers for some time past and that we remember that the hon. Minister of Agriculture pointed out to the House that we now had a perfect Fruit Marks Act in so far as perliament could make it so. But I would like to draw his attention to the fact that there are a large number of complaints that the condition of the export apple trade in this country at the present time is not at all satisfactory and that a great deal of the complaint is made against the Fruit Marks Act and the manner in which it is administered by the government.

Mr. THOMAS SPROULE (East Grey). As this subject is up for consideration and as it is on the same line, the minister while he is on his feet may deal with the ques-

tion which my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) has brought up at the same time as he does with that which I propose to bring to his attention. I have a copy of a letter which was addressed to the Hon. Mr. Fisher, Minister of Agriculture, and which reads as follows :

Middleton, Nova Scotia, October 22, 1907.

Hon. Sydney Fisher,
Minister of Agriculture, Ottawa.

Sir,—I beg leave to call to your attention the following facts:

Freeman Fitch, of Clarence, in the county of Annapolis, is at present employed by your department as inspector of fruit under the provisions of the Fruit Marks Act.

As such inspector his duties are to inspect apples packed by growers and dealers thereof and to ascertain if they are packed in accordance with the provisions of the said Act.

If, as such inspector, he finds apples fraudulently packed he is required to mark the package in which such apples are contained with the words 'falsely marked.' It is also a part of his duty to prosecute parties violating the provisions of the said Act.

From the quasi-judicial nature of the office of inspector it is possible for the occupant of the said office to discriminate between those toward whom he is friendly disposed and those toward whom he is unfriendly disposed.

The ratepayers of polling district No. 111, in the county of Annapolis, are nearly all engaged in the pursuit of raising apples for sale, and it is a part of the duty of the said Freeman Fitch, as said fruit inspector, to inspect the apples as packed by the different ratepayers of said polling district No. 111, in the said county of Annapolis.

The said Freeman Fitch is at present a candidate for the office of municipal councillor to represent the said polling district No. 111 in the municipal council of the municipality of the county of Annapolis. The election for the said office will be held upon the 19th day of November, 1907, when the ratepayers of the said polling district will elect their councillor by ballot.

As a candidate at such election the said Freeman Fitch is peculiarly open to the temptation of showing favouritism as an inspector to those of the said ratepayers of polling district No. 111 as may support the said Freeman Fitch at the said election and discrimination against such of said ratepayers as do not support him at said election. If elected as a councillor the said Freeman Fitch will be peculiarly tempted to refrain from enforcing the law against his supporters for the fear of estranging their support, and his usefulness as an inspector will in the nature of things be seriously impaired.

The time spent by the said Freeman Fitch in canvassing the said polling district as a candidate as aforesaid, coming as it does at the season of the year when his official duties are the most pressing cannot but interfere with the proper discharge of his duties as an inspector as aforesaid, as will also his duties as a councillor, should he be elected to that office.

All of which facts are respectfully submitted for your careful consideration.

Yours respectfully,
A. L. DAVIDSON.

Attached is a declaration as to the correctness of the allegations contained in the letter. I understand that the hon. Minister of Agriculture gave to Mr. Davidson a reply, a copy of which I have in my hand and which is as follows :

Ottawa, October 25, 1907.

Mr. A. L. Davidson,
Middleton, Nova Scotia.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of yours of October 22 and note what you say in regard to Mr. Freeman Fitch and his duties as inspector of fruits under the Fruit Marks Act.

Your statements require careful consideration, which I shall certainly give them. I cannot say, however, speaking from memory and without investigation, that there is any law or rule in the public service that debars members from taking part in municipal affairs.

I will see what the practice is in regard to such things, and will act accordingly.

I am, yours very truly,
SYDNEY FISHER.

As far as I know no further information has been vouchsafed in regard to this case than that. I do submit to the Minister of Agriculture the question if it is not very improper for a man acting in this capacity and who would in the very nature of things —it is only human nature to do so—be likely to favour his friends in some way or other to a greater extent than those who are opposed to him in an election. I do not think, of course, that politics enter into it at all. I do not see anything that indicates that there is any political question involved whatever. But it is the duty of an employee of the government to do certain work. If he runs for a position in the municipal council, part of the community will be for him and another part will be against him; those who are against him are obliged to come under his inspection afterwards and he is in a quasi judicial sense deciding as to whether they have done their duty properly or improperly in packing apples, whereas he does this same duty in regard to those who are his friends. Does not the minister think that it will seriously impair his usefulness? Will it not be likely to destroy the confidence that many people will have in him there who are obliged to submit to his arbitrament in such cases and who have been perhaps strong opponents in the election contests in which he has been engaged? In my judgment it is entirely wrong and I think that the minister ought to have given attention to it before and that he should have communicated something to his inspector there that would have prevented him from taking the very anomalous and onerous position as between the different members of the community with whom he must deal afterwards.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I will reply to my hon.

friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) first as the subject he has mentioned is fresh in my mind. The correspondence which he has read has been before me. Mr. Fitch is not a permanent officer of the department, he is an employee for part of the year as a fruit inspector and for a part of the year he is his own master. I am not prepared to formulate positively an opinion as to the advisability of employees of the government taking part in municipal affairs. It is a moot question and I think it depends largely upon circumstances and the character of the employment. I was not prepared to say to Mr. Fitch that he should not be elected to the council of the municipality unless he resigned his position. I hardly think that the circumstances would justify that. As to the supposititious statement in the letter, I shall be prepared to deal with the events which the writer fears may happen, should they ever happen, but I am not prepared to express an opinion on such supposititious events. The idea expressed is that Mr. Fitch may act improperly. Well, if he ever should I shall look into thes accusations.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman not regard it as important that confidence should exist between the inspector and the people he has to deal with, so that they will feel there is no possibility of their getting other than fair play?

Mr. FISHER. Certainly. But I must confess I look upon the letter as the outcome of a miserable squabble between what are probable rival aspirants. I do not know that the gentleman who wrote the letter was a candidate against Mr. Fitch or interested in some one who was a candidate against him, but the trend of the letter makes it look like an attempt to injure Mr. Fitch in a municipal contest which he had an undoubted right to enter if he chose. Mr. Fitch is not a permanent employee of the department. He does not work for it the year round. He is not paid by the year, but by the month, which makes a little difference.

Mr. SPROULE. This communication states that Mr. Fitch was in this contest when he should have been performing his duties as inspector.

Mr. FISHER. The department will inquire whether Mr. Fitch was paid during the time the municipal contest went on. Unless it be shown that Mr. Fitch's entry into a municipal contest at that time was inconsistent with the discharge of the duties to the department, I am not prepared to go into the squabble.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does not the minister think that this is a case in which the officer should not be encouraged to go into any municipal contest because that might lead people to suspect that he was not giving fair play to those who were opposed to him when performing his duties as inspector?

Mr. FISHER. I am not aware of any charge against Mr. Fitch of unfair dealing. This writer imputes to Mr. Fitch such a possibility, but I cannot inquire into possibilities.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the minister think that would be allowed in England?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say whether it would or not, and I do not very much care. In so far as matters of that kind are concerned our Canadian officials have as good a record as the English. I am not willing to have any reflections cast on the honesty and integrity of either the Canadian people or officials. I believe they stand well before the whole world and can bear comparison with the officials of any government on the face of the earth. I did look into the matter and I found no complaint of Mr. Fitch's actions. There is nothing in the department to show that there was any imputation of wrong doing, and under the circumstances I do not think it would be in the public interest to interfere in what appears to be a municipal squabble over a municipal election.

With regard to a statement which the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) read from a newspaper, the head of the branch, in which the Fruit Marking Act is administered, sent a statement to the newspaper in response to some such paragraphs as have been published in the last few weeks. I have not that statement here, but I will say that we have at present some 40 or 50 prosecutions under way for wrongly marking fruit packages. We have been enforcing the Act fairly and I think judiciously. In no case have we undertaken a prosecution in which the individual was not convicted. But we do not undertake prosecutions, as a rule, when a person has filled in the wrong mark for the first time and when it appears that he did this through ignorance. It would not be fair to the individual to do anything that would savour of persecution, but whenever an individual has been found marking his fruit wrongly and it is the second offence, we invariably prosecute him and exact the fine. It never was the contemplation of parliament, in passing the Fruit Marks Act, that the department should undertake universal inspection or universal prosecution. The Act is one which provides the individual himself with the machinery for protecting himself. But incidentally, for the purpose of dealing with the export and interprovincial trade especially, certain inspectors were appointed whose duty it would be, as far as the number of them would permit, to take up cases of evident intentional fraud and deal with

such cases instead of throwing the burden on the individual who might be aggrieved. Especially is this done when the individual aggrieved is not in a position, owing to the locality in which he lives and that in which the offender lives, being wide apart, to conveniently bring a prosecution and carry it to a successful conclusion.

With regard to the export trade, with which this paragraph in the papers has especially to deal, this has been rather an exceptional year. We have had a very large quantity of rather small sized fruit. We have had sent forward to Great Britain a very large quantity of packages, and these packages have been marked under our Fruit Marks Act, on the whole, legally. But I want to point out this. While, usually, our fruit is of large size, this year the best of our fruit—or nearly the best of it—is of only medium size. It is of good enough quality, so far as spots, or blemishes, or hurt in the packing, is concerned, but the size is deficient. Under the Act, the definition of grades of apples for export, medium sized apples are allowed to be marked No. 1, and our people have taken full advantage of that provision this season. It has been usual for our packers and exporters to mix the largest and medium apples, so that the average package of No. 1 would contain a large number of large apples, and a moderate quantity of apples of medium size. This year, there has been a marked absence of the large apples. The result has been that our apples marked—quite legally—No. 1, have consisted almost entirely of medium-sized apples, otherwise good enough. I have no doubt that this has led to the formation of an opinion in Great Britian that our No. 1 apples this year are not equal to those of ordinary years. There has been some criticism and complaint. In a number of these instances, perhaps in all, the complaints have been founded on that misconception as to what may be legally marked No. 1, So far as the enforcement of the Act is concerned, it is not our duty to examine every package that goes forward—it would be a physical impossibility to do it—but we have examined packages as in former years, and where apples have been found to be improperly marked or packed, we have had a number of prosecutions. As a matter of fact, to-day, there are about forty or fifty prosecutions being taken before the courts. I think we are doing our duty in the way of enforcing the Act; and, while our export apple trade this season is not giving us the credit which it earned us in former years, still, I think the Fruit Marks Act has saved the country from a very deplorable disaster, which otherwise would have come about.

Mr. BLAIN. How many inspectors are there ?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot give the mumber offhand. The number is the same as last year and the year before. I have been urged very strongly to add to the number of inspectors, and, possibly, it would have been wise under the circumstances of the year to increase the number somewhat. But hon. members opposite will remember how severely they have criticised me for finding places for my friends and they can understand why I hesitated to appoint more inspectors.

Mr. F. R. LALOR (Haldimand). I am glad that this matter has been brought to the attention of the House; I had intended to call attention to it myself later on. Earlier in the present session, I did call the attention of the minister in this House to the question of apple inspection. The 'Free Press,' of this city, came out with big headlines over its report of that debate 'Not true.' What will the farmers of Haldimand county think of Mr. Lalor?' I am not worrying very much about that because I think the farmers of Haldimand county think that Lalor is all right. I know something about the export apple business, especially this year, and I speak with some experience. I noticed that, after I brought the matter to the attention of this House, it was only a short time after that when the inspectors of the government got busy and a seizure was made in the port of Montreal of about 60,000 barrels of apples. It was found that these were marked in pencil on the head 'No. 3,' but they were branded, 'No. 1.' I believe that up to that time there had been little or no inspection of apples, even for export.

Mr. FISHER. What was the date ?

Mr. LALOR. I have forgotten the exact date, but it was before the Christmas holidays.

Mr. FISHER. There were dozens of prosecutions before that date.

Mr. LALOR. I had an opportunity of seeing a good number of the apples being packed for export, and I can tell the minister that they were absolutely not packed according to the Fruit Marks Act, nor were they marked on the end of the barrel according to that Act. At my own station, the town of Dunnville, a shipper of apples came to me and asked me to go and look at some apples just loaded on the car. In fact, there were two of these gentlemen, and both were very strong Liberals, one especially. I went to the car and he opened up a barrel which was marked 'No. 1.' I said, 'Surely you are not going to ship these apples branded No. 1?' He answered, 'Yes; we got a pointer that anything would go this year.'

Mr. FISHER. Where did he get it ?

Mr. LALOR. That is a question. I can only say that I know others who did not get it. And, on the strength of that pointer,

that anything would go, he was packing practically No. 2 and No. 3 apples, and branding them No. 1. And I know that shippers have been doing that all season, and no seizure made, no difficulty encountered. And the result is that the apple export business has been almost ruined by that sort of thing. The packer who packed his apples honestly and branded them properly, sending his apples to the British market, found that the name of Canadian apples has been ruined in that market by this false branding that hardly any price can be got for them. I know of returns that have come in of fruit that brought only $1.20 a barrel in Great Britain. And I have in my possession a letter from the largest receiving house in Great Britain, telling me that the reason for this kind of thing was that the English purchaser had come to the conclusion that he could not depend upon the branding of Canadian apples, and not knowing what was in the barrel, he had to buy them as No. 3. That is the kind of thing that has ruined the market this year, and has so discredited the name of Canada in the British fruit market that it will be a long time before the minister will be able to restore that name, and give the Canadian apple the standing in Great Britain that it ought to have. I believe that the Fruit Marks Act is a good Act, if properly administered; but, this year, there is not the slightest doubt the Fruit Marks Act was not properly administered.

Mr. FISHER. In what way was there remissness?

Mr. LALOR. You allowed them to brand No. 3 as No. 1.

Mr. FISHER. Does my hon. friend undertake to say that the department is expected to inspect all apples that go forward?

Mr. LALOR. I think when you have a Fruit Marks Act and have an army of inspectors to do that inspection, they should do their duty and should not be biased by any political reasons in doing it.

Mr. FISHER. Certainly.

Mr. LALOR. I do not like to insinuate what that reason is, but I believe that the Canadian fruit market and the name of Canada in Great Britain in connection with apples was ruined on account of the election in East Northumberland.

Mr. FISHER. In what way?

Mr. LALOR. There was so much dissatisfaction in that apple shipping county that even a special inspector was appointed there during the election to inspect the apples.

Mr. FISHER. And the department refused absolutely to make any change in the enforcement of the Act, right in the election.

Mr. LALOR. But a special inspector was appointed who was a friend of the government and of the candidate to inspect the apples going forward in order to please the shippers, and the true reason, without the slightest doubt, for the ruin of the name of Canada in the English apple market is the election in East Northumberland. Many apple shippers in this country have suffered on this account. I believe the Act is a good Act and should be enforced, but I do not see why Canada's good name in the apple market in England should not be maintained.

I find that in some important ports of this country there are no inspectors and apples pass through these ports in large quantities without inspection. If we have a law we should live up to it. It is the farmer who suffers indirectly from the absence of proper inspection, for while the apple shipper may get a good price this year, next year, owing to the discovery of this false branding, the price will not be so good, and this is ruinous to the market; apple buyers will be afraid to pay anything on account of criticisms of this year's shipments.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Did the shipper pay the farmer the price of No. 1 for his No. 3 grade or did he pay the farmer the No. 3 price for No. 3 apples and then get the price of No. 1 himself?

Mr. LALOR. In many cases they bought by the barrel No. 1 and No. 2, but it has become a common practice to buy by the orchard in which case of course the shipper would make all the money derived from false branding. If we had proper inspection the name of Canada could be kept up to that high standard which it should have in the English market.

Mr. C. L. OWEN (East Northumberland). I have the honour to represent an apple-growing riding and therefore wish to speak on this subject. I would first ask the minister why it is that the apples from eastern Ontario are subject to inspection while apples from western Ontario, shipped via Niagara Falls or Black Rock to Boston and New York, are not subject to inspection?

Mr. FISHER. That is not the case.

Mr. OWEN. Where are they inspected?

Mr. FISHER. Any place where they happen to be found.

Mr. OWEN. Have you any inspectors in western Ontario, and if so, how many?

Mr. FISHER. We have, but I cannot say offhand at the moment how many, two I think.

Mr. OWEN. Are there any at these ports?

Mr. FISHER. Not at the ports, no.

Mr. OWEN. I was given to understand by a large fruit man in western Ontario that not a barrel or box of fruit shipped by Suspension Bridge and Black Rock was subject to inspection.

Mr. FISHER. We do not have inspectors placed at any one particular point. The inspectors travel about and they are liable to drop on a shipment at any place at any time, and the Niagara district and that neighbourhood which ships by the ports mentioned, is inspected just the same as other portions of the Dominion

Mr. OWEN. I was told by a large fruit man in western Ontario that that was not the case, but I will, of course, accept the minister's statement. I would then ask why it is that farmers of eastern Ontario are subjected to such rigid inspection, more rigid than in other portions of the Dominion?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think they are.

Mr. OWEN. It is well known that half a million barrels are shipped from Nova Scotia with very little inspection.

Mr. FISHER. Excuse me, we have a larger number of inspectors in Nova Scotia, in proportion to the amount of fruit exported, than in Ontario.

Mr. OWEN. I am going to endeavour to prove to the minister why the Fruit Marks Act is not in the interest of the farmer. An apple buyer with some few years' experience, on entering an orchard, can tell very nearly the number of barrels it will produce ; but no matter how much experience he has he cannot tell the number of barrels of No. 1 and the number of barrels of No. 2 in the orchard. The apple shippers from my section, Brighton and Colborne, where 300,000 or 400,000 barrels of apples are shipped every year, find it necessary to rob the No. 1 quality in order to bring the No. 2 up to the standard of inspection, and it is well known that it is the No. 1 quality that commands a high price in the British market. The No. 3 quality are not shipped at all, in fact many buyers do not take them from the trees ; and unless the farmers pick them themselves and take them to the evaporator, where they will bring from 30 to 40 cents a hundred, they are allowed to remain on the trees until they are frozen. Last season was a very late season for apples as for everything else. In our district they began picking apples rather early and they were fined for shipping apples too green. That made the shippers very cautious and they allowed the apples to remain on the trees two or three weeks longer so that they were caught with the early frost and thousands of barrels were shipped that had been twice frozen to the core before they were picked from the tree. There should be some clause in the Act permitting shippers in such a season as last year to pack the apples a little earlier than they do ; this would prevent the shipping of frozen apples. I have had several letters from shippers in my district with regard to this Act ; they say they are trying to live up to it, but they have heard that in other portions of the Dominion it is not being lived up to, that the apples from these other districts are not inspected ; improperly marked apples go upon the English market lowering the price. The inferior apple makes the price for the good apple and in that way I claim that the Act is not in the interest of the apple grower in this country, because it is not impartially enforced. I cannot understand why the farmers or other shippers of eastern Ontario are treated differently from the shippers in other parts of Ontario or the Dominion. I do not think it is fair for the shippers of eastern Ontario that their fruit should be subject to a rigid inspection when such is not the case in other parts of the Dominion.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). In reference to this matter, I am not so well informed as other hon. gentlemen who have spoken upon it. However, I do not think that the inspection has been so lax in western Ontario as has been claimed. During the Christmas holidays I was talking to a gentleman from the county of Bruce who ships large quantities of apples year after year, and he told me that a number of barrels of apples that he had shipped this fall—I do not know by what port they were shipped, whether by Buffalo or by Montreal—had been held up for inspection and found not to be properly marked. He said that the Act was a good Act, and that while he would have to pay the penalty of shipping apples falsely marked, he had no complaint to make. He said that the fault was his own or that of his employees, that he had instructed his employees to pack carefully, but that they had not been careful to do so, and that he would have to pay the penalty. He made a suggestion. He said that in his own case, as probably in many other cases, the inspection had been made a long distance from his home in some of the cities and a large number of inferior barrels of apples were placed upon his hands there, owing to his own fault, and which he might much more profitably have dealt with had the inspection been made at his own home. His suggestion was that it would be a good thing in the interest of the shipper if it could possibly be arranged that the inspection could be made at the point of shipment rather than at some place a long distance from there.

Mr. LALOR. In answer to a question asked by myself on December 9, the hon. Minister of Agriculture informed me that there are—

Nine fruit inspectors stationed at different ports of the Dominion as follows: Montreal, Quebec, four; Quebec, 1; Halifax, Nova Scotia 1; St. John, New Brunswick, 1; Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, 1, and Vancouver, British Columbia, 1.

Which, I think, will show that the ports are not all properly equipped with inspectors.

Mr. OWEN. That will prove to the minister that apples in western Ontario are not subject to inspection. There is no inspector up there, according to his own answer.

Mr. FISHER. These are the permanent inspectors. Besides that, during the apple shipping season, we have five or six more who are employed for a few months, and we always have at least two of these in western Ontario. The men in Montreal practically inspect most of the apples that come down from Ontario for shipment to Europe, just the same as the man in Halifax inspects apples leaving that port for Europe. But, in addition to these, we have, during the apple shipping season, six or seven—I forget the exact number—of temporary employees, such as Mr. Fitch, whom my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was speaking of a little while ago, whom we employ for six or seven months in the year, and these are the men who do the work in western Ontario. I would like to say to my hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Owen) that he was not present during the discussion in regard to this Act when the Act was passed through parliament, but that it was then distinctly understood that there would be no attempt to inspect all the fruit. It would require an army of inspectors. The fifteen or sixteen that we employ each year during the apple shipping season, nine of them permanently the year around and some six or seven temporarily, could not possibly inspect more than 10 per cent of the fruit that is shipped from Canada, to say nothing of any of the interior fruit. If the proposition of my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) were to be adopted, I would have immediately to treble the number of my fruit inspectors. I will do that if parliament thinks it is wise or necessary, but it would involve to a very considerable extent a change in the methods of the enforcement of the Act which I never felt justified by the discussion which took place in parliament in doing.

Mr. LALOR. If I might suggest to the minister, and I do it with the intention of giving him good advice——

Mr. SPEAKER. The only motion before the House is a motion to go into Committee of Supply, and on that motion the hon. gentleman has only a right to speak once, except with the consent of the House.

Mr. FISHER. I would be very glad to hear what the hon. gentleman desires to say.

Mr. SPEAKER. With the consent of the House the hon. gentleman may be allowed to speak again.

Mr. LALOR. I think that the suggestion of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) to have inspectors at the point of shipment would be impracticable.

Mr. FISHER. It would be very expensive.

Mr. LALOR. Yes, though I believe that if at ports like the International bridge and the Suspension bridge inspectors were placed it would have a good effect, because shippers would then know that they would run the risk of inspection.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the minister form any idea from his experience of the year or so that the Act has been in force as to what proportion of the apples that are exported are really inspected?

Mr. FISHER. I have had these figures exactly; I would not like to speak from memory, but I will furnish my hon. friend with a statement of the proportion. It is not a large proportion—quite small—I do not think 10 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. The point that would appeal to me would be this: You put in force an Act which purports to give a foreign buyer a protected article—protected by the inspection and stamp of the government.

Mr. FISHER. No; I think my hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. FOSTER. It works out in practice that not 10 per cent of the apples that go to the foreign market really have the benefit of the inspector's work. Is it not much better to have no Act than to have an Act so improperly carried out?

Mr. FISHER. Does the hon. gentleman wish me to answer him now?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will be speaking again on the subject, and he may defer it until then.

Mr. MARSHALL. I would like to ask the minister if he really thinks in his own mind that this inspection is any benefit to the apple packers?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, emphatically.

Mr. MARSHALL. The reason I ask that question is that we have an apple packer in the section in which I am living. He thinks the inspection is of no use, and the reason he gives is just that which you have mentioned—that the inspection is not sufficient, that there are not inspectors enough. It seems to me that unless these apples can be all inspected the inspection is useless. I am not prepared to say how many apples are going into the old country without inspection, but it seems to me that if they are not all inspected it is of no use whatever. I am only quoting what a large packer in East Elgin said to me. He was not condemning the system at all, but he said: I think the present system of inspecting apples does not go far enough. Apparently the inspection of apples is very much like the inspection of canned goods. I am aware that the minister has not appointed a sufficient number of inspectors, but I must tell him

that as far as he has gone I am pleased with the system. He has had one or two men out inspecting the factories. That is very necessary, and I am going to give him all the encouragement I can, for the reason that I think it will be a benefit to the business. I do not think it is necessary, as I said last session, to have an inspector at the factory while the packing is going on. It is too expensive, and it is unnecessary. But as far as the minister has gone, I think it is going to improve the quality of canned goods very much in so far as cleanliness is concerned.

THOROUGHBRED CATTLE—EXPORT TO THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). At the present time in the city of Ottawa there are a large number of influential Canadians from all parts of the Dominion attending a convention of the National Live Stock Association, and it may be an opportune time to bring to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture a matter concerning our live stock industry. I understand there is a practice in the United States whereby Canadians who import thoroughbred animals from the old country and then sell them into the United States have to pay a fee of $100 on each animal before it can enter the United States. We were under the impression that the quarantine of cattle going into the United States was entirely abolished, and I confess it was a matter of some surprise for me to learn that this fee of $100 is exacted. I do not say of course that it is an actual quarantine on these animals, but it amounts to very nearly the same thing. It is an indirect tax of $100 imposed by the United States Breeders' Association on each animal. Has the Minister of Agriculture taken any steps to have that penalty removed so as to enable Canadians who are engaged in this industry to carry it on without such a restriction? In the county I have the honour to represent there is a gentleman who does a large amount of business in that line, and it will be a matter of interest for him to know whether the minister has taken any steps to have removed this unjust restriction on the carrying on of the Canadian trade in thoroughbred animals.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). This is a matter of considerable consequence. The convention to which my hon. friend refers is the convention of the National Live Stock Association in which a very representative body of men from the whole Dominion have gathered in Ottawa this week to discuss matters in connection with live stock interests. I am only sorry that more members of the House of Commons have not been able to come to the deliberations of that body, which have been extremely interesting and valuable. I will have to correct my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) a little in regard to the matter he has mentioned. This $100 is not in the form of any taxation or customs duty. The customs laws of the United States as of Canada permit the free entry of pedigreed or pure bred stock free of customs duty. But the United States authorities have hedged that privilege about with a good many restrictions which have been constantly increasing. About a year ago they passed a resolution by which no person could have the privilege of entering free pure bred stock into the United States unless he was a citizen of the United States and had registered that stock in one of the live stock association records of the United States. A person who was a United States citizen and a member of one of the associations for the record of pure bred stock can present an animal as to which he has a certificate from that association at the frontier and enter that animal free of duty. Formerly, if a Canadian was a member of that American association he could get free entry and, therefore, some of our Canadian dealers joined the American association, paying the membership fee of $100 so that they might have the privilege. But lately there has been a still further restriction and unless the importer into the United States is a United States citizen he cannot get the privilege. A Canadian who is a member of a live stock association in the United States cannot now get free entry for these animals.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not equal treatment of citizens.

Mr. FISHER. It is certainly not. It is to my mind a barbarous—I say advisedly—it is a barbarous regulation. It savours of the old time restrictions in Europe between Russia and other countries.

Mr. BLAIN. When did that come into force?

Mr. FISHER. I am not quite sure, but about a year ago.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the minister taken any steps about it?

Mr. FISHER. I have had discussions with the Bureau of Animal Industry in Washington, but they say it is in the hands of their own breeders' associations, and they say they will not go apart from the recommendations of these associations, which are practically close corporations and which wish to retain for themselves the entire market for pure bred stock in the United States and to shut out the Canadian stock or the Canadian dealer. We have no control over the matter.

Mr. BLAIN. What does the minister propose to do about it from the Canadian standpoint?

Mr. FISHER. I do not see anything we can do about it. We have regulations which are very much more liberal, and I do

not feel like following such a bad example as that and cutting off our nose to spite our face.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would it not be one way to bring them to a sense of their duty?

Mr. FISHER. Well——

Mr. HENDERSON. I did not suggest that.

Mr. FISHER. It is a natural inclination if you are hit to hit back, and I feel that just as much as anybody does, and I sometimes practise it. But at the same time I do not know that it would be wise, and I doubt if it would be in our own interests to do it.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the minister lost all his influence with the government of the United States of which he used to boast a good deal?

Mr. FISHER. I have had some influence and I have accomplished quite a little there. But perhaps that has been by reason of the fact that I have tried to do what I thought I could do and have not tried to do what I was pretty sure I could not do. In that case, as in others, prudence is sometimes the better part of valour.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was not the primary action taken for the removing of the quarantine by an association of cattlemen in the city of Buffalo?

Mr. FISHER. No, it was taken by the authorities at Washington on representations made.

Mr. STAPLES. I understand this subject has been debated in the convention now being held in Ottawa, but I have not yet heard what conclusion they have come to. This is a question which I think should be taken up and dealt with by the minister. If we Canadian farmers have to submit to such a regulation. I think it is up to this government to adopt a similar regulation. This to my mind is the only way in which they can be brought to time. The feeling of the delegates to that convention with whom I have conversed is very keen on the subject, and I hope the minister will pay close attention to the debate that has taken place on this subject and will devise some legislation that will work out to the best interests of the stock raisers of this country.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. About a month ago I obtained from the House an order for a return showing what lands have been sold, leased, given as homesteads, transferred or set apart in any way by the government to each, individuals, companies, syndicates or other organizations in the Peace River Valley, or along or near tributaries thereof, in the Northwest of Canada, and so on. I first put it in the form of a question. There are very many questions answered in the House much longer than that. But at the request of the government I put it in the form of a motion, which I moved at the first opportunity. I would like to ask the leader of the government to direct the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the matter and request him to have the return brought down at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. FIELDING. I will direct the minister's attention to the matter, as requested.

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

To provide an amount to purchase seed grain for homestead settlers in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan; the cost of said seed grain to be repaid by the settlers with interest at the rate of 5 per centum per annum, and until repayment, to be a lien or charge upon the lands of the settlers held under homestead entry	$ 585,000 00
To provide an amount to enable the government of Canada to advance to the government of Alberta, by way of loan, a sum for the purchase of seed grain for settlers..	440,000 00
To provide an amount to enable the government of Canada to advance to the government of Saskatchewan, by way of loan, a sum for the purchase of seed grain for settlers..	$1,825,000 00

Mr. FIELDING. As these three items all relate to the same subject, it is convenient to treat them together. The papers which I have already placed on the table give, I think, all the information which parliament will desire, and for the moment I will not enlarge on the question. My hon. friends the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Agriculture both of whom are more familiar with the matter than I am, will be happy to answer any questions. With regard to the first item, relating to seed grain for homestead settlers in the Northwest, I may say that homesteaders are regarded to a certain extent as the wards of the country, in whom we have a special interest, inasmuch as the titles of their lands have not yet passed to them, and they are not in as good a position to give security as other persons who have received patents for their lands. Although these are three separate votes, and although one is for a loan to Saskatchewan and another for a loan to Alberta, it has been deemed expedient that the administration of this matter shall be largely in one hand. Regulations have already been made by the Minister of the Interior, confirmed by the Governor in Council, with regard to the distribution of seed grain to homesteaders. It

is in contemplation that similar arrangements will be made as respects the distribution in Alberta and Saskatchewan for which the provincial governments will be responsible.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Have these regulations been issued ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. They have been approved by His Excellency and were laid on the table last night. The order in council authorizing these proceedings provides that the distribution of seed grain to homesteaders shall be subject to regulations to be made by the Minister of the Interior and approved by His Excellency in council. That regulation has been made. It is in contemplation however, that the regulations, while made originally for homesteaders, shall be practically the basis upon which the money which we loan to Saskatchewan and Alberta will be administered.

Mr. STAPLES. A few days ago, when this subject was up for discussion in this House, I gathered from the remarks of the minister that the provision now being made was going to be confined to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, and I find that in the resolution the province of Manitoba had been overlooked. The other day I made the remark that if there were any homestead settlers in the province of Manitoba coming under the same conditions as those provided for in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, they had an equal claim. I am still of that opinion. While I am satisfied that there is not any great number of settlers in the province of Manitoba requiring this assistance, yet I believe there are some in the northern portion of the province. To my mind, this is a question which could well have come up in the Committee of Agriculture, and I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture how it is that although we have been in session two months, we have not yet had a meeting of that committee except the one to elect a chairman. I think it would be well for him to see that that committee is called together at the earliest possible moment. I have not had an opportunity of looking at the papers which have been brought down in regard to this matter, but I would like to ask what correspondence or what request has come from the different provinces for this assistance. I would like also to know if the province of Manitoba has made any request, and if so, what it is ?

Mr. FIELDING. The correspondence was printed and laid on the table several days ago. I presume a copy of it has not reached my hon. friend. With regard to the province of Manitoba, I quite agree that under similar conditions Manitoba ought to be treated in the same way as the other provinces ; but I think the Minister of the Interior will be able to show that Manitoba has not desired this.

Mr. FIELDING

Mr. BURROWS. I am sorry that I was not present when the discussion on this subject took place the other day. I was surprised to find that the members from the province of Manitoba, particularly the hon. member for Marquette, had not expressed the opinion that similar aid should be given to the farmers of Manitoba. Both Marquette and Dauphin contain districts in which there will be a great shortage of seed grain this year, and I think that provision should be made whereby the people of Manitoba shall have the same opportunity to take advantage of this provision as the people of the other provinces. I wrote to the Minister of the Interior with regard to the matter, and received a reply in which was inclosed a telegram from the Manitoba government stating that it was their intention to pass a Bill empowering the municipalities to deal with the matter. I am still of the opinion that the government should undertake, at least so far as the homesteader is concerned, to extend to Manitoba the same terms as they are extending to homesteaders further west.

Mr. LAKE. I think it would not be right that we should put this matter through in its entirety to-day. The House sat until half-past three this morning ; and although the Minister of Finance laid on the table the printed regulations, they were not distributed before noon. No time has consequently been given hon. members to study the regulations. Representatives from the Northwest have been in consultation with members of the government the last three weeks regarding this matter ; and before we agree to all the details, it is highly desirable that we should have more opportunity to study them. Another thing I learned to-day is that a very small number of copies of these regulations have been printed. It would be very desirable that a considerable number should be printed so as to enable members to get the opinions of their constituents concerning the details. It is desirable that we should decide upon the principle right away in order that the department might get the matter under way, but as regards the details we should have a number of copies of the regulations and have some little time to look into the way in which it is proposed to put them into effect. I would like to add to what one of the hon. members from Manitoba has said. My opinion, although it is the opinion of a man from another province, is that any settler, who may be called a homestead settler, should be permitted to come under the same heading as homestead settlers in other provinces. I presume that the Premier of Manitoba intended that the municipalities should deal with those cases where the people have the patents to their land and the municipality would be able to get proper security. But where people do not own their land, it would be naturally

the function of this government to give the authority which would enable some security to be taken on those lands. I have given just a cursory glance through the regulations, and there are several points which ought to be thoroughly threshed out before we adopt them.

Mr. FIELDING. The whole matter is large enough to entirely justify larger discussion than we can have at present. The regulations can be the subject of consideration later on. I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that the adoption might be put through subject to revision of the regulations later on. There has been necessarily some little time occupied in reaching the conclusion that this large amount should be asked for ; and if it is to be effective at all, we should have authority to proceed without delay. As to the regulations, they would be proper matter for consideration later on.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that the course suggested by the Minister of Finance and by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) might well be adopted. We might take the principle, and that would be authority for the Minister of Finance and the Minister of the Interior to proceed, but as regards the modus operandi, we should have time to study the regulations.

Mr. FIELDING. We are not asking the House to approve the regulations. They are on the table and will be subject for discussion.

Mr. SPROULE. I have here a bulletin showing the results of germination tests of seed grain. These regulations ought to have some regard for the experience of the department with these seed tests. Take, for instance, oats, the bulletin says the No. 1 germinated 72 per cent in ten days and No. 2 only 32 per cent in the same time. There is a big difference between 72 and 32 per cent. The regulations provide for the purchase of No. 1, 2 and 3 grade oats, but I do not think it would be wise to buy No. 2 and 3 for the purpose of seed. With regard to No. 1 and No. 3 Northern wheat, I do not understand why No. 2 Northern is not given in the bulletin. No. 1 Northern germinated in four days 99 per cent. No. 3 germinated in four days 98 per cent, but No. 2 is not given. I presume it would be between 98 and 99. No. 6 Northern germinated in four days 74 per cent and feed No. 2 germinated in five days 44 per cent. I assume that the latter would not be purchased for distribution as seed.

I wish more particularly to read a letter which I received from a farmer in the west. He says that the situation is very much worse than many suppose.

An hon. MEMBER. In what part of the country is it ?

Mr. SPROULE. He writes from my riding, but he comes from southwest of Saskatoon, which is a locality where it is claimed the frost did very litle damage. I saw splended samples of grain from that locality. He says :

In many places there is no grain that would do for seed, it being quite green when the frost came.

He goes on to say :

Every one has to get seed the best way they can, and there will be a very large percentage of the people who will not be able to get it.

He points out that this will be the result if the seed is only distributed at certain points far apart and he recommends a very large number of points. He says :

To my opinion, and it is the opinion of most people, there should be some arrangement to enable the people to get seed grain at any place where there are elevators. If each individual has to send away for his own seed, it won't do, and in many cases it will be necessary for the settler to get seed without cash until he threshes next fall.

He also urges that the seed ought to be provided very early so as to be ready to be sown in the spring at the earliest possible moment, as the difference of a few days may produce very serious results when it comes to harvest time and frost is threatening. I think this a very good suggestion. He says further :

In my opinion—and it is the opinion of people here—some arrangement should be made so that people will be able to get the seed grain at any place where there is an elevator or elevators. If each individual has to send away for his own seed, it will not do. And, in many cases, it will be necssary for the settler to get seed without paying money.

Even if a man is not able to give security, still means must be provided by which he can get the seed. He says also :

The repayment of this ought to be spread over at least two or three years.

If that is not done, it will be a serious disadvantage to many. He speaks also of a matter, which, I take it, he saw mentioned in the newspapers—that it was in contemplation to give this money to the banks and allow them to loan it to the farmers, taking security. He says that that would be absolutely ruinous ; that many people dislike to go to the banks for any accommodation. They are treated with so much red tape and tyranny that they would rather allow their ground to go idle than ask the banks for accommodation to enable them to buy seed grain. He suggests also that there should be a certificate with every sample of grain to indicate the percentage of germinating power so that if it is below the standard a farmer may know how much more he ought to seed in order to give him a return. Another point to which he draws attention is, that it is likely that much of this grain will come from

abroad and that there is danger of importing with it a lot of weed seed. He thinks that, therefore, it ought to be cleaned as thoroughly as possible before it is given out for distribution. These are suggestions which the minister can keep in mind when perfecting the scheme for this seed grain distribution. I cannot speak of the scheme, for I have not had time to read the regulations. But if the minister gives us time to go over them we may be able to offer him some suggestion that will be of value. The vast importance of the subject calls for the best attention and greatest care on the part of the government so that this seed grain distribution may be attended with best results.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not intend to discuss the regulations at this stage. But I would simply remind the government of the importance of wasting no time. This is the 7th of February. In a month, or at the very outside, six weeks, from now, the farmers will be ready to seed their land. Now, even if this grain had been already purchased, and if it were now in hand, it would take at least three or four weeks to have it distributed. I would suggest that this work be expedited as much as possible.

Mr. SPROULE. They commence seeding, in some cases, about March 15.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. As a rule, the seed will be needed toward the end of March. On March 20 many of these farmers in the Northwest will be ready to seed. Last year a great deal of grain for seed that was shipped to farmers in the Northwest did not reach its destination until weeks after it should have been sown, notwithstanding that last spring was very late. The minister should not wait until he gets the grain in hand before arranging for facilities to ship it to the various points. Unless provision is made in advance to expedite the distribution this seed grain will be late all along the line.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. When this subject was under discussion before I stated that the northwest part of Manitoba was harder hit by frost than any other part. That includes a part of my constituency. Up to that time I had not received any letters calling attention to the fact that seed grain was wanted. Listening to the debates in the local House on the way down I heard the representative of one of the northwest constituencies state that there would need to be large importations of seed grain, though it was not implied that farmers were not in a position to purchase what they needed. When I spoke on this subject before, I said there was a law in Manitoba under which the municipalities were authorized to borrow money for the purchase of seed grain. But I have learned since that that law was a temporary expedient, intending to relieve a situation similar to that which has now arisen. Within the past week a Bill has been introduced in the Manitoba legislature conferring upon the municipalities of that province power to borrow to the extent of $10,000, expressly for the purpose of buying seed grain for the farmers of these municipalities. I am aware that there will be many municipalities that will not avail themselves of this privilege, though some individual farmers in those municipalities will be sadly in need of seed grain. Since I spoke on this subject I have received a letter from a gentleman in the northwest part of Manitoba from which it would appear that there are many farmers in that part of the province who are really badly off for seed grain. The letter is as follows :

Binscarth, Manitoba, January 25, 1908.

Dear sir,—I have noticed by the papers that the government are considering the advisability of aiding the farmers whose crops were frozen last year, and who are going to be short of good seed. This district has suffered heavily by the frost. I will state our own case—and there are lots of others just as bad. We came to the country two years ago, and bought a section of wild land, and have broken 320 acres on it. We also bought the horses and implements to work it, and put buildings on it. We have hardly the half of it paid for. Last summer we spent the last of our capital, and were dependent upon our crop. Well, the frost came and all the wheat we threshed was 270 bushels of what ought to have been a 6,000-bushel crop. We threshed also 1,300 bushels of oats, but it will take all that to feed our outfit until the next crop comes in. The oats will not grow at all, and the wheat, as you will see from the inclosed sample, is of a very poor variety.

He incloses a sample, and a very inferior sample it is.

Now, we have to live a year and seed 320 acres of land before we see any money. We have paid all moneys due the bank up to the present, but $50 is the limit of our credit there now, and I doubt if I could get that much unless I could pay it before the crop comes off.

I have tried to get money in Ontario, but so far have had no success and unless I get it somewhere that 370 bushels of bad wheat has to go on the land and our oat crop will be nil. If I sowed the whole 1,300 bushels of oats I would scarcely get a crop. Of course our land will all go in somehow, but if the spring is cold and backward, why it would be as well out, unless I get better seed. If the government takes this matter up it will be a Godsend to us and a lot of our neighbours. Their cases may be a bit different to ours, but there are plenty of them just as bad. Either seed or money, it matters not much which, repayable in two annual payments at a fair rate of interest would be a boon which a lot of farmers, who have worked mighty hard these last two years, would appreciate.

When this measure comes before the House again I hope you will see your way to support it; by doing so you will be helping quite a good number of your constituents in this corner of your constituency.

It would appear from this letter that there are many farmers in that portion of the province who are really in very bad straits for seed grain; and should the municipalities in which they reside not avail themselves of this provincial Act which would enable them to obtain relief they would not come within the scope of the Act. I think the government should make this relief extend to these people, especially to the homesteaders referred to by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake). Of course the municipality would have no security in the way of lien on their land as they would have no title to it. I think the government should also provide for assistance in portions of Manitoba where assistance is necessary.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will this assistance be confined to those who are actually suffering for want of seed grain owing to the fact of their crops having been frozen last year or will it be possible for a man who may have obtained a fair crop to take advantage of this assistance, sell the grain he has obtained for seed purposes and use the money for some other purpose ? I think the government should guard against any abuse of this kind.

Mr. OLIVER. Section 15 of the regulations reads :

No aplication shall be received or accepted from any one applicant for more than 200 bushels of seed grain, including wheat, oats and barley. Every applicant shall be required to state the proportion or quantity of each kind of grain he may desire; provided that no applicant shall apply for more than 50 bushels of barley. Except as in this clause provided no seed grain shall be supplied to homestead settlers who had sown no crop in the season of 1907, nor to homestead settlers whose crop for the season of 1907 was marketable and gave a reasonable return, although not suitable for seed; provided, however, if it is found after all applications have been received that there is more seed grain purchased than is needed to meet applications for advances, sales may be made to such settlers for cash at the same prices as are charged to other applicants.

The intention is only to meet the needs of those who have suffered loss. The conditions in regard to the man who lost no crop are not changed by the events of last year.

Mr. SPROULE. $f he cannot obtain proper seed, he must suffer as others do.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. A homesteader who came in last year and broke up 50 acres may not be in a position to acquire seed, whereas if there had been an ordinary crop he would have realized sufficient to procure seed this year.

Mr. OLIVER. The idea is that we are as yet necessarily in the dark as to the actual needs ; and we know that the first need to be met is the need of the man who lost his crop. That is the need we set out to supply, and so far as we are able we will supply that need. When that need is supplied, if we are able to provide or sell seed to the homesteader who did not lose any crop, we will do it but we do not enter into any undertaking to do it for him as we do in the case of the man who has lost his crop.

Mr. STAPLES. Do you not limit the assistance to the homesteader who has not obtained his patent or recommendation for patent ? That does not cover the case raised by my friend (Mr. W. J. Roche) or many others who are in need.

Mr. OLIVER. These are the regulations under which seed will be supplied to homesteaders, that being done on the responsibility of the Dominion government, which alone is able to take security upon the homestead. In cases where the recommendation for patent has been given or in other cases of purchased land or land held under agreement of sale or otherwise, the provincial government takes the security and provides the regulations under which that grain shall be advanced.

Mr. LAKE. I thought the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said there would be regulations similar to these.

Mr. OLIVER. It is understood that the regulations in regard to homesteaders, over whom this parliament will have control, shall be applied to those who are not homesteaders over whom the provincial government shall have control ; so that there shall be, as far as possible, uniformity of regulations although there is the widest divergence between the two classes of security. In the case of the homesteader who has not received recommendation for patent this government is the only authority that can take security, but it can take no security from the man who has received his patent ; the provincial government takes the responsibility of dealing with him. Under the arrangement proposed, the provincial government borrows the money from the Dominion and agrees to repay that money to the Dominion ; but the provincial government, by resolution or order in council, asks the Dominion to administer the distribution of that grant to the people who are not homesteaders, under the regulations of which they will approve.

As to seed grain in Manitoba it will be remembered that with one exception the members from Manitoba expressed the opinion that there would be no need of extensive assistance in that province; and every one will agree that it is undesirable from the point of view of the province and of the

Dominion that there should be such action as we are taking now if it can be avoided. It would be very much better, in everybody's interest, if it could be dealt with as a provincial rather than as a Dominion matter. We have gone on the assumption that the conditions in Manitoba were such as not to require extraordinary action, and we have dealt with the two provinces only which made very strong representations to us that there were needs that they were not in a position to meet.

Mr. BURROWS. Was there any representation made by the Manitoba government ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, but the two provincial governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan made definite representations to us. The provincial government of Manitoba, of course, did not and neither did the representatives of Manitoba in the House ; therefore, we did not prepare to deal with the question in so far as Manitoba is concerned. Besides, I may say that the commissioner of immigration, Mr. Scott, during his visit of investigation in the west, had some conversation with the Premier of Manitoba and was informed by him that the province was able to take care of the requirements within its limits.

Mr. STAPLES. May I ask the hon. minister if this letter is in the correspondence ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, it is not, because this correspondence only deals with the transaction that we have in hand ; that is with the two provinces. We did not think that we would be warranted in introducing the name of Manitoba into this correspondence because we did not have before us any proposition to deal with Manitoba.

Mr. STAPLES. May I ask the minister if he will put all the correspondence on the table of the House so that we can see what the urgent reasons are and where they are from.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no objection to that, but, of course, there is a very tremendous mass of correspondence, and I would have thought the official expressions of the several governments would be all that the House would require to arrive at a conclusion. However, as it now appears from what has been said here that there is a requirement within the province of Manitoba or that there possibly may be a requirement in that province, I will say that in so far as this government is concerned, we are just as ready to take measures on behalf of those who have suffered misfortune in the province of Manitoba as in the other two provinces. Although we have not made any such provision here it will be a very simple matter, if the House agrees and if the provincial government of Manitoba also agrees, to make provision later on for meeting that case.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the minister what objection there would be to applying it to the province of Ontario and other eastern provinces where there is suffering ?

Mr. OLIVER. If representations are made by the provincial governments on the same lines as they have been made by the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan I presume that the conditions would be dealt with in the same way. I am assuming that; I do not know. At any rate, as far as Manitoba is concerned I am perfectly satisfied that the government is quite willing to deal with Manitoba just as readily as with Saskatchewan and Alberta, but the government will be glad, the House will be glad, and the country will be glad if it is not necessary to deal with Manitoba in that way. Let me say further in regard to the province of Manitoba that if it is understood by the House that there is a need for homesteaders in the province of Manitoba to be dealt with a very trifling amendment will be required to the regulations, and supplementary estimates will have to be passed. That will be all; there will be no delay, no extra machinery and no trouble. But, if it is required or desired that this government should advance money which shall be used for the purchase of seed to be supplied to people of Manitoba who are not in the position of homesteaders we will have to have the co-operation of the government of Manitoba as we are having the co-operation of the governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan. That, of course, must be thoroughly understood, but such, I understand, is a matter to be discussed with the government of Manitoba.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) has struck the key note. There is not a moment to be lost. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has promised to allow full latitude for discussion of the regulations and I would suggest to him that he start the machinery and get the grain moving at once. Therefore, pass the resolution.

Mr. FIELDING. Hear, hear.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. FIELDING. I would desire the House to wait for a few minutes and perhaps we will avoid the necessity of an evening session. I would also ask the cooperation of the House in taking the several stages necessary to give effect to the resolution which has been adopted. For that purpose I beg to move that the House do now resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. FIELDING moved :

That towards making good the supply to be granted to His Majesty on account of

certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1908, the sum of $2,850,000 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that we will not have much of an opportunity of discussing these regulations or of making suggestions with regard to them that we may think it desirable to do, and if we go on and pass the Bill without giving it any consideration we will not have much latitude for further discussion. I think that we should have some opportunity of looking over these regulations carefully because I have no doubt it will be found that there are many suggestions that ought to be made, that are not made and which might be made by western men and others. We ought to have some additional scope for discussion before this is disposed of.

Mr. FIELDING. It is very important that we should get authority to buy the grain. Until we pass the several stages of this measure we have no authority to expend a dollar. The regulations however, are subject to the supervision of the House and if in the judgment of the House, it is advisable to amend them, I think that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) will be very happy to receive any suggestions because we are all after the same object. But, I think that the House will agree that it is desirable that we should take the several stages and get authority to buy the grain at once. I will ask the co-operation of my hon. friends in facilitating the passage of this resolution and of the Bill which is based thereon.

Mr. SPROULE. I agree with what the hon. gentleman says but by whom are these regulations to be made? I take it that they will be made by the Department of the Interior——

Mr. FIELDING. They will be made by the department.

Mr. SPROULE——and that we will have no opportunity of offering any suggestions in regard to them.

Mr. FIELDING. Inasmuch as they are to be placed before the House the hon. gentleman will have every opportunity of making suggestions with regard to them. The House does not adopt the regulations themselves but it gives the government authority to deal with them and to proceed with the purchase of the grain. The whole matter is as open as it can be.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that it is the aim and, of course, it is all right, but unless there is some general opportunity of bringing it up other than by means of a side issue on going into Committee of Supply or on some occasion like that when the attention of the minister will not be directed to it as astutely as it would if we were discussing the regulations here, I assume that we will not have an opportunity for that full discussion which is desirable. We might read them now, and make suggestions, they may be adopted if they are considered desirable or they may not as they see fit. We may live to learn that there are many things that ought to be provided for which are not provided for at all.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman can suggest any such, we could leave the matter open for discussion.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We will be able to discuss the regulations.

Mr. FIELDING. The regulations are laid on the table like any other information and if the hon. gentleman should think they are not right it will be a proper subject for discussion. Anything we do now will not in the slightest degree restrict that right of discussion.

Mr. HERRON. I agree with what has been said by the Minister of Finance and I think it would be better that the House should agree to the principle on the understanding that we should have full liberty to discuss the details at a later date.

Mr. SPROULE. That is all I am asking.

Mr. FIELDING. I give my hon. friend that assurance.

Resolution reported, read a second time, and concurred in.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 94) to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending 31st March, 1908. He said: This Bill simply takes the resolution which has been agreed to and puts it in the form of a statute. It has been prepared in the usual form by the law clerk of the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a first and second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before the Bill is reported I wish to ask when it is intended this money should be repaid.

Mr. FIELDING. The order in council stipulates that the money shall be repaid by the provincial government by the end of the next fiscal year, which would be the 31st of March, 1909; it is a little more than one year.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That can be changed?

Mr. FIELDING. The regulations can be changed.

Mr. LAKE. Does that appear in the Bill?

Mr. FIELDING. The Bill simply appropriates the money, but the order in council

stipulates the dates as respects the provincial governments and I think as respects the others.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that on Tuesday there will be an opportunity given for a full discussion of the regulations.

Mr. FIELDING. Or on any other day that may be mutually convenient.

Mr. HENDERSON. There will be no power to alter the regulations?

Mr. FIELDING. The regulations are made by the Governor in Council and, of course, if attention is called to any improvements that should be made, I am quite sure the Minister of the Interior would be happy to make them.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The condition upon which we are allowing this Bill to pass is that we will have an opportunity to discuss these regulations when the time comes, and not only discussing them, but amending them.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I cannot say that. The House cannot amend an order in council, but it may by expression of its views oblige the minister to amend. If you get a general expression of the opinion of the House on a matter of this sort which is non-controversial, I do not anticipate there will be any trouble about the regulations.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not desire to do anything to obstruct the passage of the Bill if the conditions are as they have been described by hon. gentlemen opposite, but it does appear that it is a pretty swift piece of work to vote this large amount of money in this way. It is my opinion that we are dealing with this a little too fast, and that the Bill should have further consideration before it becomes law.

Mr. FIELDING. I can tell my hon. friend that this very day representations were made by the parties who are in negotiation for the purchase of grain, but I have insisted that no authority be given until the House approves of the appropriation.

Mr. STAPLES. Why was it not brought down in December ?

Mr. FIELDING. Well, it is a thing that ought not to be done at all if we could help it, and it is only after long consideration that we have come to the conclusion to do it.

Mr. STAPLES. When did the first request come to the government?

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot tell.

Mr. STAPLES. We do not appear to have the necessary information.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the papers will show that.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). We are here legislating in this matter with extraordinary haste, and I venture to say that not half a dozen members in this House understand very much about what they are doing. Here we are voting nearly $3,000,000, and I think we ought to have a little time to consider the question. The price of wheat is not jumping very rapidly, and I don't think there is any very great haste to rush this bill through in this way. It would appear to the ordinary man that the government must have some inside information about a quick jump in the price of wheat so that they must buy at once, or else there is some other object in this haste. With all due deference, I think this Bill can well afford to stand over so as to let us have a full discussion of it. It is an extraordinary principle for the minister to lay down that we should vote the money first and then consider it aftewards. The minister says we should vote the money on the basis of this order in council, but they may change the order in council to-morrow. The minister simply tells us that everything is all right and that we should vote the money. Well, I have some little confidence in the government, not very much it is true, and it may be all right, but at the same time it is rushing the thing through too swiftly. It is not half an hour ago since we got this order in council placed in our pigeon holes, and have availed of the opportunity of reading it, and it appears to be all right, but on a further study we may find some very strong objections to it. The point is that after we have voted the money the order in council may be changed at any time. I am not against extending help to the farmers of the Northwest when they have had bad crops, but I think there is too much haste in rushing this matter through the House.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no doubt about it, the government are to blame in this case. They should have had this legislation down before, and have given us time during the last week to discuss this matter. But they confess the box they have got themselves into, and I for one feel that we shall have to extend a little grace to them this time, with the understanding that on Tuesday we shall be able to do all that we could really do to-day if we had hours for discussion, that is, present our ideas as to how these regulations may be improved, and with the same prospect of their being accepted as there would be if we presented them to-night. So I think we shall have to be charitable and let them get themselves out of the box they have got themselves into.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to say with regard to the regulations, so that there may be no misunderstanding, that they represent the joint views of the provincial governments and the Dominion government ; so that, while we have of course a perfect right to make alterations in them, any alterations we make will have to be acqui-

esced in by the provincial authorities, which will render the operation somewhat difficult.

Mr. LENNOX. I want to say that I have read the regulations, and I am sorry that the Minister of the Interior has had to make the statement he has just made, though it is better under the circumstances that he should have made it. While I am not familiar with conditions in the west, I am not satisfied with the regulations. I think they will require a good deal of amendment, and I understood from the Minister of Finance that this matter would be made more than usual an open question, and that the government would be ready to consider suggestions from this side of the House. We are all anxious to facilitate the passage of this measure, because it is very important that if aid is to be given it should be given promptly. But all the same I would be sorry to feel that we were committed to these regulations and that there was not a strong probability that the government would favourably consider suggestions for their improvement from all parts of the House, and receive those suggestions with a predisposition to meet the views of gentlemen on this side of the House, if possible. I believe many alterations will have to be made in these regulations, or they will not be satisfactory.

Mr. FIELDING. While I recognize the importance of this matter, I do not wish to press it if hon. gentlemen opposite wish it to be held over ; or I am perfectly willing to meet to-night to discuss it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the government will say that they are willing to accept suggestions for changes on condition that they are agreed to by the provincial governments, I think there will be no difficulty.

Mr. FIELDING. We shall certainly be glad to receive suggestions from our hon. friends opposite, with a desire to meet their views if convenient.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would the minister agree to extend the time for the repayment of the money by the homesteaders ? I think one year is too little; it should be two or three years.

Mr. FIELDING. That is certainly a fair and proper question, and while I would not like to commit myself in regard to it, I admit that it is a legitimate question for discussion.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

Mr. FIELDING. As we had a very late sitting last night, and as a very general wish has been expressed on both sides that we should not sit to-night, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 6.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 10, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Munro Young McLean, Esq., member for the electoral district of South Huron ; introduced by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. Geo. P. Graham.

OLD AGE PENSIONS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That Messrs. Lemieux, McIntyre (South Perth) Sinclair, Ralph Smith, McKenzie, Verville, Monk, Pringle and McCarthy (Calgary), be appointed the committee of nine ordered by the House to investigate the subject of old age pensions.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

THE ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I would like, as a matter of privilege, to bring to the attention of the House the condition of the Order Paper. Owing to the adjournment of the House at six o'clock on Wednesdays, it has been impossible so far, and will probably continue to be impossible during this session, unless some change is made, to reach Public Bills and Orders. They are put down for Mondays and Wednesdays, but they are always preceded by notices of motions ; but as several pages of the Order Paper are filled with notices of motion, the Public Bills and Orders will not be reached unless they are allowed to alternate with notices of motion, or unless some other change is made in the procedure. Formerly they could be reached on Wednesday evening, but we have now no Wednesday evening sitting. I merely direct the attention of the leader of the House to the matter, with a view to some change being made so that Public Bills and Orders——

Mr. SPEAKER. This can hardly be called a matter of privilege.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I may say, with all due deference to you, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot get on with my Bills ; therefore I claim the privilege of calling the attention of the House to the matter. However, I take this occasion to give notice to the government that I will deal with it at the first opportunity on the motion for Committee of Supply.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN (P.E.I.). I would like to remind the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that in January I put two questions on the Order Paper which he asked me

to put as motions; one was made on the 15th January and the other on the 8th. I also called the attention of the Postmaster General to the question of daily mails in my province, and the question of the removal of the postmaster at St. Peters. There was also a return to be brought down from the Public Works Department.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will my hon. friend be kind enough to tell me what is the reference to my department?

Mr. A. MARTIN. The freights on the winter boats and the steamers from Charlottetown to Georgetown.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I may tell my hon. friend that my department has a whole staff at present working in his interest. The information wanted concerning the postal service on Prince Edward Island covers many years, and we have ransacked the whole department in order to get it. The work is going on, and I hope shortly to be able to bring it down.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I had a motion on the same subject several years ago, and it is not necessary to bring down the same correspondence twice.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has my hon. friend limited his motion to the last year or does it include several years before?

Mr. A. MARTIN. I think that the papers since the correspondence was brought down before would be sufficient.

THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to inquire of the First Minister when we may expect the report of the Commission on the Civil Service. It was promised long before this. I see a statement in the papers this morning that there are some differences between the members of the commission, and that the report may be delayed for a long while. If we are going to have any benefit of it, we should have it as soon as possible.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall have to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the question. Perhaps he can give some information to my hon. friend to-morrow.

BANK OF WINNIPEG.

House in committee on Bill (No. 19) to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—Mr. Bole.

On the preamble,

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire again, as I have done in former years, to enter my protest against Bills of this kind going through in the absence of a member of the government who is prepared to answer for the committee and to give explanations. The Banking and Commerce Committee met and deliberated on this and other Bills on the same day on which an important meeting of the Railway Committee was held, which prevented a number of members being present. For my part, I am entirely ignorant of this Bill; but I understood that in former years the Minister of Finance had some decided opinions with regard to the chartering of new banks, and that he was going to insist very strongly, for example, on the capital of these banks being practically in sight. I think this Bill should stand until there is a minister in his place to give any explanation that is called for.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The request of my hon. friend is not unreasonable. Unfortunately, the Minister of Finance, whose business it is to look after these Bills, is not here to-day. Therefore I move that the committee report progress on this Bill, and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

PRESBYTERIAN MINISTERS' WIDOWS AND ORPHANS FUND.

House in committee on Bill (No. 23) respecting the Ministers' Widows and Orphans Funds of the Presbyterian Church in Canada—Mr. Bickerdike.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not know who is the minister responsible for Bills that come from the Miscellaneous and Private Bills Committee, but I presume there is some minister able to explain this Bill. If not I must take the exception I have done before and ask that it be not proceeded with. This Bill will affect a great many people, possibly to their detriment, and we ought to have the reasons which led the committee to approve of it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no minister in charge of this Bill. It is a private measure, but it is only reasonable that somebody should be here to explain it. If the promoter of the Bill is not present, we shall have to let it stand.

Mr. SPROULE. In connection with the work of these committees, I desire to support the contention of my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Henderson). It is improper that we should have two important committees sitting at the same time, as we have had this session and frequently last session. I refer to the Banking and Commerce Committee and the Railway Committee. Members who are on both committees can only attend one at a time no matter how much they may desire to attend both. It seems to me that some arrangement might be made beforehand by which we could avoid having these two committees sitting at the same time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does my hon. friend think that can be arranged? The Railway Committee sits almost every day of the week.

Mr. SPROULE. The Railway Committee usually meets on Tuesdays and Fridays.

The next most important committee is the Banking and Commerce Committee, and that might sit on some of the other days.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. SPROULE. That generally meets on Wednesdays.

Mr. TISDALE. My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) is quite right. The two committees he refers to do not usually meet on the same day, but an important Bill came before the Railway Committee and that committee adjourned until Wednesday of this week. On Wednesday, I see by the newspapers, there is to be a delegation of insurance people who are to appear before the Banking and Commerce Committee. It would be most unfortunate if we had both these committees sitting on next Wednesday.

Mr. MILLER. I do not see how it is possible to escape some conflict between the two committees and avoid their meeting on the same day. The Banking and Commerce Committee meet on Wednesday and a large number of people interested in the Insurance Bill are to be present. There will doubtless have to be several sittings on this insurance matter and it will be necessary to hold meetings of the committee during consecutive days. Otherwise these gentlemen will have to return to their homes and come back again. I believe it is intended to have three sessions on Wednesday—morning, afternoon and evening. But it will be impossible to escape some conflict. There is also the Public Accounts Committee. It has been thought advisable to have the opinions of these insurance men taken down in shorthand, and the same shorthand writers are engaged on the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. HENDERSON. While I agree with the point raised by my hon friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller), the point I raise is not directly along that line. In the Bill before us we are legislating respecting the rights of the widows and orphans of ministers, and the amendment proposed by the Bill has far reaching importance. Under the present law, the widows and orphans are entitled to a certain allowance out of a fund contributed by their husbands and fathers. This Bill proposes, under certain circumstances, to deprive these people of their rights to that fund. For example, if the widow of a Presbyterian minister should marry a man belonging to a different denomination, she would at once be deprived of the revenue to which she was entitled from the fund to which her husband had contributed perhaps for forty or fifty years. There may be good reasons for the change, but the chairman of the committee or the minister who attends that committee should be here to explain the reasons.

Progress reported.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the Women's Auxiliary to the Missionary societies of the Church of England in Canada—Mr. Worthington.

QUESTIONS.

STATISTICS OF REGISTERED SHIPPING.

Mr. SINCLAIR asked :

1. How many tons of shipping have been registered in the various provinces of Canada during the statistical year ending June 30, 1907, distinguishing steel from wooden vessels, and steam from sailing ships?

2. Specifying each province separately, what amount was paid by the government during said year for drawback on ships?

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

1. STATEMENT—Showing number of tons of Shipping registered in Canada during statistical year ending June 30, 1907.

	Steam.				Sailing.			
	Wood.		Steel.		Wood.		Steel.	
	Gross.	Net.	Gross.	Net.	Gross.	Net.	Gross.	Net.
New Brunswick	220	153	44,938	29,140	1,511	1,417	.....	.....
Nova Scotia	771	467	1,650	990	6,373	5,502	560	543
Quebec	622	402	3,623	2,145	4,385	4,154	1,318	1,226
Ontario	5,629	3,448	14,006	8,880	5,983	5,394	1,227	978
Prince Edward Island	211	98	.....	.....	117	95	.....	.....
British Columbia	5,247	3,313	351	185	1,250	1,238	1,496	1,380
Manitoba	438	283	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Yukon	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Saskatchewan	141	89	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	13,279	8,253	64,568	41,340	19,619	17,800	4,601	4,217

2. Statement showing amount paid by Customs Department, during the twelve months from July 1, 1906, to June 30, 1907, for drawback on ships.

Nova Scotia	$ 4,132 34
New Brunswick	120 64
Prince Edward Island	125 51
Quebec	2,012 83
Ontario	10,747 00
British Columbia	78 01

LADY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Lennox—asked :

Is it the intention of the government in any suitable manner to recognize the invaluable services rendered to the empire by the forty young ladies who volunteered and went to South Africa as school teachers?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Such is not the intention of the government.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY—VOTES OF OFFICERS IN MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS.

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked :

1. Has the warden of the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary the right or authority to oblige, under pain of dismissal, the officers of the penitentiary to vote for the candidate of his choice in municipal elections?
2. Has that superior officer authorization to give several days holidays to subordinate officers of that institution with instructions to work for the candidates of his choice in municipal elections?
3. In acting in this manner, has this officer overstepped his powers?
4. Has the said warden the right to openly meddle in politics?
5. Has he right to use his influence as warden to force the employees of the penitentiary to vote for his candidates?
6. What is the government's policy in this regard?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1, 2 and 5. No ; and he has never done so.

3. The officer did not act in the manner described.

4. So far as the department is aware the warden has not done so.

6. No instructions have been issued to penitentiary officials in regard to participation in municipal affairs.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY—HOLIDAYS FOR OFFICERS.

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked :

1. Did the warden of the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, on or about January 12, 1908, give holidays to one or more of the officers of the penitentiary?
2. If so, who are those officers?
3. What was the duration of the holidays?
4. What was the reasons therefor?

Mr. BRODEUR.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Every official who had a right to vote was relieved from duty long enough to go and vote ; such absence did not exceed fifteen or twenty minutes in each case.

On the 13th and 14th of January, Rodrigue Desjardins, stone cutter instructor, who was a candidate at the municipal election, was absent one day and a half, and on January Guard Odilon Papineau was absent during the afternoon upon private business. These periods of absence were in each case deducted from the fourteen days' holidays the official is entitled to annually. These were the only cases of absence during 13th and 14 January last.

PAYMENTS TO OWEN SOUND DREDGING COMPANY.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

What amounts have been paid for dredging services to the Owen Sound Dredging Company since 1896, giving places at which work has been done by the said company, and the total amounts paid to the said company at each of the said places?

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). From July 1, 1896, to December 31, 1907:

Owen Sound, Ont.	$ 39,402 00
Midland, Ont.	256,597 04
Meaford, Ont.	3,376 67
Victoria, Ont.	11,628 00
Penetanguishene, Ont.	6,168 14
Matchedash Bay, Ont.	10,871 09
Total	$328,042 94

ELDER-DEMPSTER SUBSIDIZED SOUTH AFRICAN SERVICE.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM asked :

1. What is the amount of the annual subsidy to the Elder-Dempster steamship line for a direct monthly South African service?
2. Is such subsidy conditioned upon the company's furnishing cold storage facilities for perishable articles?
3. Is the government aware that such regular cold storage service is not being regularly supplied?
4. What reason, if any, is given by the company for its failure to live up to the contract, and what action does the government intend to take in regard to the matter?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

1. $146,000.
2. Yes.
3. No.
4. Answered by No. 3.

UNDER-SIZED LOBSTERS CAUGHT IN WATERS OF LUNENBURG, SHELBURNE AND YARMOUTH, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens) asked :

1. Have any reports been received by the Department of Fisheries from overseers or

inspectors that small lobsters are being caught in the waters of Lunenburg, Shelburne and Yarmouth counties, Nova Scotia, and that same are being sold under measure at two for one? If so, what is the nature of said reports? and what action has the department taken in the matter?

2. Have complaints been made to the overseers and to the Department of Fisheries by persons other than officers concerning the illegal practices in said localities, with respect to the catching and sale of lobsters under size?

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

1 and 2. The department is aware that the regulations respecting the size of lobsters are in some districts not strictly enforced.

The difficulty which usually exists in the administration of the lobster regulations has recently been increased by a change in the American laws, which permit the importation of live lobsters of smaller size than formerly, thus diminishing the supply available for the canneries. It is feared that the rigid enforcement of the size limit would prevent the canners receiving sufficient quantity of fish to carry on their business.

The matter is now engaging the attention of the department, and it is hoped that means may be found to harmonize the conflicting interests.

POST OFFICE IN SCOTCH HILL EAST.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens) asked :

1. Has a post office been recently established at Scotch Hill East, Pictou county, Nova Scotia? If so, when?

2. Who is the postmaster, what is the date of his appointment, and when did he commence the duties of his office?

3. Has a mail route to said office been established? If so, what is the route?

4. Has a mail carrier been appointed for this route? If not, why not?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1, 2, 3 and 4. No, in view of the fact that the department was unable to make any satisfactory arrangements for the service of the proposed office. The question of establishing the office is still under consideration.

FISHERY OVERSEERS IN LUNENBURG, SHELBURNE AND YARMOUTH, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked :

1. What are the names of the lobster fishery overseers or inspectors in the counties of Lunenburg, Shelburne and Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, and the dates of their respective appointments?

2. Have any complaints been recently received by the Department of Fisheries, that said overseers or inspectors, or any of them, have been neglecting their duties in permitting the catching of lobsters under size?

89½

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

1. Lunenburg—

J. A. Webber, November 1, 1897.
J. B. Morris, April 2, 1898.

Shelburne—

E. S. Goudey, March 24, 1884.
G. K. Hines, March 12, 1897.

Yarmouth—

A. M. Hatfield, December 24, 1896.

2. The situation respecting the enforcement of the size limit of lobsters has been to-day dealt with in reply to question No. 15.

MR. CHARLES L. SMITH, POSTMASTER, WOODSTOCK, NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. CROCKET—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked :

1. What is the salary of Mr. Charles L. Smith, postmaster at Woodstock, New Brunswick?

2. Has the Postmaster General's attention been called to statements to the effect that Mr. Smith has been taking an active part in the general provincial election campaign now in progress in New Brunswick, and that he was one of the speakers at a political meeting held at Woodstock in the interests of the government candidate in Carleton county on February 1?

3. Does the department allow its officers to take such part in either federal or provincial elections.

4. If not, what action has been taken or is it proposed to take in the case of Mr. Smith?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Salary and allowances, $3,376.96.

(Out of this amount the postmaster provides for the salaries of his staff and the expenses of his office.)

2. No.

3. No.

4. Answered by 2 and 3.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—PRODUCTION OF ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS.

Notices of motion being called :

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. I suppose we can go through the unopposed motions first; and, in connection with that, I would ask the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he has come to the conclusion to still ask Nos. 38, 39 and 40 to stand ? If they are to stand on the ground that they are to be discussed, it is quite probable that we may not reach them during the session, but, if they can be moved as unopposed motions, we can take them off the Order Paper. These motions are for original papers in each case.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When they are called I shall be glad to answer.

On the order being called :

For the production before this House of all original applications and tenders filed in the

Department of the Interior in respect of timber berths Nos. 1031, 1118, 1114, 1097 and 1098, and that the same be laid upon the table of the House.—Mr. White.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will consider the application of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), as to this and will give an answer on Wednesday.

COASTING PRIVILEGES.

On the order being called :

That in the opinion of this House the government of Canada should take such steps as would secure for Canada the cancellation of existing coasting privileges now enjoyed by foreign countries, whether this privilege is granted by imperial treaty or by the courtesy of the government of Canada.—Mr. Black.

Mr. SINCLAIR. In the absence of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black), I would ask that this motion be struck from the list. The change asked for by this motion has already been granted by the government.

Order dropped.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all correspondence between Mr. A. E. Dyment, M.P., and the Department of Marine and Fisheries as to granting of pound net licenses in 1905 to Messrs. Lowe & Roque, of Killarney, as also to any other persons; also a list of persons to whom pound net licenses were granted in that year.—Mr. Bennett.

For a return showing what action, if any, has been taken by this government since March 19, 1903, which would have for its object the removal of cattle embargo placed upon Canadian cattle entering Great Britain.

2. For a copy of a resolution said to have been passed some years ago by the Committee on Agriculture, which requested that the Minister of Agriculture of the Dominion should invite the ministers of the different provinces in the Dominion to form themselves into a committee, whose object was to lay before the government of Great Britain the importance of removing the cattle embargo.

3. Also showing what efforts, if any, have been made by the Minister of Agriculture to comply with the wishes of the above-named committee so expressed; together with a copy of the report, if any, of the same to the House, and what efforts have been so made, with what reason, if any, the government assigns for not taking action in the matter.—Mr. Armstrong.

For a copy of the minutes of proceedings of the Board of Internal Economy of the House of Commons from January 1, 1902, to January 1, 1906.—Mr. W. J. Roche.

For a return showing what pedigreed cattle, if any, did the Central Experimental Farm, Ottawa, sell during the years 1906 and 1907; and how many in each year, giving the different breeds, the name of purchaser, his place of residence, price paid, and breed.—Mr. Wm. Jackson.

For a return showing what land has been withdrawn for settlement, or set apart, or sold, for colonization purposes, since 1896; the location and amount in each case, specifying townships, sections, half or quarter-section; to whom it has been sold, or alienated, and on what terms of settlement; the price per acre, on terms of payment, and the nationality of the settlers in each colony; when the land was sold, alienated, reserved, or set apart, for such purpose, in each case; and how many of these companies have complied with their contracts, and to what extent.—Mr. Sproule.

For a return showing the parties to whom were made the original grants from the Crown of the lands comprised within the limits of the town of Whitehorse, Yukon Territory, and any assignments made thereof, with names of parties, dates, and consideration therefor.—Mr. Foster.

For a return showing: 1. How many returns or sessional papers have been presented to parliament in answer to motions for the same, since January 1, 1906.

2. How many of these returns were taken out of the office of Routine and Records, and the Journal Office, by members of this House, since the above date, giving also the name of the member to whom delivered.

3. For what length of time such returns were retained by the members who obtained them.

4. How many of these returns had not been returned to the proper officer of the House of Commons on January 1, 1908.

5. In the case of those returned, how long they were out with the members.

6. How many of these returns are still in the possession of the members, and how long they have had them.

7. The means usually adopted by the clerk of Routine and Records and the clerk of Current Sessional Papers to have outstanding returns retransferred to their possession.

8. The average cost to the country of preparing these returns by the various departments interested, during the above period.—Mr. Johnston.

G. T. R.—BELLEVILLE AND NORTH HASTINGS RAILWAY.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings) moved :

For a copy of all papers, writings and letters, between the government and the Belleville and North Hastings, or the Grand Trunk Railway, or any other railway, or any one, on behalf of any railway, relating to the granting and payment of the subsidies to the Belleville and North Hastings Railway, under 48-49 Vic., Cap. 59, and 49 Vic., Cap. 10, including the agreement executed by the railway company under which the subsidy was paid, and the cheque given in payment.

He said : Mr. Speaker I make this motion with sincere regret that at any time it should be possible to call attention of the House to such a state of facts touching one of the great railway corporations of Canada as it will be my duty in making this motion to present to the House ; and I also regret having to make such a motion at this

particular time when the feeling of the country is as all know it to be. The motion is simply one for papers but of course it is in my mind that there may be subsequent action on the part of the government or of this House. The facts are briefly these: By an Act of the Ontario Legislature of 37 Victoria, a railway company called the Belleville and North Hastings Railway company was incorporated. Shortly before that another railway company called the Grand Junction Railway Company had been incorporated. The Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company was to run from a point on the Grand Junction Railway about ten miles north of the city of Belleville northward through the township of Madoc to a place in Eldorado called Moore's Mine. Both of those roads were built. In 1881 an Act was passed by the Ontario Legislature to allow the amalgamation of the Grand Junction Railway Company and the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company and these two railways were incorporated and became one under the name of the Grand Junction Railway Company. Years rolled on and the Grand Junction Railway Company, by an Ontario Statute of 45 Victoria, was amalgamated with the Toronto and Nipissing Railway Company the Whitby, Port Perry and Lindsay Railway Company, the Victoria Railway Company, the Toronto and Ottawa Railway Company, and the Midland Railway Company of Canada. All these railways were united and as the Act said :

From and after the passing of this Act the said companies shall form and be one company . . . . under the name of the Midland Railway of Canada.

So that in 1882 the Belleville and North Hastings road had first been absorbed by the Grand Junction road and the Grand Junction road and all these others had then been united, forming the Midland Railway Company of Canada. The Belleville and North Hastings Company itself had obviously passed out of existence.

By chapter 59 of 48-49 Victoria of this House a subsidy was granted to the Belleville and North Hastings Railway, which had not been in existence for a number of years :

For a line of railway from the village of Madoc to the junction with the Central Ontario Railway at Eldorado, a subsidy not exceeding $1,500 per mile, nor exceeding $10,500.

In the following year, another subsidy Act was brought down and by it $1,700 a mile in addition to the $1,500 a mile was granted to the Belleville and North Hastings railway for 7 miles of the railway from the village of Madoc to the junction of the Central Ontario Railway at Eldorado. Thus by these two Acts $1,500 and $1,700 a mile were granted to the Belleville and North Hastings road for 7 miles of railway from Belleville to Eldorado. In both these Acts a provision is made :

That the subsidies hereinbefore mentioned as to be granted to companies, shall be granted to such companies, respectively; the other subsidies shall be granted to such companies as shall be approved by the Governor in Council, as having established to his satisfaction their ability to construct and complete the said railways respectively.

The substance of that being that the subsidy is for a road between two places, but where the railroad company is named the subsidy is to be paid to that company.

We have here the case of a road having ceased to exist for several years and forming part of the Midland system and some years subsequently to its amalgamation an Act grants $1,500 for 7 miles of road and the following year another Act granting an additional $1,700 for the same seven miles.

It is very doubtful if the company put a dollar into the building of the road. As was the custom the municipalities subsidized the road very liberally ; all along the line every township contributed something and the county of Hastings gave $50,000. Then the local administration at Toronto assisted the road. I have a letter from the provincial treasurer saying that $66,000, being $3,000 a mile for 22 miles, which would include the 7 miles, was granted to the Belleville and North Hastings road. It seems the road was not completed as soon as it should have been and therefore the interest did not begin to run at the time expected and the company were given a present of the arrears. They were then paid by certificate, 40 certificates payable half yearly, the result being that Ontario paid $114,206.40.

So far I have nothing to complain of. The road had been built as far as Eldorado and two Acts passed by this House granted it $1,500 and $1,700 a mile for the construction of a portion of it. After the Act had been passed by this House application was made to the government for the subsidy. A motion was made some years ago in this House and a portion of the papers for which I am now asking were then brought down, so I can speak authoritatively when I say that in consequence of the subsidy Act passed this application was made.

Grand Trunk Railway of Canada, office of the assistant manager.

October 31, 1887.

Sir:—Referring to the matter of a subsidy to be granted to the Belleville & North Hastings Railway Company for seven miles of railway from the junction with the Central Ontario Railway at Eldorado, I have the pleasure in making application for the same to hand you herewith map of the line as well as the profile, &c., &c.

The gentleman who made this application was William Wainwright, assistant manager, Grand Trunk Railway of

Canada. The application was referred to the chief engineer and general manager of Canadian government railways, Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, he inspected the plan and specifications and on the report as brought down an order in council was passed on November 14, 1887, by which it is set forth that the subsidy had been granted by the two statutes :

And the minister is authorized to enter into a contract with the Belleville & North Hastings Railway Company for the construction of the said subsidized work, on the specification therein set forth.

So we have the order in council following up the statute authorizing the minister to enter into an agreement. There was some little discussion over the plans and specifications between the department and other persons, sometimes one and sometimes another, all officials of the Grand Trunk, and a contract was entered into on December 12, 1887. This contract is not between the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada and the government, but

Between Her Majesty the Queen, acting in respect of the Dominion of Canada herein represented by Hon. John Henry Pope, Minister of Railways, of the first part, and the Belleville & North Hastings Railway Company of the second part.

That contract is executed in the name of the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company, which had not existed for years, as the statutes prove. It was signed by Thomas Kelso, president, and to my own knowledge I can say that he had been the president when there was a company, and E. Donald, secretary. Whether he had been secretary or not I do not know. I do know that he was at that time a law clerk in the office of the solicitor of the Grand Trunk Railway and he is now the claims agent of that company whose name appears on all their literature, as one of the high officials of that road. He signed this contract as E. Donald, secretary of the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company. That contract rested on the faith of two statutes providing that $3,200 per mile was to be paid, it contained the usual covenant on the part of the company—a company that did not exist—that

The company shall and will well, truly and faithfully make, build, construct and complete a line of railway from a point on the north side of St. Lawrence Street in the village of Madoc to the Central Ontario Railway near Eldorado, in the county of Hastings.

In addition to a clause such as the one I have read in which they agreed to construct the road, there is clause 6 :

That the company will upon and after the completion of the said line of railway and works appertaining thereto, truly and faithfully keep the same and the rolling stock required therefor in good sufficient working and running order, and shall continuously and faithfully operate the same.

Now, Sir, if ever a covenant was distinctly entered into, unquestionably it was the contract made by the Grand Trunk Railway Company in the name of this company that did not exist that it would not only construct the road but would faithfully and continuously operate it. At this time the road had been completed and that, if possible, makes the matter worse. The corespondence brought down some years ago shows that the government of the day was aware, as the Grand Trunk Railway was aware, that this road had been completed some years before and that, having been completed, seven miles of the road had been allowed to fall into decay. The Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company applied to the government—I would suppose—imposed upon the government, they believing that there was a railway—for this assistance to complete the road, to equip it with rolling stock and to get it in running order. The government of the day—I am advised by a member of the government of that day—consented to this grant on the representation that the road had fallen into bad repair, that it required repair, that it required rolling stock and that if this grant was given towards repairing this road for a distance of seven miles it would provide a connecting link with the Central Ontario Railway of Canada. So, after the contract had been made I see that a report was handed in by Mr. Collingwood Schreiber and I would like to call the attention of the government to some facts in connection with this report. It is as follows :—

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS,

Office of the chief engineer and general manager.

Ottawa, December 31, 1887.

Sir,—Mr. Ridout on the 21st instant, inspected the section of the Belleville and North Hastings Railway from the village of Madoc to the Central Ontario Railway near Eldorado with a view to the payment of subsidy.

This section of road it appears was built some nine years ago, but was allowed to fall into a dilapidated condition and became unsafe for traffic. A subsidy of a sum not exceeding $3,200 per mile nor exceeding in the whole $22,400 was granted to relay the track and bring the road up to a high state of efficiency, and with this in view a contract was entered into with the company.

The length of the section of road is 6 84-100 miles, the work it appears has not been carried out according to contract and much remains to be done to complete it as required by the specification. The amount of subsidy applicable is $21,888.

The value of the work remaining to be done....

This work is specified and it only comes altogether to $14,732.

I may here mention that no rolling stock has been provided, the company's engineer stating the Grand Trunk Railway have agreed to furnish the rolling stock and operate it, but so far as I can learn the company have furnished no evidence of this being the case, by filing with the department an agreement, and I think their attention should be drawn to this omission.

Then, there is a letter dated January 17, 1888, from Mr. Wainwright, assistant general manager and secretary of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which is as follows:—

Dear Sir,—In reference to the subsidy to be granted to the Belleville and North Hastings Railway, as provided by Acts 48 and 49 Victoria, chapter 59; and 49 Victoria, chapter 10, the Grand Trunk Railway Company have agreed to provide the line with the necessary rolling stock required to work it in accordance with the provisions of the contract entered into between the government and the Belleville and North Hastings Company and this will be supplied as soon as the railway is ready for operating.

So that the Grand Trunk Railway Company had agreed to supply the rolling stock for the Belleville and North Hastings Railway. It might well do that since the Belleville and North Hastings Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway were at that time one and the same company.

Mr. HAGGART. They had been amalgamated by Act of parliament.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Yes, years before. First, the Belleville and North Hastings was merged with the Grand Junction Railway Company and then these two companies were merged with the Midland Railway which was really part of the Grand Trunk Railway system. I find the certificate of Mr. Schreiber giving the estimated cost of the work to be done as $14,732. This is dated the 19th of November, 1888. Of that $14,732, $3,450 were for replacing timber box culverts with masonry. Although masonry seems to have been specified, as the cheque was given a few days afterwards, it is perfectly clear that up to the time the cheque was given, the road had not been furnished as required with the masonry and therefore from that $14,000 you had to deduct $3,450 which would make a little over $10,000 that the Grand Trunk Railway Company had to expend to enable it to put in its pocket $21,000. That letter of Mr. Wainwright, having provided for the rolling stock on the road, a letter appears from an engineer, Mr. Bradley, certifying to the road being in proper condition and then an order in council is passed on the 29th December, 1888, on the following terms :

On a memorandum dated December 27, 1888, from the Minister of Railways and Canals, respecting that under date December 26th instant, the chief engineer of government railways reported that the subsidized line of the Belleville and North Hastings Railway between the village of Madoc to the junction with the Central Ontario Railway at Eldorado, the subsidies for which authorized by the Acts 48-49, Victoria, chapter 9, and 49 Victoria, chapter 10 aggregate a sum not exceeding $3,200 a mile for a distance of seven miles or a total of $22,400, is in good running condition, and the amount of the subsidy actually applicable is $21,888 being for 6·84 miles, the rolling stock is provided by the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

The minister recommends that authority be given for the payment to the company of the said sum of $21,888.

That language authorized the payment of the subsidy to the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company, but not content with saying that such and such a sum might be given to that railway company, we have clause 3 saying :

The subsidies hereinbefore mentioned as to be granted to companies named for that purpose, shall be granted to such companies, respectfully.

Making, as it were, assurance doubly sure that the companies referred to were legitimate, genuine companies and would receive the money.

Mr. HAGGART. Had the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company any corporate existence at this time ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I cannot see how there could be any corporate existence when two Acts of parliament had wiped it out and the very language in the second Act which I read a moment ago and which I will read again appears to make it perfectly certain.

Mr. HAGGART. That is what I drew from the hon. gentleman's observations. He need not read it again.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The agreement between these two companies this Act of parliament validates in the following words :—

The said companies shall form and be one company, on the terms and conditions set out in the said agreement, and this Act, with capital also mentioned in said agreement, under the name of The Midland Railway of Canada.

All these statutes were Ontario statutes and that is, I presume, the reason the Department of Railways and Canals were not aware of all that had been going on, and they assumed that there still was a railway and when the assistant manager of a reputable corporation like the Grand Trunk Railway applied on behalf of that railway company it was a fair assumption that there was a railway and that he was acting genuinely. As a result of what I have detailed a cheque was issued and the government of the day apparently guarded itself, because I see the cheque is dated at Ottawa the 15th January, 1889, only a few days after the memorandum which required that $3,000 odd should be expended on masonry instead of woodwork. This cheque was as fol-:ows l—

Finance Department of Canada,
No. 9159.
Ottawa, January 15, 1889.
$21,888.
To the Bank of Montreal.

Pay to the order of the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company twenty one thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight dollars.
(Sgd.) W. COURTNEY,
Deputy Minister of Finance.
Countersigned,
W. ALLAN,
For Auditor General.

I would like to ask who in the world had the right to receive payment for that cheque—a cheque given by the Dominion government in favour of a road that did not exist? Surely the moment that road ceased to exist no one had the right to endorse that cheque. I would presume that any man who undertook to sign his name for the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company to a cheque was doing something that was not regardful of the law and for which he might have been called to account. I find on the back of the cheque:

Pay to the order of the president of the Midland Railway of Canada, the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company.
Per E. DONALD,
Secretary.

This is the same E. Donald who was secretary of the company at the same time as he was a clerk in the office of the solicitor of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and who is now their claims agent. Then underneath that I find:

For deposit, Midland Railway of Canada.
J. HICKSON,
President.

Which is the same corporation as the Grand Trunk and was under the same system. Then at the top I find.

For deposit, Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.
H. LEAL,
For treasurer.

Mr. GRAHAM. You have got to the right place now.

Mr. FOSTER. It is easy to see where it went.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I think the original documents show exactly where the money went. I think there is no question that this House granted nearly $22,000 to the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company to secure the completion and operation of seven miles of railway which had already been heavily subsidized.

We find that the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada applied for that subsidy in the name of the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company; that they in their own name agreed to furnish the rolling stock; that in reliance on the agreement with the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company, the late government handed over a cheque of $21,888 payable to the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company; that that cheque was endorsed by a clerk, and was deposited to the credit of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Under these circumstances, it seems to me that there is a real grievance on the part of the people in that part of the country; first, because, as taxpayers of this country they have contributed their share of the $21,888; then, as residents of the province of Ontario, they have contributed their share of the $3,000 a mile, which, with the interest, came to $114,000; then the county of Hastings gave a subsidy of $50,000 and the township of Madoc a subsidy of $37,000 for these seven miles; so that if we compute how much this Belleville and North Hastings road for a length of twenty-two miles, was assisted by the people of this country, we find that apart from the local townships other than Madoc it received $3,000 a mile for the whole distance from the province, $1,400 a mile for the whole distance from the county, $1,600 for the whole distance from the township of Madoc and $1,000 a mile from the Dominion, making altogether $6,800 a mile for the twenty-two miles. But if we take the seven miles of which I am now speaking, with regard to which this fraud has been perpetrated, the subsidies would be as follows: From the province, $3,000; from the county, $1,400; from the township of Madoc, $5,300, and from the Dominion, $3,200; a total of $12,900 a mile, or $89,600 for the seven miles. After all that money was paid by the people of this country the road was operated but a few days and then left to fall into decay. For years that $21,888 has been in the coffers of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, while not a single car has moved over that line of railway. That fact in itself would be sufficient to irritate the people; but I will go further, and show how they have been treated by the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

To show how consistent the Grand Trunk Railway Company have been throughout, let me mention a little more legislation that took place in regard to that road. I have referred to the fact that an amalgamation of all these railways took place in the year 1882. In the agreement annexed to the Act of amalgamation—the Act refers to the agreement and ratifies it—it is set forth that the various roads making up the Midland system, the united capital of which amounted to $4,100,000—should be capitalized at $6,500,000—more than 50 per cent of water poured right in at once. It was provided in the Act:

That the directors of a consolidated company for the time being may at any time, and from time to time, as they shall deem expedient, issue, sell and dispose of said re-

maining shares so held in reserve, or they may be issued in payment for services rendered or to be rendered or for such consideration as to the said directors shall seem to the interests of the said company, and at such price or discount or consideration as they in their discretion and judgment may deem best, and they may accept from the subscribers for, or purchasers of such shares, such sum, consideration or service as they may think expedient, and the said shares so issued shall be deemed, held and taken to be fully paid up shares in the said consolidated company's stock, and the holder or holders thereof may or shall have and exercise all the powers appertaining to holders of fully paid up shares, the proceeds of or consideration for any such sale to enure to and to be applied to the general purposes of the company.

In the course of these proceedings we find the Grand Trunk, octopus like, grasping out and combining together a certain number of roads, whose combined capital stock amounted to $4,100,000, and by legislation, without another dollar of money being put in, having the stock watered up to $6,500,000. When the time comes for the regulation of railway rates by government, when perhaps the hon. member for South York may succeed in having the passenger rate reduced to two cents a mile, we shall have hon. gentlemen saying: You cannot do that. Here is a road capitalized at $6,500,000, and it has to pay its poor shareholders interest on its capital. As a matter of fact, if the various railroads which formed this combination cost no more to their shareholders than the Belleville and North Hastings—and I speak with knowledge, having been solicitor of the trustees of the bondholders—I doubt if there is any man in this House so poor that he could not build a railroad.

I have brought this matter up in order to call the attention of the government to it. I am not aware that up to this date any fault could be found with the present administration in connection with this matter. I am not aware that their attention has been called to it and that they have refused to do their duty. The attention of the Grand Trunk Railway Company has been called to it. Deputation after deputation has waited on the magnates of that road; but, despite the fact that the money of the people of this country, improperly obtained, has been for many years in the coffers of the company, the only satisfaction these gentlemen have given to the defrauded people of that part of the country is this: If you will put up the necessary money, they say, to rebuild and equip that road, we will make such reduction in freights that in time you will get your money back.

I am sorry that it has fallen to my lot to bring this matter before the House, because I recognize, as does everybody else except perhaps the railway magnates themselves, that a feeling of indignation and resentment—one might perhaps call it revenge—exists among the people of this country from one end to the other against the great railway corporations. The people, rightly or wrongly, I will not say which, have come to the conclusion that while these great railway corporations are exceedingly alive and active in the pursuit of grants and bonuses, they seem to be without any sense of responsibility or gratitude in return. The day is probably not far distant when the people of this country, exasperated beyond perhaps what they ought to be, will come to this House demanding more drastic legislation against the corporations than should really be given. It does not require a prophet to foresee that at no distant day the people will demand that we deal with the railway corporations as mercilessly and rigorously as in the past they have been generously treated. In this matter we have a double duty to perform, we have to protect the people against the arrogance and injustice of the railways and, on the other hand, we have to see that no act of confiscation is perpetrated by this parliament against any railway company. I feel particularly the responsibility of what I am saying, because I recognize that Canada is, and must be for many years to come, a borrowing country. Our industries cannot be developed except by means of foreign capital, and any one who wantonly does anything to impair the credit of this country and to deter foreign capital from coming here, is playing the part of an enemy of the country. Therefore, I should be sorry if anything I have said about the Grand Trunk Railway Company should be construed into an unfair attack on that corporation. I have tried to lay the facts fairly and honestly before the House, and I believe that if the day should ever come—and unless a change comes over the spirit of the railway corporations, it will come before long—even should public opinion compel acts of injustice to be committed against the railway corporations, the railway magnates, who treat the public with contemptuous indifference, will be more to blame than the public, who have suffered so long and pleaded so unsuccessfully for redress.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the power not given to the Railway Commission to compel the company to operate that line?

Mr. NORTHRUP. That is very doubtful. The difficulty is that the Grand Trunk Railway do not appear in the matter at all. If the Grand Trunk Railway had signed this contract, I would not require to come to this House. I could go at once to the commission, but the Grand Trunk Railway astutely avoided making itself a party to the contract. So that if I should go before the commission, I would no doubt be met with the question: What has the Grand Trunk Railway to do with this, the Belleville and North Hastings

Company got the money ? I have not all the papers which were moved for some years ago, but sufficient have been laid on the table to justify my appeal to the government, and there are other papers not yet brought down which warrant my applying for them. I hope that my appeal to the government will be sufficient and that it will not be necessary for me to take any further steps in the matter. It seems to me that if the Grand Trunk Railway applied for a subsidy in the name of the Belleville and North Hastings Company—a company which did not exist at the time—and if the Grand Trunk Railway got the money and then failed to carry out the contract which it had deliberately caused to be entered into by a bogus company, the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will bear me out when I say that no man, with a proper regard for honesty, would do, in his own private business, what the magnates of the Grand Trunk Railway have thought proper to do. It is a simple matter for the government to obtain justice. I would ask the First Minister or the Minister of Railways to demand a refund from the Grand Trunk Railway of the $21,000 it improperly obtained, with interest from the date the money was paid, January, 1889. If that money be given back, the road could be built regardless of the Grand Trunk Railway, for it is but a little road seven miles long. But if the Grand Trunk Railway will not pay the money back, let the right hon. gentleman say to them : I want that road operated. If he should say that, that road will be operated at once. If I had the power of the right hon. gentleman or the Minister of Railways, I could have that road operated within two weeks. All I would have to do would be to let the Grand Trunk Railway understand that it must come before the Railway Committee, when it has any application to make to that committee, with clean hands. But that if it should come before that committee, still retaining that $21,000 robbed from the people, no further legislation would be granted it. How long do you suppose it woud then take to carry out its obligations ? There need be no confiscation of railway property, no pretense of injustice, but simply the intimation that until the company did what was right with this $21,000, which it had improperly obtained, it would get no further legislation. I apologize for having detained the House at this great length. My only excuse is that this is a matter of great importance to that part of the country from which I come. You will understand how important it is to a little township like Madoc to pay $37,000 and get nothing in return. The Grand Trunk Railway runs from Belleville north twenty-six miles to Madoc and stops there, whereas if it were extended seven miles further to Eldorado, it would connect with the Central Ontario Railway and we would have a road running to Bancroft and thence to the Parry Sound Railway which runs to Ottawa.

The reasons these large sums were contributed by various municipalities and subsidies given by the government, when Sir Mackenzie Bowell was representative of North Hastings, was that there were valuable mines along the line of that railway which required development. I have seen within the last six months people who expressed their readiness to operate these mines just as soon as a railway was opened, but that is out of the question when there is no railway to carry away the ore. There were some people operating mines there when the road was first built, but a depression occurred in the iron trade which put Canadian iron out of business and the mines necessarily had to close down. But the value of these mines is to-day beyond peradventure. In the northern part of the county there have been wonderful discoveries of minerals during the past few years. There are large deposits of iron in the township of Mayo being worked to-day. One establishment has a contract to supply 250,000 tons a year, and the only outlet is down by the Central Ontario Railway. But if these seven miles were built to Eldorado, that would furnish another outlet. There are valuable and extensive marble and soladite quarries in the north, which would be opened up if these seven miles of road were built. I appeal to the government to see that justice is done that part of the country. I am not imputing the slightest blame to the government, but I appeal to them, as custodians of the public funds, to consider what their duty is, if the facts I have stated are true. If my statements are not true, let them be gainsaid. If the Grand Trunk Railway improperly obtained $21,000 of the people's money in 1889, why should it not be compelled to carry out the contract it caused to be made by a company which none knew better than it, did not exist. I leave the matter in the hands of the government. I trust the papers will be brought down and that the government will see that this grievous injustice, not only to the people of Hastings but to all the people of Canada be remedied and this corporation made to do what is right.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I must congratulate my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup) on the statements he has made ; and to emphasize his remarks, I would give another instance of breach of faith by the Grand Trunk Railway. In its original charter—that charter which gave it large subsidies practically from the government—there was a clause compelling it to give the people from Montreal to Toronto a penny a mile third class passenger service.

Mr. GERMAN. Order. The penny a mile service has nothing to do with the subject under discussion.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am citing it as another instance of breach of faith by the Grand Trunk Railway, and this is a most opportune occasion on which to draw the attention of the House to that breach of faith. That obligation this company has never complied with, and the consequence is we have had instead a three and four cent a mile transportation charge over that railway.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is hardly relevant to the motion.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I think it is. I am simply citing another reason why this motion should be granted. My hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup) has appealed to the government to compel the Grand Trunk Railway to do its duty, and I want to show that not only has it been derelict in its duty in the instance he has cited but in other instances.

Mr. GERMAN. I beg leave again to point out that the hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the point is pressed I shall have to rule that the hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I shall have to bow, Sir, to your decision, but I propose to make my point in another way. I am pointing out that this company is guilty in other respects of what it is charged with in this instance, and in that connection I wish to say that not only has the government failed to enforce the law in the case cited by the hon. member for Hastings, but also in connection with the penny a mile service. And there are other instances of similar neglect on its part. I say it is incumbent on the government to secure some kind of redress. And I am glad to hear the suggestion to-day that the Grand Trunk or any other road that is delinquent in the performance of its obligations under the law should not be granted other legislation until it has complied with the law and with its solemn obligation in satisfactory fashion. They have disregarded their obligations in this case, as shown by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), and they have disregarded their obligations under their very charter. I appeal to the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) and ask why they do not insist on the Grand Trunk fulfilling its obligation in both these cases? The government constantly argue that it is not their duty to compel performance of such obligation. I contend that it is their duty. I have given reasons more than once to prove that it was the duty of the Minister of Railways to insist on the performance of these obligations. That duty rests also on the Railway Commission. The excuse given for the government in these matters is that we have appointed a Railway Commission and clothed it with great power. But still nobody seems to have the duty of enforcing the law. Now, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to the way in which they have solved this difficulty in the state of New York.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion is for a return of copies of certain papers. It does not seem to me that on such a motion such matters can be discussed as those which the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is discussing.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who moved this motion showed that a duty rested upon the government and upon the Minister of Railways to have the law obeyed in this particular case.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Northrup) was merely explaining the facts in this case as a reason why the papers should be brought down, but a general discussion of railway matters is another thing.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. In supporting the contention of the hon. gentleman, surely I have the same privilege that he had of appealing to the government to do its duty.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) says that he intends to bring up this matter on motion for Committee of Supply. That will give him his opportunity for discussion.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If the Prime Minister, or rather if the House, will pardon me, it seems to me that I am in order in going so far as the hon. member for East Hastings went in showing that the government ought to refuse further legislation to these people until they have fulfilled their obligations. Or, instead of that, the Railway Commission should compel the fulfilment of these obligations. On that suggestion I would point out that in the state of New York they created a railway commission——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is quite within his right in discussing reasons why this order for papers should be made, but he has no right to travel outside that and discuss matters that are purely irrelevant.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Is it not the proper practice in this House if a member wishes to bring any subject of importance before this House to move for papers and on that motion express his views? We find that course followed even when the member knows that there are no papers. This is one of the methods we

have always adopted for the discussion of matters of importance. It seems to me that this should give us the right to travel just beyond the exact record in the discussion of whether papers should be brought down or not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The point of order is taken and you have decided, Mr. Speaker, that it is well taken. All I can say to the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is that I shall be happy when he wishes it to give him an opportunity to bring up this question on motion for Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Under the ruling I shall have to accept that. But the question before the House, essentially, is the non-performance of an obligation by the Grand Trunk. I wish to emphasize that, and now would appear to be the proper time, but for some reason the delinquencies of this company are not to be discussed on this occasion when it is most proper. If the Prime Minister wishes to have this discussion to come up on motion for Supply I cannot object, but, while accepting the ruling of the Chair, it does seem to me that the case I wished to cite bears directly upon the motion of the hon. member for East Hastings. I suppose I am debarred equally from referring to the overcapitalization which was mentioned by the hon. member. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) would say that I am out of order there. But this overcapitalization of railways is a great and growing evil. Railway charges both for freight and for passenger must be reduced in this country. But when this is advocated, the answer always is: You are attacking capital. But the simple proposition is made here—and I have great pleasure in supporting it—that the Grand Trunk should be compelled to carry out its contract made with the Belleville and North Hastings Railway, and I say that it is the duty of the Prime Minister to compel that railway to fulfil its contract and so give a return for the money which was paid to it. As the hon. member has said, the law must be observed by great companies and small companies as well as by individuals. But, apparently, the rule to-day, according to the evidence placed before us, is that the Grand Trunk can defy the law when it suits them. It is defying it in this case. And I hope that the Prime Minister or the Minister of Railways and Canals will rise up and tell us that now that the matter has been brought to the attention of the government within two or three days the Grand Trunk will be compelled to give the people on that line the service to which they are entitled and to secure which for them the money has been paid.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I was very much interested in the remarks of the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), because I know something of the conditions existing along the railway of which he speaks, and of the feeling of the people there. The matter brought before the House now is not new. These papers were moved for some years ago, and practically all of them were brought down. The original sin seems to have been in granting a large subsidy to what my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) calls a bogus company. Well, if that is the original sin, I see before me the original sinners.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Sinners, or victims.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, the person who is a victim through incompetency is a sinner to that extent. I really agree with the hon. gentleman when he censures the lieutenants of his present leader, for there must have been gross carelessness on their part or they never would have given $21,888 to a company that had gone out of existence—according to his own statement—some years before. The charge made by my hon. friend is that the Grand Trunk, through a side door got a subsidy amounting to $21,888. That seems to be true so far as getting the subsidy is concerned. Then, another fact stated by the hon. gentleman is that they got it through a bogus company, or a company that had gone out of existence. Now, lest the public should think that my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) is censuring this government for carelessness, I would like to have it clearly understood that it is the late lamented government that he was censuring. I am surprised that my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) with all his astuteness, as Finance Minister should have paid a subsidy to a company that did not exist. I am surprised that my hon. friend from North Lanark (Mr. Haggart), when almost on the heels of this transaction he became Minister of Railways and Canals, did not demand an investigation, or something of that kind, into the payment of this subsidy to a bogus company. This was back in 1887—twenty-one years ago; so this trouble is of age.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, I am out of it. I was not Finance Minister then.

Mr. GRAHAM. But the payment was made a little later?

Mr. FOSTER. What date?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will give you the dates in a moment. Let me give a resume of the situation. I agree with my hon. friend that there ought to be some method by which the Dominion, the province or some other power would be able to make the railways who take Dominion or provincial subsidies or municipal bonuses carry out their part of these contracts. In November, 1887, an order in council was passed to

allow the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company to enter into a contract for the construction of seven miles. As my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) says, by the statute they had received $1,500 a mile for seven miles and also $1,700 more per mile, or $3,200 all told. The executed contract was sent in, apparently, by Mr. Wainwright in December, 1887. In the same month Mr. Schreiber sends in a report saying that the road had been built some years previously and had been allowed to fall into decay.

Mr. HAGGART. Was this contract of 1887 made between the government and the company ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Between the government and the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company—that was the company that my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) said did not exist.

Mr. HAGGART. The corporation did not exist at that time, I understood ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. Mr. Schreiber, in December, reported that this seven miles had fallen into a dilapidated condition, and the subsidy was granted to relay the tracks and put the road in good repair. In January, 1888, a letter came from Mr. Wainwright, for the general manager of the Grand Trunk, addressed to Mr. Perley, the secretary of the department, stating, as my hon. friend has said, that the Grand Trunk would supply the rolling stock. If what my hon. friend says is correct, they were supplying rolling stock practically to their own road. In January following, Mr. Schreiber makes a report, giving reasons why the sum of $14,732 should be deducted from the subsidy. In December of that year—that is nearly a year following—an order in council was passed authorizing the payment of the sum of $21,888 to the Belleville and North Hastings Company, which money, I am told by my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) the Grand Trunk finally received. Now, it is said that this seven miles of road is not now used. My hon. friend says it was used only for a few weeks. Reasons have been given for that, and upon these my hon. friend touched—such as the falling away of the trade of the mines and so on. But the fact remains that some company got the people's money. I am not here to defend any company. We must all remember that we, the people, have made ourselves partners of the railway—partners as a Dominion through Dominion subsidies, partners as provinces through provincial subsidy, and partners as municipalities in granting bonuses. We get our share of the return in the form of good service, or we do not get it at all. I am heartily in accord with all that is said in favour of making the companies live up to their obligations.

Now, this government has had this matter brought to its attention before. In 1906, a complaint was made by petition, I think, from Madoc. A letter was written to the general manager of the Grand Trunk, and, if the House will permit me, I will read his reply. This is not my reply, it will be understood, but the reply of the general manager of the Grand Trunk to the complaint that this piece of road was not being operated.

Copy file No. 6161-3.

Montreal, Quebec, October 16, 1906.

L. K. Jones, Esq.,
Secretary, Department of Railways and Canals, Ottawa, Ontario.

Sir,—Your communication of August 30 last relative to cessation of the operation of the railway line between Madoc and Eldorado, in the county of Hastings, Ontario, addressed to Mr. Wainwright, has been referred to me for attention. In answer thereto beg to state for the information of the department that in the year 1895 this same subject was discussed between the government and my predecessor, at which time it was represented that the building of this section of railway was one of those projects which results have not justified, the revenue resulting from the traffic thereon not being sufficient to pay but a small portion of the actual working expenses. Shortly after the date mentioned, I find that this company expended a considerable amount of money (exclusive of any subsidy) in rebuilding the line and relaying it with steel rails, and continued operation of the line until it was demonstrated to a certainty that it could not be made to pay expenses. From time to time during the last few years, coincident with the revival of business throughout the country, we have received inquiries as to the reopening of the branch and I have, for the encouragement of legitimate enterprise, offered to rebate the entire net earnings, in refunding the expense of repairing and making the line again fit for operation, on the basis of cash advances being made for that purpose.

Unfortunately up to the present such offers have not met with acceptance on the part of parties desiring the rebuilding of the line. I observe it is stated in the copy of the petition that accompanied your letter that the judgment of the petitioners is that a profitable business can now be done in the shipment of low-grade ores owing to certain discoveries which now permit such ores to be utilized. I am not personally aware of the facts referred to, but if it can be demonstrated to be a sound business proposition that a profitable business can be established on the line, I shall be very glad to consider the ways and means of again putting the line in operation on the basis I have referred to.

Until there is at least some reasonable certainty of the line meeting its fixed charges from local revenues the government cannot expect that this company shall be considered under the necessity of again demonstrating otherwise.

Yours truly,
CHAS. M. HAYS,
Second Vice-President and General Manager.

That letter is dated October 16, 1906. There is a grievance. No person is at all

anxious to evade the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) that there is a grievance. Happily these grievances are not very extensive or numerous throughout the country. Two or three of them have been brought to the attention of the department and I say frankly to the House that although it may appear to my hon. friend easy to say that the minister could do it if he chooses. I say frankly to the House that up to the present time I have not been able to discover machinery by which these contracts can be enforced after the railways have received the money. If a portion of the subsidy was yet due the railway we could, of course, retain it, but the company having received the money, having complied with all the conditions under the contract, it is not so easy and I must say that I have not yet found a way by which we can compel these roads to carry out their contracts in this respect. I will say further that I will not be satisfied until I do find some way. I do not believe that a railway company has a right to take the money of the people of Canada and then not carry out its contract any more than it would have a right to take my money and not carry out a contract entered into with me.

Would the remedy suggested be a fair remedy? Let us take a concrete case. Take my hon. friend from Grey who wishes to have the Grand Trunk Railway extend a branch through his part of the country. The remedy suggested by my hon. friend is that I, as Minister of Railways, should say to the Grand Trunk: We will not allow you to build a railway through the county of Grey until you settle up in the county of Hastings. Would that remedy be fair to the county of Grey? It sounds well theoretically, but it is not practical to my mind. We ought to have a provision somewhere in the statute by which we could possibly give the railway commission power to deal with these cases. The Railway Commission I believe is the proper authority to deal with them. While we have found that there are grievances in several cases, that have come before the department, we have not yet found the remedy and the remedy has not been suggested in this House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. You would not allow me to suggest it. I have it right here.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend has so many right there, he gets them in the wrong place; he gets the right remedy in the wrong place.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That is something.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are anxious to find a remedy so that this will not occur again. The people have a grievance not only on account of the subsidies voted by this House, but on account of the votes by municipalities throughout Ontario and in other provinces. Hon. gentlemen will remember having seen reports of one or two lawsuits where municipalities endeavoured to get back their money given in bonus to a railway corporation, but they have not been able to recover it. There is a weakness in the law somewhere that ought to be remedied, and I assure the House that I am trying to find out the method to remedy this grievance. If possible I shall have something further to say a little later on so that the Railway Commission or some authority may be given power to deal with such cases and compel companies to carry out their contracts with the people of Canada.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the minister know how long they operated the road after they got the large payment of $21,000?

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) says just a few days.

Mr. LANCASTER. I was wondering if the minister and the hon. member for East Hastings were in agreement on that, does the minister dispute the statement?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not in a position to dispute it. I know they are not operating now and have not been for some time.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (North Lanark). The extraordinary part of the statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) is that a contract was made in 1887 by the government of this country with a company which had no existence.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is what he said.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely there must be some mistake about that, although the hon. gentleman fortifies his position by quoting two acts showing that this company could not possibly have had an existence at the time. More extraordinary still is the payment of a sum of money and the bond given in the form of a subsidy to this particular company which had no existence and the fact that the endorsation on the cheque by which that payment was made is by the company, signed by an officer of the company. Surely that is forgery; surely the officers of the Auditor General's Department or some one was very lax in the performance of his duty when it was possible at all that any payment could be made in that way. That is a matter which the government may, if they think it worth while, have the law department investigate.

As to the power to compel the operation of a subsidized road, if I remember rightly that particular question came up during the discussion of the Railway Act, the refusal of a railway to operate a line for which it had received a subsidy. I think

we did give the power under the Railway Act to the commission to exercise that authority, even giving them the power to fix the dates on which the trains shall be run on the road in order to effectually work it. However, the minister says that there is doubt as to whether we did give that power to the Railway Commission. If so, it is the first time I have heard a doubt, but if there is such a doubt I am glad that the minister intends to remedy it and see that the power is clearly given them. I think they have the power now, but if they have not they should have it, for it is a monstrous thing that a railway receiving subsidies from municipalities and the governments of the province and the Dominion should refuse to operate the road. It is monstrous that they should be able to do as they seem to have done in this case, and say: unless we get more money from the government and the municipalities in order to put the road into working order, as the road is not paying well, we will refuse to operate it.

There ought to be a clause in the Act, as there is in the General Act, which we have adopted again and again in reference to railways—that if they refuse to operate or if they refuse to perform the conditions which are required of them—that is to keep their track in perfect order, and to pay their hands and employees upon the road—the government can take possession of the road, work it through the court for a certain time and then absolutely sell it. There should be power by which the government by itself or through the courts of the country, under such circumstances, could forfeit the charter and sell the road or transfer the charter and rights to a company which would operate it. We are all agreed as to that. We were agreed when the Railway Act was passed that one of the primary conditions of receiving a subsidy by any corporation would be that they would work the road. It would be monstrous if it were not so, as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) says, and if it is not in the Act it ought to be embodied in it. The idea of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which acquired the property of this company and which received subsidies altogether to the amount of $18,000 a mile writing to the government of the country and saying: We do not find it convenient to operate the road, we do not find it a paying concern, we have suggested conditions to the municipality which might result in putting it in working order, but they have not thought fit to make the advances necessary to do this as we are not in a position to do it and we will not do it. The company that wrote such a letter as that ought to be reminded of the power of the government, and should be told that if it is not in the law we will put it in the law to compel the operation of the road and we will take such means as will compel you to operate the road or forfeit your charter.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of very considerable importance and I am glad that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) has expressed a desire very clearly to exercise a remedy if he can possibly find one. It is not a question of who were the original sinners because the government, as soon as they are in that position, have to represent the rights of the people and it is their duty to carry out what is in the interests of the people. I am not prepared to admit at all without a good deal more information than I have today that there have been any original sinners in the sense of the former government. I understand that no great difficulty has arisen at all and I do not go as far as my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) in that respect. I think that the proper construction of the whole history of the transaction is that the Grand Trunk Railway Company has succeeded to all the rights and also to all the liabilities of the former company and it matters not at all, in so far as the remedy of the government or the Board of Railway Commissioners is concerned, that the transaction continued to be carried on for a time in the name of the original contracting parties. It is not of the essence of the transaction whether the government subsequently made a contract with a company which had become merged in another company, that is the Hastings company, which had become merged in the Midland company, or whether they contracted in the name of the Midland company; the result is the same, the substance of the transaction is the same and that is that the Grand Trunk Railway Company have taken to themselves all the rights and advantages which were enjoyed by the former company, and having done so, they have, as a matter of law, succeeded to all the obligations of the former company. What are the facts? We have the fact that the early company—the Hastings company—had become merged in the Midland company, and it appears we voted a subsidy to a particular railway and we voted it under the former name of the company. My hon. friend from East Hastings said that it was a defunct company. I do not think so, I think that we merely voted it to a company that had become absorbed in another company and that the company which had taken over the earlier company succeeded to the obligations and succeeded, by virtue of the vote of parliament, to the benefits of that vote. The Minister of Railways, the other day, said, in reference to the arbitration in which Mr. Schreiber is engaged, that we wanted to look at these matters as matters of equity and, as a matter of equity, there is no doubt at all that

the people have a right at the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to have this line operated just as much as if the cheque had been issued to the Grand Trunk Railway. We have to ascertain the facts ; and the facts are that by a succession of statutes and assignments all the rights and obligations of these earlier companies have been vested in the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The Grand Trunk Railway Company does not deny it. It is not questioned. It is not argued in any way that such is not the case. This letter which has been produced, dated at Montreal, October 16, 1906, and addressed to L. K. Jones, Esq., secretary Department of Railways and Canals, Ottawa, admits incidentally that they have to carry out the obligations of the parties who have gone before and whom they represent :

Dear Sir,—Your communication of August 30 last, relative to cessation of the operation of the railway line between Madoc and Eldorado, in the County of Hastings, Ont., addressed to Mr Wainwright, has been referred to me for attention. In answer thereto I beg to state for the information of the department, that in the year 1895 this same subject was discussed between the government and my predecessor, at which time it was reported that the building of this section of railway was one of those projects which results have not justified, the revenue resulting from the traffic thereon, not being sufficient to pay but a small portion of the actual working expenses. Shortly after the date mentioned, I find that this company expended a considerable amount of money (exclusive of any subsidy) in rebuilding the line and relaying it with steel rails, and continued operation of the line until it was demonstrated to a certainty that it could not be made to pay expenses.

The company does not here raise any point that they are not answerable to the government for the operation of the line because of the matters referred to by my hon. friend from East Hastings, or the matter referred to by the minister, or any informality in the granting of the money. I am not prepared to admit at all that this company should be allowed to merely refund that money. They ought to refund the money as the least they could do, but I think they should be compelled to carry out their part of the bargain. They take over an assignment of the business to be derived from all the assets of the earlier companies and they get subsidies of the moneys voted by parliament and by municipalities, in all, amounting to $90,000 without computing interest at all. They should be required now to operate that road just as certainly, to my mind, as if in their own name they had got that cheque. There is no doubt that they got the cheque. The transaction was carried through by one of their own employees, the cheque was issued to the Hastings company, endorsed to the president of the Midland company, a company they had been operating for years and which they subsequently took over and the cheque was deposited at the credit of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. It is not denied that they have the cheque. To my mind all the government have to do is to apply to the Board of Railway Commissioners for redress against that company. A year ago we authorized the board to employ counsel for the purpose of prosecuting cases where necessary and advantage should be taken of that.

But the minister asks, what remedy have you ? I do not think there is any material difficulty, if these facts are called up, in the board compelling this railway company to act fairly by the people. That is the first proposition. What we want to get at is the substance of the transaction. When the subsidy was applied for, it was applied for by the Grand Trunk Railway Company ; when it was paid, it was paid to the Grand Trunk Railway Company as a matter of fact. Then the railway company, I submit, is bound to carry out its obligation to the people. If there is any doubt about that, what is the duty of the government ? It is to see that equity is done, that the people have their rights ; and nothing is easier than for the government to bring in a short Act, and put it through this House in the same rapid way that we put through the Distribution of Seeds Bill on Friday last, directing that this company shall operate that road. We do not want confiscation or any undue pressure brought to bear on any railway company ; but when you have the facts established that this company has succeeded to the rights and got all the money invested in this railway, and has that cheque yet unaccounted for, there can be no wrong in passing an Act which will compel it to take steps to put that railway into a proper condition and to put it into operation for the benefit of the people who have contributed these moneys.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think there is no doubt whatever that the intention of parliament, when the Railway Commission Act was passed, was to give jurisdiction to the Commission to deal with such matters as the one brought up by my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), that is to say to compel railway corporations to perform the duties towards the public which parliament has imposed upon them. I did not understand my hon. friend to dispute that, but if I understood him aright, he thought no party in this case could be brought before the commission.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I very much doubt it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is disputed by my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). The railway was built by somebody, otherwise the subsidy cheque would not have been paid. I presume the subsidy cheque was paid to the party

who built the railway. I am not concerned to defend the late departed government for their numerous sins of omission or commission; but I do not know till I hear further evidence that in this particular matter they were very much to blame, for I presume that the cheque was paid to the people who put in their money into the building of the enterprise. It may be, as is stated by the hon. member for East Hastings, that through a process of transactions the money finally got into the hands of the Grand Trunk Company; but it seems to me that there is force in the argument of the hon. member for South Simcoe that if after all the cheque was received by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, even though it was in the name of another company, and they have benefited from it, there is some way of bringing them before the commission. At all events, I should like to hear the opinion of my hon. friend from East Hastings on this point.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I certainly cannot find any fault with the attitude of the government on this matter. From one word which was dropped by the Minister of Railways he seemed to think that I had cast some reflection upon him. I was not aware of the letter to which he referred until he spoke; but I was careful to say that up to date no imputation could be cast on the present government, for so far as I knew the matter had not been called to their attention. As to the letter of Mr. Hays written in 1906, I can only say that if I were Minister of Railways and I appealed to a railway corporation to carry out a contract which it had made, and the only answer that I received was one from the manager, not saying we did not get the money, or, there has not been a fraud perpetrated, but simply we won't do it because it does not pay us to do it, that railway manager would rue it to the last day of his life.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the objection to bringing the Grand Trunk Railway Company before the commission?

Mr. NORTHRUP. There are two difficulties. It is not at all certain, taking the reading of the Railway Act as it is to-day, that it would cover this case, even if the Grand Trunk Company had originally built the line. Our first Railway Act has followed the English Act in this respect, and under that Act it has been decided that you could not compel a railway company to operate seven miles such as this. So long as they were operating it you could make them do whatever was necessary and right for the proper operating of it, but you could not compel them to operate. So it is perfectly clear that under the original Railway Act the Canadian board would not have jurisdiction. It is doubtful whether they would under the amended Act, although I am inclined to think they would. Our difficulty is that if we brought this matter before the commission, the Grand Trunk Company would say: We have nothing to do with those seven miles of the road; when we took that road over in 1893, we did not consider those seven miles at all; they were not being operated. As to whether the road had really been operated at all after this payment in 1889, I have here a petition—I do not know the date of it, but from the signatures I know that it cannot be more than two years old, as it is signed by the reeve and village clerk of Madoc. It is a petition addressed to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada. After reciting how the road came to be built and what subsides were given, it says: 'A spasmodic effort was made for running the road, which only lasted a short time, but has not been attempted since.' But it states above: 'It has ceased altogether for fifteen years.' So I think it may be taken for granted that the road was never operated. I have been informed by the mayor of Madoc that after the Grand Trunk got the subsidy, they only ran a freight train to Eldorado, and did not run a passenger train.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Would it not be proper for the Prime Minister to assume that the Railway Commission has jurisdiction and proceed against the railway company? Probably they would find that they have jurisdiction and can compel performance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend from East Hastings seems to have some doubt as to that. I understood him to say that the Grand Trunk corporation had come to be the owners of that railway only in 1893.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The amalgamation of all these roads into the Grand Trunk system took place in 1893, and all that system has since been known as the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada; but the Grand Trunk Railway Company had practically owned and controlled all those railways for years before.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And also received the subsidy?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I have read a copy of the cheque, and I have seen the original, with the words, 'Deposit to the credit of the Grand Trunk Railway Company,' and in conversation with Mr. Hays he admitted to me that the company had received the $21,888.

Motion agreed to.

THE PARDONING POWER.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved:

For a return showing the number of imprisoned criminals released since the year 1896

by the Minister of Justice before the expiry of sentence, the names thereof, the term of sentence, the date of release, the reasons therefor, and the name of the solicitor who was interested in procuring the release.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make any extended remarks in asking for this return. I wish simply to give two or three reasons why I think it would be in the interests of the House to have these papers brought down. Probably other members than myself have noticed and with some wonder, the often recurrent paragraphs in the papers as to the release of prisoners condemned to imprisonment as punishment for crimes of greater or less magnitude, some time before the expiry of the sentence to which they have been condemned. Of course, under the general order established by the Justice Department and the government, it is open to any criminal imprisoned in a penitentiary to earn years off his sentence by good conduct, and a persistent good conduct in conjunction with a fairly long sentence often shortens the term by a very considerable time.

To that, I think, no one objects. It tends to produce in the prisoner a real reform, by giving him the hope that if his conduct shows evidence of a disposition to turn over a new leaf, he will have a certain number of years taken off his term, and thus be enabled, much sooner than he expected, to begin a new life. But what does strike one is the very frequent cases of men who have been sentenced for fairly long terms for offences which are not at all venial and who are let out of prison within a very short time. That has become so frequent that you find the newspapers drawing attention to the fact that it has become a branch of the practice of the legal profession for some lawyers to use their influence with the government to get prisoners out of penitentiary long before they have completed their sentence. That is reprehensible in two ways. When an offender has undergone trial and has been convicted, the judge who has tried him and who has consequently every opportunity of estimating his conduct and the character of the evidence, is undoubtedly the one best fitted to determine whether the circumstances are such as to entitle the convict to some mitigation of his sentence later on. There may be an appeal on points of law or a petition to the Minister of Justice urged by a solicitor, who is pressed by the friends of the criminal to do the best he possibly can to get him out of confinement; but the Minister of Justice, or the cabinet, which decides on the report of the Minister of Justice, is, after all, far removed from the atmosphere of the trial, and therefore is not in as good a position to pass judgment as the magistrate who presided at the trial. I have been informed of cases in which the pardoning power has been exercised without even the formality being gone through of asking the trial judge for a report on the case. If that be true, that is certainly going very far. I should hope that in scarcely any case has that been done, because I do not think that any Minister of Justice or any cabinet should pass on a sentence without having a report from the judge who imposed the sentence. Very scathing articles have appeared in the press from time to time in this connection, and this reckless exercise of the pardoning power has come to be looked upon as a menace to law and order and an encouragement to the criminal classes, by removing from them the salutary dread of stern justice. I have some very flagrant cases in mind. I have one, the case of a man who, acting as a broker, undertook to sell on a commission the stock of a certain company. He did sell the stock and pocketed, not only his commission, but nearly all the money. He was tried and sentenced to the penitentiary. But he had scarcely found his way into the penitentiary when an influential solicitor took up his case, and in a very few weeks he was set free again. I remember that the opinion was expressed at the time that, as the facts of the case had been published in the newspapers, it would not be possible for this man to go into that business again, but this country is large and memories sometimes not very long. Within the last year or so this same man carried on the very same practice in another city in the Dominion far removed from the scene of his first offence. He was again tried and sentenced to a very long term of imprisonment. That sentence was reviewed and his term cut down, but he is still in prison. It seems to me that it is a very heavy responsibility for a Minister of Justice or a cabinet to interfere with the sentences of judges who have heard all the witnesses and know all the circumstances, and more especially to do so on extremely short notice, before there could be the least evidence that the prisoner had changed his views and had really decided to reform. It is a serious menace to society to let loose upon the public convicted criminals who have given no evidence of reform and who are likely to resume their old life. I have not mentioned any names, but no doubt the case I have mentioned is familiar to many hon. members who are listening to me, and I could cite other instances. I merely cite this to show the gravity of the question, and I hope that when the papers come down they will show that this sort of thing is not so rife as one would judge it to be from the paragraphs which from time to time appear in the newspapers.

I know I shall be met with the plea that these are matters of privacy, and that it is not customary to bring these papers down. Well, on the broad grounds of common sense and constitutional government, I think there comes a period when such a plea ought not

to be urged. It is not impossible for a Minister of Justice to so abuse the pardoning power that parliament would be justified in insisting on a thorough investigation. Whether that time has come or not, I am not going to say; but if such a plea could be urged, we might be debarred from having any examination at all into what might be regarded by the public as a flagrant abuse. The too liberal use of the pardoning power may have a more baneful influence on the criminal classes than possibly we imagine. While I believe in tempering justice with mercy, it cannot have a beneficial effect on those criminally inclined to become convinced that, even if convicted, they can always have their terms of imprisonment very considerably shortened if they will only make use of certain lawyers who have a reputation for being successful with the Department of Justice and the government in their petitions on behalf of their clients. Especially is this the case if these lawyers should happen to be friends of the government, because that can give strength to the idea that if you only retain a lawyer who has sufficient influence with the party in power you stand a very good chance of having the pardoning power very effectively exercised in your behalf. That remark will hold with reference to any and every government.

The idea has got abroad—it has worked its way down deep into the minds of the people of every stratum in our society—that, if you want favours, you must approach the government through a friend of the government. Our whole system of patronage has taught that lesson too widely altogether in this country. And it will take a deal of a different kind of dealings to unteach that which has been taught. So, taking all these things together, this is not a right understanding of the exercise of the pardoning power. People read and think, and gather the lesson from each instance that arises. After all, the consensus of opinion of the people is pretty close to the line of justice; and if they see that this pardoning power is being badly used, they will form their opinion of our institutions of justice. And we here, conservators of public justice, whose duty it is to keep the sources of justice pure, must see that it is not well that there shall be any chance afforded for the formation of such an opinion as that of which I have spoken.

Now, I want these papers, and I want the reasons given; and I would like to be sure that I shall not be ruled out by the plea to which I have alluded, and which, in some cases, I quite acknowledge, may be a valid plea. However, we shall see what the Minister of Justice may say with reference to this matter.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I am glad, for some reasons, that this motion has been made. It gives me an opportunity of saying something with respect to this question, which, probably, I should not otherwise have had. But, except for that circumstance, I think it is very much to be regretted, in the interests of the men who are the objects of executive clemency themselves, that this motion should have been put upon the Order Paper. It is true that the motion asks for a return showing the number of criminals who have been released, since the year 1896, before the expiration of their sentences; but, in view particularly of numerous newspaper attacks which, in this connection, have been made upon myself personally during the few months that I have been in the position of Minister of Justice, I cannot but regard this motion as levelled directly at myself and my administration of the affairs of the department in connection with the exercise of clemency towards criminals. For that reason, I feel it, and I feel it the more because I stated in this House, within a few days from the time when I became Minister of Justice the principles which underlay the exercise of this power and which govern the administration of this prerogative of the Crown in Canada. And from that day up to the present time, I can conscientiously say that there has been no part of the duties which devolve upon me in the administration of the Department of Justice to which I have given more careful, more patient, more assiduous and earnest attention than the exercise of the pardoning power and the responsibility which rests upon me as the constitutional adviser of His Excellency in such cases. This is a branch of administration in this country which, if any branch of it ought to be absolutely free from the taint of party politics, this peculiarly should be; and I certainly, in my administration of the affairs of this department—as I believe every predecessor I have had in that office for the forty years of the life of the Dominion of Canada—have taken care to exclude absolutely and entirely every consideration of a political character, and of a personal character, and of every other character which might improperly influence the nature of the reports and recommendations which have been sent to His Excellency.

If this motion asked merely for a statistical return of the number of prisoners who had been the objects of clemency during any period of years, there could be no objection to it. But that information is already before the House; it is contained in the annual reports of the department and of the parole officer. I have only to refer hon. gentlemen who are interested to these reports for the number of prisoners released on parole from each one of the penitentiaries of the Dominion, the number released on parole from the Central Prison at Toronto, the Quebec jail, the Montreal jail, the Regina goal, the reformatory for boys,

the Mercer reformatory for women, and the other jails and institutions. There is presented annually a complete statement of the number of persons who have been the subjects of clemency during the preceding twelve months. But this resolution asks considerably more than that, and is worded in a way which, unless it betrays lack of familiarity with the constitutional principles connected with the exercise of clemency. must be intended to convey an erroneous impression. It may be that, practically, the releasing of any criminal before the expiration of his sentence rests with the Minter of Justice of the day ; but it is not literally so, and, at the present time, at all events, and in the hands of His Excellency the present Governor General, the personal examination into the case of every criminal on the part of His Excellency is something that I think I am in a position to vouch for.

There are two separate and entirely distinct branches of the exercise of the prerogative of clemency. There is the exercise of the pardoning power by which the criminal is released unconditionally, and his sentence as effectually put an end to as though he had served his full period of imprisonment. That is the exercise of the royal prerogative entrusted to His Excellency as the representative of His Majesty and in regard to which the instructions given to His Excellency under the royal sign manual state the circumstances under and the manner in which it is to be exercised. Let me refer you to what I said on June 13, 1906, on this subject, a few days after I took the position which I now occupy. Hon. gentlemen will remember that, a few days before I spoke, under-the recommendation of my predecessor in the position of Minister of Justice, a criminal had been released in British Columbia and that the circumstances occasioned considerable public discussion and were brought to the notice of this House in a somewhat fiery speech by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson). I stated upon that occasion after referring to the particular circumstances of the case then in hand :

> In Great Britain, for the last sixty or seventy years, the administration of the prerogative of mercy has devolved upon the Secretary of State for the Home Department, who is considered as being directly and exclusively responsible for the same. In Canada, His Excellency the Governor General is, by his instructions under the Royal Signal Manual, authorized and empowered, as he shall see occasion, when any crime or offence against the laws of the Dominion has been committed, to grant to any offender, convicted of any such crime or offence, a pardon, upon receiving, in capital cases, the advice in that behalf of the Privy Council for Canada, and in other cases, the advice of one of his ministers. In cases other than capital cases, such advice has been in practice that of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. AYLESWORTH.

And then I referred to the case then in hand and the circumstances under which the release of that prisoner had taken place. I pointed out then that so far as the pardoning of criminals is concerned, the unconditional release and the ending of the sentence which was fixed at the time of conviction by the court before whom the prisoner was charged, the exercise of that prerogative is by no means necessarily under the advice of the Minister of Justice. His Excellency is to act upon his own judgment but upon the advice of one of his ministers and that one, although in practice it ordinarily has been and no doubt will continue to be, the Minister of Justice, is by no means necessarily so. In this country we have and have had for the last nine years a system of a different character entirely, depending upon the statute in that behalf, the system of releasing the prisoner conditionally upon parole. He is not by any means pardoned ; he is still, in theory, in custody. He is no longer in close custody but he is liable to be returned to close custody upon breach of the conditions upon which he has ben liberated. His position, in short, is very much the same as that of a man upon bail, or a man under the old system of law which used to obtain not so many years ago, where every defendant was subjected to arrest upon the institution of civil proceedings against him, a man who had been released from his arrest in civil process upon bail. He was in custody of his bail, they were responsible for him, they must produce him, according to the condition of their bond, or take the consequences. He was no longer in close custody but he was none the less in custody. That exactly is the position of a criminal who, before the termination of his sentence, is released under our ticket-of-leave Act, and the exercise of the power of release conditionally under the statute is by the statute itself made to be a part of the duty of the Minister of Justice in advising His Excellency. As to that branch of the administration of clemency the Minister of Justice acts under the direct mandate of this parliament.

As I have said the two things are radically different, radically different in their application to individual cases. Some cases are not cases for ticket-of-leave, other cases eminently are. In some of the newspaper attacks to which I have previously referred, notably in one which appeared in the 'Citizen' of this city early in October last, it was stated in so many words that the exercise of the pardoning power since I had been Minister of Justice within the last year or two had come to be an abuse, that pardons had become under my administration of the department so frequent as to constitute an abuse and that in some cases it was the result of strong political influence. Now so far as concerns the charge of the exercise of, let alone the yielding to, politi-

cal influence, I have to say that in the twenty months during which I have been Minister of Justice there has never been one single instance, there has never been one single hint, even, of political influence on the part of any member of this House or of any other person. In the next place, with regard to the charge that the number of pardons has of recent years or of recent months so increased as to become a scandal, I have to say that instead of the number having increased, the number has in fact slightly diminished. During the twelve months ending September 30, 1907, there were 137 prisoners pardoned, while in the twelve months before that there were 145 and in the twelve months before that, 146. I made inquiry as to those three periods at the time that this article to which I allude appeared, about the first of October, in the newspaper I have mentioned. I did not go further back, but the statistics are public property and any one may inquire as he pleases.

It may be, however, that the writer in the newspaper was confusing and not distinguishing between the cases of pardons and the cases of conditional liberation npon ticket-of-leave. With regard to the releasing of prisoners on ticket-of-leave, it may be that I have adopted a system differing in some respects from those followed by my predecessors. I am not aware whether that is the case or not, but I wish to state, for the knowledge of hon. gentlemen of this House, something of the principles upon which, in my effort to reduce to some kind of rule the disposition of applications of this character, the exercise of the prerogative in this regard has proceeded. In the first place I wish to say that very possibly it may be that prisoners get the opinion or it may be are told by some more or less designing person, that the intervention of a lawyer, of any lawyer will be of advantage to them. I have to say that so far as I am concerned, the intervention of a lawyer has been on no occasion any kind of advantage that I am aware of to any prisoner. Frequently petitions come which very commonly are prepared by some professional gentleman, not necessarily a lawyer, but no doubt by the prisoner or the prisoner's friends, going to some lawyer to obtain the preparation of the paper. But no petition is of necessity, in the least degree. Only to-day I received a letter from some person whose name I was not at all acquainted with, from the northern part of the county of Hastings, Ontario, asking me what steps he must take to endeavour to secure the release of a friend of his who was in prison. I replied to him in three lines that all he had to do was to send me the man's name and the place where he was in custody; and I say now that is absolutely as effective as all the petitions or all the intervention of any lawyer in this country or any politician, or any person, no matter who he may be. I have paid thus far exactly the same attention and I intend so long as I remain in the position I occupy to pay exactly the same attention in the case of any prisoner to the plea of the prisoner himself, if he chooses to write a letter or if he chooses upon the occasion of the visits of the inspector of penitentiaries to the institution in which he is incarcerated to state his case; and out of the thousands of applications which in every year are made for clemency there are dozens upon dozens, I think I might say there are hundreds of cases, in which the only applicant is the prisoner himself.

The course of procedure upon receiving an application no matter from what source it comes, is identical and the same. We have in the Department of Justice two officials, one our senior clerk, a gentleman who has been in that department for now more than thirty years, a chief clerk, a man of long experience, an able lawyer, and a careful man. In his charge particularly and in the charge of clerks under him, is the work of preparing the cases for examination and for report, because I may say to the House that the cases are not few in number; they reach in the aggregate over 2,000 every year. The average number of cases of application for clemency considered is from 40 to 50 each week. Upon an application arriving inquiries are made; a report is obtained from the warden or head of the penal institution in which the prisoner is. If that report shows that the prisoner has not been of satisfactory behaviour during his incarceration, that instead of behaving himself as he should, he has been a continual source of trouble, has been continually infringing the prison rules and committing breaches of discipline, that circumstance alone goes far towards being an answer to his application. The warden is furthermore expected to state, if he knows or can find out, whether or not it is the prisoner's first offence, whether he is an old offender who has served terms before in the same or some other penal institution; and if the return of the warden shows that a man is not then purging his first offence. that circumstance does not necessarily preclude the exercise of clemency in his favour but goes very far towards doing so. The warden is also asked and practically in all cases responds to the request to give his own personal opinion from his observation of the man during his period of imprisonment as to the likelihood of his being a creditable subject for the exercise of clemency, in his behaviour subsequent to his release. Next as a matter of absolute course, the judge before whom the prisoner has been tried, is consulted and asked his opinion. I understand that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) in the observations which he made in introducing this motion stated that there

were cases in which the power of pardon had been exercised without the judge before whom the case was tried having been consulted. I can only say that I am quite sure no such case has occurred since I have been administering the department unless it has been a case where immediate, instant action was necessary to save the life or in hope of saving the life of the prisoner.

It is not an infrequent thing, it is a thing which occurs once a month, perhaps, that the warden of an institution or possibly the sheriff of a county or some one in an official position will send a request for a prisoner's immediate release accompanied by the certificate of the surgeon of the institution that his life would be endangered by longer custody and that release immediately might perhaps save him. Cases of that sort are sometimes of apparently such urgency that if action is to be taken and is to be of any advantage to the prisoner there is no time to refer it to the judge. Unless in a case of emergency of that character, there has not, to my knowledge, been a single instance in which a report has been forwarded to His Excellency where action has been taken without the judge having been referred to and without the judge's report appearing among the papers. Now, the report of the judge is of necessity of the most absolutely confidential character. No judge would be willing to state his ouinion about the case of a prisoner if he thought the opinion might appear in the newspapers at any future period. The prisoner may have been a man of prominence in the community; the judge knows more or less about him or the prisoner may be the veriest scoundrel among the dregs of humanity. These are circumstances which must be known if a case is to be dealt with intelligently and of necessity the report of the judge under such circumstances must be treated as being of the most absolute confidential character. Indeed it has always been so regarded. As far as I am aware no Minister of Justice in this country has ever taken any position other than the one which I adopted on the occasion I referred to and which is thoroughly and fully borne out by all the authorities as the true constitutional position in that regard. I find this citation in Todd upon parliamentary government in England, page 561:

> It was said by Macaulay that he would rather entrust it——
>
> This prerogative——
>
> —to the hands of the very worst ministry that ever held office than allow it to be exercised under the direction of the best House of Commons.

And Todd, commenting upon that says:

> No interference by either House of parliament with the exercise of this prerogative is justifiable, except under extraordinary circumstances.

But, the confidential character of the report which the judge makes in regard to the prisoner is not peculiar to what the judge may say because there are other inquiries made if there seems any occasion or necessity for it. If there is any hopeful source of information indicated upon the papers, if the judge makes reference to some other official who might know something about the case, or if, for any other reason, it is thought that information which would be of value, can be obtained from any person of standing or prominence in the community, a member of this House, on whatever side he sits, a member of one of the provincial legislatures, a sheriff, or any person in a responsible position is communicated with and he is told in terms in writing to him that anything he chooses to say will be treated as absolutely confidential. It must be so when you consider what is being asked of a correspondent and what answer he very probably will make. There are therefore in the cases of those thousands of prisoners' files now lying in the Department of Justice letters and papers of the most confidential character which, certainly, I should not be willing to disclose and never would disclose unless absolutely ordered to do so by this House. I would hope that this House would not make such an order upon me. There have been in the history of the department but three instances, I am told by the gentleman to whom I have already referred and who has grown up with the exercise of this branch of the department during the last thirty-five years, in which this House has so ordered—capital cases, cases which attracted a great deal of attention and cases to which, by reason of their public character—one of which was the case of Louis Riel—a great deal of attention was directed and which the House thought were of that extraordinary nature which would warrant the House in requiring the papers to be produced.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. When you left the chair, Mr. Speaker, I was speaking of the responsibility which rested upon the Minister of Justice in connection with the exercise of the pardoning or releasing power, and I wish it to be understood that I am not in any sense disclaiming the responsibility for every exercise of that power which has taken place since I became Minister of Justice. At the same time, I wish to explain to you the routine of applications for the exercise of clemency, in order that you may understand the extent, and the full extent, of the re-

sponsibility of the minister for the manner in which that power is exercised. As I have said, I accept the fullest responsibility for every case of release that has taken place during the twenty months that I have been Minister of Justice. In that time some 3,500 of such applications have been considered and passed upon ; perhaps as many as 500 prisoners have been released either conditionally or unconditionally before the expiration of their term ; and I am quite sure that except for the few weeks last fall during which I was absent from this city and this country, no single instance of the release of a prisoner has taken place otherwise than upon my personal recommendation and my personal examination of the papers. So that I take the fullest responsibility for whatever has been done in that respect. At the same time it should be understood just what the routine in dealing with these cases in the Department of Justice is. I have already described the course which is taken in every instance of making inquiries that are open to the minister from every source that seems favourable. We have the services of an active, intelligent and excellent parole officer to whom the cases are referred when it is thought that he can make inquiry into the antecedents of the prisoner ; and after all possible information has been gathered from every available source, the papers are examined by the chief clerk to whom I have referred, and who has had many years of experience in exactly this kind of work. No case comes before the minister for consideration except upon a report drafted by that officer or by the deputy minister, and with a recommendation either to exercise or to withhold clemency. Since I have been Minister of Justice—I cannot speak for my predecessors, but I presume that they followed the same course of practice—I have personally examined and have personally read every word of every file relating to every prisoner who has made application for his release. This involves in each case on the average a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes or possibly half an hour of work. That means a considerable amount of work in the course of a week, and much more in the course of a month or a year, when it is remembered that there are at least two thousand such applications every twelve months. If, as happens in the majority of cases, I see no reason to differ from the conclusion that is put before me by the deputy or the chief clerk, it is a mere matter of my expressing by endorsement my concurrence in the recommendation, and the papers proceed to His Excellency. But if it is a case in which anything has struck me in my perusal of the papers, leading me to think that perhaps clemency ought to be exercised, or the reverse, a conference is had on the subject with the officer who has prepared the report, and, after discussion, some conclusion is come to as to the recommendation which ought to be made to His Excellency. The papers are then laid before His Excellency, and I am in a position to state that the signification of approval on His Excellency's part is no mere matter of form with the right hon. gentleman who occupies that position at the present time. Not infrequently suggestions are made, or a personal conference takes place between His Excellency and the minister upon the subject of a particular prisoner, with the result that clemency either is exercised or is withheld. I think I am entitled in the circumstances I have described to ask the House, if credit is given to the minister for a desire to do his duty in the case of these prisoners—who are in many instances unfortunates, as well as in many instances actual criminals—I say I think I am entitled, if I have the confidence of this House, to ask hon. gentlemen to believe that the recommendation for the withholding or the granting of clemency is made with as much care as in the ordinary course of business affairs it is possible to devote to what is certainly a very important matter. The responsibility for the recommendation, whatever it is, rests on the minister, and, as I have said, I take it. Except in capital cases, the relations between His Excellency and the minister who is advising in matters of clemency is a personal one. It is not a responsibility on the whole government as such, as no other minister than the particular one who is advising His Excellency is acquainted with the circumstances of the case. But certainly in the system which at present prevails, and which I have no doubt has always prevailed since these matters rested upon the recommendation of a responsible minister, every safeguard I am able to suggest to myself to ensure the care and attention which ought to be given to these cases is thrown about the course of business upon which the advice and recommendation is given.

The question then is whether this House ought in the circumstances to exercise the power which I fully concede it possesses to order a return of the character which is asked for by this motion. I invite the attention of hon. gentlemen to the wording of the motion. It asks not only that the number of criminals who have been released since the year 1896 before the expiry of sentence should be given, but the names of such prisoners. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not able to enter into the mind of the hon. gentleman who framed this motion, but it is not possible for me, thinking about it to the best of my ability, to divine what reason there can have been for asking that the names of pardoned prisoners should be made public. If it is thought about, is it not cruel to propose such a thing. There have been in the course of eleven years

probably some thousands of prisoners released by the exercise of clemency. It is proposed that the names of all these should be published and put upon the records of this House. I am not able to understand any possible advantage to any person that there could be in such a proceeding. It is the theory of the law—it is more than a mere theory, it is an actuality—that a man who has served his sentence in full has atoned for the crime for which he was sentenced. Not many years ago a case very well known among lawyers occurred in England where, in a newspaper quarrel, one editor referred to a rival as a felon editor, it being the fact that the editor so referred to had some years before been convicted and sentenced to punishment in some penal institution, and had served his term. The man so referred to brought an action for libel, and it was adjudged by the courts that to apply to him the term of a felon was as grievous a libel upon him as if he had never seen the inside of the walls of a penal institution. He had served his term, he had purged his offence, he had atoned to the laws of his country for the crime he had committed, and he could no longer lawfully be spoken of as a felon. Notwithstanding that a man may have been pardoned or may have been at large during a portion of his term, he has as completely wiped out the offence in the eye of the law as if there had never been the exercise of any clemency in his case, and he has served the full term of sentence which the court imposed upon him.

And such men, although they have been the recipients at the hands of the representative of His Majesty, of the grace of pardon or the exercise of clemency, are now —after years have passed and after they may have to some extent regained their lost position in the eyes of their fellow men —to have their names brought before parliament and published broadcast throughout the country, and they are to be branded as men who have served their term in the penitentiary or who were set at large by grace of the Crown. It would be a piece of needless cruelty to expose these men to the odium of such a proceeding, and I should hope that this House would never—unless the best of reasons were shown—order any minister to publish such a return. And this motion asks for not only the names of all persons who have received clemency at the hands of the Crown but the reasons therefor and the names of the solicitors interested in procuring the release. I have already indicated the necessarily confidential nature of the reports of the judges or other authority, which are asked for and received by the minister when considering cases of this character. It is manifest that, however confidential such reports may be, the report of the minister upon the whole case, sent to and acted upon by His Excellency must be equally confidential. I am not for a moment denying that this House has the power to order the production of such returns or to order a statement or a copy of any part or of all these reports which have been made since 1896, but I am asking ought that to be done? Is there any reason given for doing it? Why should it be done when, in the nature of things, these reports are personal to the individual, when they describe the circumstances of his offence—when they give everything in the man's past record which aggravated it or extenuated it. As I have already indicated, the whole course of procedure, both in England and in this country, has been opposed to any such course. In Todd upon parliamentary government in England, at page 415, discussing this question, I find he uses the following language :

If the Queen's ministers possess the confidence of parliament, it is inexpedient and unwise, as a general rule, to interfere with their decisions in regard to the details of administration except in cases wherein it may appear that the public interests have been injuriously affected by the action of the minister.

On page 417, referring to the powers of the House, he says :

But it is evident that these extraordinary powers of interference ought not to be invoked except upon special necessity. As a general principle, parliament should confide in the discretion of the responsible advisers of the Crown who are the trustees of the Royal Prerogative for the rightful administration of the same. So long as parliament continues its confidence in the ministers, it ought to be willing to leave the exercise of the prerogative in their hands, unfettered by restriction in regard to its exercise and should ordinarily refrain from interfering.

In this House,—as I said, Mr. Speaker, before you left the chair at six o'clock—I stated on the 13th June, 1906, the general principles which I understood obtained in England and in this country with regard to this particular matter. I concluded what I then said in these words :

In the view of His Excellency's advisers, it would be, as a general principle, unusual and inconvenient to lay before parliament the ground upon which that discretion proceeds, which dictates leniency or severity on the part of the responsible advisers of the Crown. The course generally practised in the past has been in accordance with this principle, and it is considered that in the particular case no special reasons exist for departing from the general rule.

It has been said here that the impression prevails that political influence dictates the action of the minister in this regard. I may say, with reference to that particular case alluded to in the citation I have just read, that the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McPherson) accompanied by one of his colleagues from British Columbia, came to me personally and asked me to see the papers,

and I begged them to withdraw their request. They did not see the papers, and papers, which were of a confidential character, have not ben shown in any instance, since I have been Minister of Justice.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. minister will allow me, I can tell him that I have been invited into the office and examined the papers on more than one occasion, under the administration of some of his predecessors.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I understand my hon. friend to say that some previous Minister of Justice had invited him to see the papers and that he had seen them. I have not a word of criticism to offer on the course taken by any of my predecessors. I can only say that unless the case were of a very unusual character, if the hon. gentleman or my closest political friend came to me and asked to see a file I would try to disuade him; and I am not sure that, in any case, I would consent.

I have already pointed out that this motion asks a great deal. It asks to have made public that which is in itself of a most confidential character. No judge expects that what he says about an individual, if he speaks his mind, is going to be shown to any one, and it may be, to that particular person's intimate friend. No judge would act with the same freedom if he thought that his reports would be, under any circumstances, made public. But I fully acknowledge the power of this House to order the production of papers in any particular case, if it thinks proper. I am only arguing, as well as I can, against the principle of doing it, unless the circumstances are of a most exceptional and unusual character.

I said before you left the chair, Sir, that, so far as I am aware, and so far as is reported to me by gentlemen of long experience in the department, there have been only three instances since confederation in which that had been done. One was the case of Louis Riel—a state case. The other was the case of the man Shortis, at Valleyfield, in which there was a great deal of public feeling. The third was also a murder case, and all three are instances, not of an ordinary prisoner regarding whom the exercise of clemency had proceeded on the recommendation of the minister, but of capital cases in which the whole council sat and acted.

In referring to the terms of the proposed resolution, there is just one other circumstance to which I wish to advert. The motion asks for the names of the solicitors interested in procuring releases. As I have already explained, in the majority of cases that have come up for consideration, no solicitor has been in any way concerned. I think I am safely within the mark in saying that eighty, and more likely ninety out of a hundred applications, are applications made by some member of the family, or by the prisoner himself, or some person other than a solicitor. A large proportion of the applications are the personal applications of the prisoners made verbally to the inspectors. On visiting any penal institution, the inspector, before he leaves, appoints a time when he will see any prisoner who comes before him with complaints. The inspector notes what takes place and reports to the minister. There is no visit of an inspector to a penal institution which is not followed by applications for clemency. Many are made personally by the prisoners, and in each case the appeal receives absolutely and exactly the same consideration, the same fulness of inquiry that it would receive if made by any solicitor in the land.

It is impossible for me to prevent the interference—if I may use the word without intending any reflection—of a solicitor in such a matter.

I do not know that I desire to prevent it. If the father of the prisoner, or the prisoner himself, has means and wishes to engage a solicitor to prepare the papers, that is his own affair. I can only say, as I have said before, that I can assure any such person that there is no need for the services of a solicitor, and that his case is not in the least degree advantaged by any such services so far as I am able to see. I have been told, in some instances, that large fees have been exacted from poor people, ill-able to pay these fees, by solicitors who ought to have been above any such conduct, as a condition of their preparing and presenting the papers supposed to be necessary for an application of this character. If such things have taken place, I can only say that I lament them as thoroughly as any man can. These are things which might well be brought to the notice of the law society or the courts controlling the action of such solicitors. It is something in regard to which I am powerless; it is something in regard to which I have no knowledge other than that such statements have, in one or two—perhaps in as many as three or four—instances been made to me. But I have done everything I could, in the way of answering letters and advising people who have written to me with regard to applications for clemency, to dissuade them or point out to them that there was no necessity in the world that they should engage the services of a solicitor in connection with their application.

Now, in regard to the number of cases in which action has been taken in the last twenty months, I have just a word further to say. On an average, I suppose, there are six or seven, possibly ten, applications made to every one of them that is successful. Applications are renewed after the lapse of a few months by, or on behalf of, prisoners of long terms. These things are of continual occurrence. But in the possibly ten per cent, possibly twelve, or maybe

fifteen, per cent of the total number of applications which succeed there has not been, so far as the pardons are concerned, any increase; on the contrary, there has been a slight diminution in the number during the months which have passed since I became Minister of Justice. There is this further to be remembered in that connection. In the session before last parliament passed a statute to provide for the deportation of undesirable immigrants. A certain portion, and by no means an insignificant portion of our convicted criminals in this country fall within the description of that statute. A man, let us say, has been in this country for only a few months when some crime is committed, and the man is sentenced to a longer or shorter term of imprisonment in consequence. It is impossible to apply the provisions of the ticket-of-leave Act to such men. The ticket-of-leave Act, as I have previously explained, requires the freedom of the criminal to be accompanied with conditions. One of the conditions, a very useful one, is the reporting to police authorities periodically; but, in any event, it is a condition of the ticket-of-leave that the criminal who has been released upon ticket-of-leave shall remain in Canada. He is still to be in custody; he is still under our control; and he may not depart from Canada without forfeiting his ticket-of-leave and his right to be at large. Of necessity, therefore, in every case of the deporting of an undesirable immigrant, who has been convicted and sentenced to imprisonment, the only form that the exercise of clemency can take is that of unconditional pardon—the prisoner is pardoned and immediately taken out of the country in custody until he is beyond the limits of the country. This statute, and the administration of the statute, during the last nearly two years, has measurably increased the number of prisoners who have received pardon. But, notwithstanding that considerable increase, their number for the last twenty months stands substantially less than during the preceding like periods, as I have already pointed out. I take no credit to myself that it happens to be so—it is but the happening. I state the fact, however, in answer to the charges that have been made, that during the last few months, during the last year or more, there has been an abuse of the pardoning power. Then, with regard to the exercise of the duty which is imposed upon the Minister of Justice by the statute of this parliament known as the ticket-of-leave Act. That statute was passed for good cause; that statute was not intended to be a dead letter; that statute was passed with the deliberate object by parliament that the power it confers upon His Excellency, under the advice of the Minister of Justice, should be exercised in proper cases. There has not been any increase in the annual number of the cases in which tickets-of-leave have been issued since that statute was enacted in 1899 in any degree out of proportion to the annual increase in the prison population. There is one difference of circumstances which I adverted to before the House rose for recess, that I should explain, and which possibly may have served to increase the number during the last year or eighteen months. We have a statute under which good behaviour on a prisoner's part, industry and adherence to the rules of the institution, entitles him, if he is a prisoner serving in a Dominion penitentiary, to a remission of a number of days, fixed by statute, in proportion to the length of the sentence he has to serve. By remissions, if a man's conduct is exemplary and unexceptionable, he serves a sentence of seven years in five years and six months, if I remember well. The shorter sentences do not receive, even for the best of conduct, so great a period of remission. But there are days of remission, and careful account of them is kept in the records of each penitentiary with regard to the conduct of each individual prisoner. There is no such provision in the case of such institutions as the Central Prison at Toronto, in which the prisoner may be serving a sentence of anything less than two years. The great majority, I suppose, of the prisoners in the Central Prison at Toronto are sentenced to twenty-three months, or two years less one day. For any term less than two years the prisoner may be sentenced to the Central Prison, or a similar institution in the other provinces, instead of to a Dominion penitentiary. Such prisoners, no matter how good their conduct, get no remission by law. It is not for me to criticise, and I do not, for a moment, question the propriety of the legislation which makes a distinction in that respect between our long-term prisoners in the penitentiaries and the shorter-term prisoners in Central Prison and similar institutions. But since I have been Minister of Justice—I do not know what the case was before—it has become a not infrequent thing for the warden of the Central Prison at Toronto to report specially by letter to me the case of some particular prisoner whose conduct may have seemed to him to deserve some special recognition. I happen to have the advantage of an intimate personal acquaintance with the gentleman who is now warden of the Central Prison in Toronto. He is a man for whose good judgment, and for whose good intentions, I have the very highest respect; and when he writes to me, as he has not infrequently done, in the case of this, that or the other prisoner, saying this prisoner's conduct could not have been better, or his industry more thorough, if he had been working here for wages, and I recommend that he receive, as a consideration for his good behaviour, a remission of one or two, or, it may be, three months, at the expiration of his term—I have always regarded such recommendations as very strong foundation upon which clemency might, without im-

propriety, be exercised. In every instance where that has taken place, as in every case that has come up for consideration, the convicting magistrate or judge is referred to. The circumstances of the offence are inquired into. These are circumstances which, in the nature of things, a warden of the Central Prison may not be in a position to know about personally.

And if as the result of the inquiry the case does not seem on the whole to be one in which, notwithstanding the recommendation of the warden, clemency ought properly to be exercised, I have placed myself in communication again with the warden, explained the circumstances and asked whether or not knowledge of these facts and the views of the trial judge or trial magistrate would modify the opinion he had formed. These are instances not without considerable number which go to swell the aggregate released upon ticket-of-leave, and there is the further circumstances that I alluded to before six o'clock and which I want more fully to explain. The case of long-term prisoners in the penitentiaries, who have made repeated applications for clemency without success is one that calls for special consideration and special care. You may have the case of an old offender, a man who has been convicted it may be half a dozen times, and you say at once that clemency has no place for such a man ; he is an habitual criminal and he should serve out his full term. But here is another way of looking at the matter. Such a man is generally experienced enough to know that it is to his interest to behave himself while in prison ; such a man very frequently receives full remission and upon the records of the penitentiary he is without a single black mark. He may be the kind of prisoner who will serve a seven year term in five years and six months. Such a man may perhaps fall to be released say 18 months before the expiration of his full term. He may make an application for clemency at the expiration of five years ; he has but six months to serve and will then go scot free without condition. I have thought—it has been an idea entirely of my own, and I am trying it as an experiment, I am trying to watch whether or not it will work well—I have thought that in the case of such a man, by giving him say three months in addition to the remission which he has earned and letting him go at large at the expiration of five years and three months, instead of five years and six months, you might be doing a good thing for the individual and a good thing for society in this way : If he serves the full period of five years and six months he goes free unconditionally; he is beholden to nobody, he is under no kind of supervision or restraint; he is as free as though he had never been incarcerated at all. But if he goes at large three months before that sentence would expire with the remission which he has earned, he goes for the remaining one year and 9 months, the full term of his original sentence, under the restraint of a ticket-of-leave. He must report to the police, he must produce his ticket-of-leave when called upon. If he does not behave himself, if he commits any wrong, he is liable to have that ticket-of-leave cancelled and to be sent back to the penitentiary to serve the full period without any regard to the remission he had earned. In several instances, especially during the last twelve months, and as my experience in the administration of this very difficult part of the duties of the Minister of Justice has extended, I have acted upon that principle. I have not yet heard of a single instance in which the experiment has not been successful. True there has not been time enough, true our experience has not been extensive enough to enable any one to judge with accuracy if that is a safe principle to go upon, but it struck me that it would be in the interest as I have said, both of the individual and of society to have that man under the restraint of a ticket-of-leave for a longer period rather than to have him go absolutely free after holding him for a few months additional of the term of his sentence.

It is a question of course just where to draw the line, just how much to give the man, for it has happened in several instances where there would be only a couple of months, say two months before his sentence with remission would expire, the old offender has been knowing enough to say : No, sir. He would rather remain and serve out his sentence with remission earned and go without restraint in a couple of months. If, however, the additional period of liberty for him is large enough, he takes it, and, whether thankfully or not, he finds himself under the restraint of a ticket-of-leave not merely for a few months of his time but for the period of the remission as well. Cases of that kind increase the total of cases in which clemency is exercised but with the increase I have adverted to the fact remains that except in proportion to the extent to which the prison population is increasing in this country the number of prisoners released either conditionally or unconditionally is not increasing.

There is no general rule that can be applied with uniformity in the determination of the proper course which ought to be taken in these cases. Every case must of necessity stand upon its own particular circumstances but as a sort of working rule to be observed so far as possible, I have laid down for myself in my own mind and have communicated to the officials who are acting in the working out of these applications, the general principle that under ordinary circumstances and unless some good reason to the contrary appears, a prisoner ought to serve one-half his time. I do not for a moment mean to say that this is ap-

plied with uniformity. There are cases not infrequently arising when to apply such a rule would defeat the whole purposes of the statute authorizing the conditional release of offenders; but I have endeavoured in a sort of rough way to lay that down as a kind of working rule for myself in my own mind. I am told in the department that this is a considerably greater portion of the sentence than previous Ministers of Justice have thought was a sufficient portion for the prisoner to serve and that the rule had rather been that if one-third of the time had been served, the case was one which at all events could be considered and if favourable circumstances appeared might be favourably considered. I mention that circumstance simply because it accounts for the fact that even with the substantial increase in the number of cases in which clemency has been exercised that I have adverted to, even with the operation of our Deportation of Undesirable Immigrants Act and with the other cases I have spoken of, the long term offenders who are repeaters and the other circumstances I have mentioned, still the total number is not increasing year after year except in proportion to the increase of prison population.

Individual cases arise which are of particular note in some particular locality which have excited particular attention there and which therefore are seized upon by those in the locality who do not agree with the action of the Crown in the premises, as cases for criticism. A case of that character has been adverted to this afternoon. I am not able to hear across the floor and was not able to hear what was said, but I am told that the case spoken of, was that of a broker, whose name the hon. gentleman did not care to state, unwittingly perhaps demonstrating by his own unwillingness, natural and proper unwillingness, to state the name publicly, the impropriety of making such an order as he asks here, that the names of all persons pardoned be published. This case is one that I do not in any degree identify by the circumstances reported to me as having been given in regard to it. I feel satisfied, however, that although there have been probably as many as 500 cases of release since I became Minister of Justice, that case is not one of them. I may be mistaken, of course I cannot pretend to carry all these cases in mind, but I feel satisfied this is not one which came under my personal notice. At all events, whether or not it was a case in which I myself acted, I am unable to discuss it because I know nothing of the particulars. I point to it, however, as illustrating the criticism of the administration of this department which is made. Some man who has been in prison is seen at large, in the streets it may be of the town from which he came. The local newspaper takes the matter up and the local newspaper does not agree with the action of the Crown, or if you please, of the Minister of Justice, in the matter. Editorial articles appear and they are copied here and there in other newspapers and there is quite a newspaper noise about the release of some particular individual.

Well I can only say in regard to such cases that it has seemd to me,, in reading these criticisms from time to time in the newspapers, that it would have been better if the people who had written in regard to them had made themselves acquainted with the circumstances before they wrote whatever they may have so penned. It is impossible in the nature of things for a newspaper writer, or for any person who has not had before him the reports of the judge or other officials and authorities who are commuicated with, and, it may be, the private letters of people in the vicinity explaining the circumstances and giving their views in regard to the case—it is impossible. I say for those who have not had that material under careful consideration to be in a position to come to a proper conclusion as to whether or not it was right to have exercised clemency in an individual case. I can only refer to such cases in the general way in which I have done, and say that it seems to me that no other system is possible than some such system as is now in operation in this country. It may be said that it would be better that there should be a board of pardons. Some advocate it. I have had delegations of earnest and right-thinking people who are interested in the welfare of prisoners and who have urged upon me the propriety of introducing legislation into this parliament to establish a board of pardons. I must say, after such consideration of the subject as I have been able to give it and with a great deal of anxious thought in regard to it, that, while it would be to me personally and to any Minister of Justice a most welcome relief to have so responsible a duty taken off his shoulders, to have such a very considerable drain upon one's time taken away from his working hours, I do not believe that such a system would be any more satisfactory than the present one. It always depends upon the individuals whom you have as constituting your board of pardons. The Royal prerogative of mercy is one of the grandest of the royal prerogatives. We are here in a monarchial country, we are all here—at least, I make this statement as representing my own feelings and I have no doubt those of many others—as ardent believers in the monarchial system as the best form of government, and I have no wish to curtail in the least degree the few remaining prerogatives of the Crown. The exercise of the prerogative of mercy on the part of the Crown on the advice of responsible ministers seems to me, if you have the proper minister and if you have, as you are always bound to have, a proper representative of the Crown, as near the ideal system of

exercising the prerogative of pardon as man can devise. We have here that system in daily, practical operation. It is a legitimate subject for criticism in this House. I do not for a moment deprecate criticism, but I do earnestly deprecate the proposition that there should be made public the things which this resolution calls for, or that there should be manifested, unless sound reasons for it are given, that absolute want of confidence in the administration of that branch of the Department of Justice, which, it seems to me, this resolution necessarily implies. I have already spoken in a general way, and I do not want to enlarge upon it except to refer again before concluding to what was said by the hon. gentleman who introduced this motion, as to the impression, which I understand, he considered was abroad that friends of the government were appealed to in order to secure favours of this kind. I merely want to say in that regard that in the short experience I have had in the Department of Justice I have had the pleasure of personal interviews or of letters from quite as many men—members of this House who sit upon your left, Mr. Speaker, as from members who sit on the right—in regard to applications of this character. I have made absolutely no difference whatever in the way I have received either such gentlemen or such representations in whatever shape they came. I have with absolute freedom written as I would to any friend to hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House in regard to cases that have arisen in their own constituencies and in regard to which I had no doubt they would have personal knowledge. I have received their confidential replies, and I have acted upon them with exactly the same feeling of safety and reliance that I would adopt in acting upon the views, or recommendations of any man in whom I had such degree of confidence as to believe that he would not mislead me in an important matter of this character. I can say without fear of any successful contradiction that there has been no manner of political influence at all exercised or attempted to be exercised in the case of any application for clemency that has come under my notice during the time that I have been in the department.

In regard to this motion I would hope—I do hope—that the hon. gentleman who has introduced it, after such discussion as may take place in regard to it, can see his way to withdrawing it from the consideration of the House. If it cannot be withdrawn then if it can be so modified that it should ask for mere statistical matters and that it should not ask for the names of the persons pardoned or the reasons therefor, apart then from the unpleasant insinuation which is contained in the asking of the names of solicitors who have been interested in the applications or as to the releasing being the personal action of the Minister of Justice, I should have no objection at all to the motion passing. But, if the motion is pressed upon the House in its present shape I can only say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to hon. members of this House, that it would seem to me nothing else than an expression of want of confidence in the Minister of Justice and I can view it in no other light. So long, it seems to me, as this House has confidence in the person who occupies the position of Minister of Justice it ought to trust that minister to administer this branch of the department without fear, favour, partiality or affection.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). If no one else is going to speak I have a few words to say before the discussion closes. I was at a loss to understand the somewhat excessive warmth and heat with which the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) commenced his remarks. He seemed to feel as though this was a motion, as he said, levelled at himself, and he has ended by declaring that the motion, as it stands, implies a want of confidence in the Minister of Justice and so, I suppose, in the government. For neither of these assumptions can I see the least reason in the world. The Minister of Justice may not believe me, and there may be some gentlemen on the other side of the House who may not believe me; nevertheless, I say, Mr. Speaker, that when I made this motion and when I spoke to it this afternoon I had not the faintest or the remotest idea of importing into it anything of a partisan character at all. I did not mean it for an attack upon the government or for an attack upon the Minister of Justice. I am quite willing to allow hon. members and the public to read the remarks I made here before separating for dinner and to judge whether or not I did not treat it in as fair and cool a manner as I thought it should be treated. It was within my own judgment that I penned this resolution and that I brought it before the House. I intimated the reasons for it not once, nor twice, but scores of times. During the past year or year and a half. I have read paragraphs in the newspapers—leaders in newspapers and seen discussions in the public press on the point which I have brought up here to-night as to whether or not it was not too great an exercise of the pardoning power, as to whether too great an exercise of the pardoning power was not weakening, to a certain extent the foundations of justice in this country. I shared that opinion to a certain extent—to an extent at least which impelled me to try and find out, as no man can find out from statements now and again read in the newspapers, as to how many were being pardoned and to what extent the pardoning power was being used.

Am I wrong, Mr. Speaker, in wanting to know that? Are the people of this coun-

try not entitled to have these indicia by which they can judge for themselves as to how the system of jurisprudence which we have in this country is being carried out? It is not a reflection on a minister, it is not a want of confidence in a ministry, if such thoughts arise and such criticisms are made on a matter on which the fullest information possible should be got. I leave myself in the judgment of the House as to whether I am correct in that or not. I am not going to inflict on the House a tithe of what I have spoken of seeing in the papers; but I am going to give one example from a Liberal Conservative paper, one from an independent paper and one from a Liberal paper, as illustrations of the discussion that has been going on. I take the following from a Liberal-Conservative paper:

The use of the pardoning power has in the judgment of many, including not a few friends of the present Minister of Justice, degenerated into an abuse. The pretense that clemency is only exercised on petition signed by those familiar with the facts, and after a report by the sentencing judge or magistrate has been received and considered, does not satisfy the public.

In another part of the same paper, after referring to an article in the 'Globe' newspaper, this paper goes on to say:

To ask these questions is to suggest their answers, and they have not been put a moment too soon. Society must be protected against the undermining process which has been going on so surely in recent years. If sentences are to be revoked after heavy expense has been incurred in running to earth the guilty parties and bringing out such evidence as constrains a jury, sworn to give the accused the benefit of any doubt which his counsel may be able to create in his favour, to render a verdict of guilty, then, we say, there will be a disposition to avoid the expenditure of effort and money to bring the guilty to justice. The 'Globe' is apprehensive of such a result.

That is from the Ottawa 'Citizen,' a Liberal-Conservative paper. I next give an extract from the Hamilton 'Herald,' an independent paper, and, so far as I have been able to read it, a very good type of independent paper. It says:

There has been a great abuse of the pardoning power, especially in the past couple of years. Prisoners who have been tried, found guilty and sentenced have been released from prison after serving only a portion of their sentences, not because they did not get a fair trial or that there had been any miscarriage of justice, but friends of the convicted prisoners get up petitions on their behalf which are signed by 'influential' citizens, politicians and people of all classes. They do not take the trouble to inquire into the circumstances and ascertain if the person imprisoned is deserving of clemency; they simply sign the petition to please somebody else. They do not stop to consider what effect it would have on the community if law and order did not prevail.

Well, after the petition has been largely signed it is forwarded to the Minister of Justice, then the member representing the place where the prisoner comes from proceeds to get busy. The convicting magistrate is, out of courtesy, asked to make a report on the case, but very little attention is paid to it unless it happens to be favourable, when it is used as a defence by the department in case its action is questioned.

It would be interesting to know just how many prisoners have been pardoned in the past few years. And in how many were there just grounds for a commutation of the sentence? We do not argue that the pardoning power should be abolished, because there may be cases where prisoners have been unjustly convicted and where there has been a miscarriage of justice. In such a case, if the prisoner proves his innocence, the jail gates should be opened, the man liberated and every effort made to amend the wrong done him. But only in such cases should the pardoning power be exercised. The convicting magistrate or judge is in a better position to make the 'punishment fit the crime' than is the Minister of Justice, who is not conversant with the facts, except as they have been presented to him. He does not know the circumstances under which the sentence has been imposed. Releases as the result of petitions are so common nowadays that people are beginning to lose respect for the administration of justice; it is becoming a travesty. A prisoner says: 'O, let him send me to jail; I'll get out in a short time.' And if this man happens to have a 'pull' he does get out. There is no evidence that he has repented or that he intends to turn over a new leaf; he is just released as a matter of 'policy.' But the poor fellow, without 'influence' and friends has to serve out his term, although a loving and unhappy wife and a devoted mother may be counting the days when he is to be released.

The next article is from the 'Globe' newspaper, and is as follows:—

Is it true that the sense of justice is beginning to sag in Canada? Is there a growing tendency to compromise with crime, to arrange beforehand as to judgment and sentence, to make legal technicalities supreme over the demands of justice, and to count law and life as matters of less than absolute authority? Does social standing, or money power, or political influence enter as an element into the administration of justice or the punishment of crime? Questions such as these are raised and pressed home by recent instances which neither the authorities of justice nor the Canadian public can afford to underestimate or dismiss. The raising of such questions involves scrutiny of the temper and attitude of every officer, attorney, magistrate and judge, and of the provincial and federal departments of justice under which they serve. It is worth while putting such questions squarely, sternly, for if the sense of justice weakens, or if adequate punishment does not follow crime, there can be neither strength nor dignity in Canadian life.

I present these three articles as samples of the kind of discussion which is supervening upon the talk and current ideas that have been floating around in this country

with reference to this matter. Would the Minister of Justice say, because the 'Globe' or either of these other papers discussed the question and said that it was perfectly proper that all departments should be held to their task even up to the highest, the federal authority, in order that these matters might be put right and the sense of justice should not be weakened or dimmed in this country, that they are pressing a motion of want of confidence against himself or against the government? None of these papers, I believe, have that in mind; but as great public journals they are obliged to discuss the current issues of the day, and this is a matter which has pushed itself into the public eye and has been widely discussed in the press of this country. My own view was exactly the same as that of these papers. I had an impression that in these latter days in Canada, as most certainly in the United States, we were verging towards laxity in the administration of the law, and maybe an over and not very wise charitableness sometimes, which led to the condonation of crimes and to the releasing of prisoners, and various other influences brought to mitigate sentences—a condition of things which was not healthy for the body politic, and against which discussions of this kind are the very best possible antidotes; and I determined that when we came to the House I would bring this matter up and have it placed as fairly as I could before the House, and I would get as much data as possible in order that the public mind might be set at rest as to the technical or mechanical phase of the matter at least. That is why I brought it up, and I do not think my bringing it up should be interpreted by the Minister of Justice as being something personal levelled at himself. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman will take my assurance, that there was nothing of that kind in my mind at all. He says that he feels it personally. Now, a man who takes a public position is bound to stand criticism, and he must not think, because the department over which he presides is criticised and sharply criticised, that in every case it is a personal matter. Why, public men would have no rest, night or day, if they supposed every criticism, good, bad or indifferent, which was levelled against the ramifications of great departments of government were always levelled personally against a minister. My hon. friend must try to thicken his skin a little so as to avoid this oversensitiveness. If he does not do it by his own operations, perhaps external operations will do it for him in the course of his political experience until he begins to see that in nine cases out of ten it is the department itself and the general conduct of business which is the subject of criticism, and not the minister—always placing on the minister, as the presiding genius and master of the department, the responsibilty for everything.

I thought the hon. gentleman did not treat a modest youth like myself with that thoughtfulness he should when he intimated that the wording of the resolution argued very little knowledge of the course of the Department of Justice in the exercise of the prerogative of pardoning, or else was intended to create an erroneous impression. With his permission, I would say that I have a cursory knowledge of the steps taken in all these cases, but nevertheless I am exceedingly obliged to the hon. gentleman—as no doubt the House is also—for the long disquisition which he gave us into the minute details in this connection; and the very fact that I gave him the opportunity of giving the House this long and minute disquisition ought to entitle me to his gratitude. Very admirable indeed it was in many respects, but possibly not altogether necessary for the purposes of this motion.

He deprecated what he termed the insinuation of mine that political influence at all swayed him. Well, I think I can appeal to any one who will take the trouble to read 'Hansard' to-morrow that I made no implication of that kind, but stated simply what was an absolute fact. I said that, owing to the depth and breadth of the feeling throughout this country regarding the influence of patronage, it was the popular impression that if you wanted anything from the government, whether by favour or by right, it was necessary that you should approach it through one of its own friends, and thereby put in operation the power of influence or what is popularly called 'pull.' I said that I did not apply that remark to any particular government, but to both parties and all governments, and such opinion will always prevail in this country until we root out some day hereafter—I hope not very long hereafter—that very vicious system of patronage, to which so many abuses can be traced.

The resolution is not at all as sweeping as the Minister of Justice would have the House think of it. It may be a little more sweeping than I had intended it to be. By the words 'the number of imprisoned criminals released' I did not mean that we should go into the whole extent of the ticket-of-leave system inaugurated a few years ago. What I had reference particularly were the cases of release by pardon and not cases under the ticket-of-leave system, because under that system the release is only conditional, and the prisoner released may be brought back to prison if the reports of the parole officers are unfavourable. So that, so far as that is concerned, my resolution is probably a little wider than I intended, if the minister puts that interpretation upon it.

With reference to the names, I acknowledge at once that there is a very well grounded objection to publishing the names

of those who became criminals and were registered as such and afterwards were pardoned and given an opportuniy to renew their lives. It is humane, charitable and proper that as little as possible—and if possible nothing at all—of preceding history should be brought to light again, and I had no idea at the time that the names would be published throughout the country. But of course if a return comes down, it is not necessarily published. It goes first into the hands of the clerk, then into the hands of the member who moved for it and is always accessible to the other members of parliament, and, as a rule, it is accessible to the gentlemen of the press. So that it might be possible for the press, if they were so minded—though I cannot see why they should be—to publish the names. But under all the circumstances, and after the explanation of the Minister of Justice, I would not feel now like calling for the names. There are two or three cases which I may bring up again, but, in accordance with the suggestion of my hon. friend, I would heartily concede, for the present at least, to drop that part of my resolution and leave the names out. I would be the last man in the world to attempt to revive, in the case of these unfortunates who go into the broader life again with the idea of rebuilding their character and making homes for themselves, anything that would be the least detrimental to them in that laudable purpose. The term of the sentences, the dates of the releases are not excepted to, as I understand. They are simply statistical.

Now, as to the reasons therefore, I have been a cabinet minister myself; I am quite well conversant with the mode of proceeding. The whole of the minister's objection amounted to this, that we ought not to have these confidential reports brought down to parliament. I never asked, and had not the least intention of asking, for them. I still hold to the right of parliament in certain cases—and they must be special cases—to have the whole record down, and that has been done in several cases. What I had in mind was that, as a source of information to the people, we should have the number of sentences and the number of pardons and the reasons for these pardons. Those reasons will suggest themselves to the minds of all members. My hon. friend has himself mentioned several. There is good conduct, certified to by the warden of the penitentiary or prison, as a sufficient reason. It would be quite sufficient to give as a reason, 'good conduct, or good conduct on the recommendation of the warden.'

Mr. BRODEUR. But when it would be based upon the report of a judge?

Mr. FOSTER. I would not ask for the judges' reports in all these cases, and I have not done so. A good reason might in such a case be given. For instance, that the trial judge had reported new facts, and that on these new facts, accompanied by a favourable report of the judge, the remission was made. That is an easy reason to tabulate. Then there might be a case in which the judge reported that an unreasonable public opinion had unduly influenced the jury and that, when the coolness of impartiality had succeeded to the warmth of prejudice, that fact should be made a legitimate excuse for the exercise of clemency. I am not a lawyer, but I think you could get a new trial on an allegation of that kind. Or it might be that in the first trial all the facts did not come out, or that new facts came to light afterwards; and that, being sufficient for a new trial, would be a good case upon which to make a remission of part sentence. Extraordinary provocation is another. Previous good character is another. Many crimes are committed in the heat of passion. What you may call temporary insanity takes possession of the individual and the crime is committed. Some people say that no man is normal when he commits a harsh or cruel crime, but that, for the time being, he is, to that extent, insane. Any one can see how dangerous is the pressing of a plea like that. But it is certain that case after case arises where a man of absolutely good character and straight life, in a sudden burst of passion, commits a crime. For this crime, he is sent to prison. It may be true that his good character cannot be taken into consideration by judge or jury at the time as a reason against allowing justice to take its course. But this good character, joined with good conduct while in prison, may be a strong reason for remission of sentence. These reasons naturally suggest themselves to the minds of all hon. members. That was the kind of reason that I wanted, and I hope that the Minister of Justice wil disabuse his mind of the idea that I wanted all these confidential reports of wardens and judges and parole officers, and all these secret bits of family history to be brought down and exposed to the gaze of the House and the public. The name of the solicitor, I think, I should have. The Minister of Justice has given me three good reasons why this part of the resolution should be adopted. He says that it is perfectly proper for the right kind of solicitor to interest himself in the right way in making out the papers and forwarding the petition for leniency or remission if he believes it to be a good case. I entirely agree with the Minister of Justice in that; and, in such cases as he has referred to, the solicitor cannot object to having his name mentioned in connection with the case, the other reason he has given was that, in ninety cases of a hundred, no solicitor intervenes. If this be so this part of the resolution will not trouble him. The third reason is the best of all. The Minister of Justice has said

that it had come to his ears that lawyers had, in certain cases, demanded exorbitant fees of criminals or the friends of criminals, either on the ground that they had influence or for some other reason. I think I took down accurately the words of the minister. He said: 'Large fees have been accepted by solicitors who ought to have been above such things.' And he went so far as to say that, in such a case, the solicitors should have been reported to the law society and dealt with by that society. If the knowledge that the solicitors' name in these cases can be brought down will prevent a repetition of what has taken place over and over again—the exaction of high fees from the friends of poor unfortunates on the idea that the person who exacted them had peculiar talent in managing these cases, or had peculiar influence with the government for the time being in power—it would be a meritorious and advantageous thing to bring down these names. If it would act as a deterrent then let the solicitors' names be brought down.

I thought it right for me to make these explanations, and to put my action exactly where I wanted it. I would strike out 'the names thereof.' As to 'the reasons therefor' I have explained that, and I do not think any one can obect to it. But, if I have not made it perfectly clear, I may add a word about it. The reason I asked for these is plain. If, for instance, there is a return brought down of say five hundred cases, and no reasons for remission or pardon be given the return is obviously incomplete. If these reasons be given, I fancy they will naturally divide the cases into six or eight groups. If no reasons were given, it would lead to an increase of the feeling which is betrayed in the quotations I have read. The people would see a case given, but they would have to imagine the reason for the remission or pardon. I should think there would be no difficulty in bringing down the information. In these explanations that I have given, I think I have met the suggestions of the Minister of Justice. If, with these emendations, the motion be adopted, and I get the information, I think probably the object in view will be gained. My desire has been, in the first place, to get the statistical information so the country may see what has been done in the way of remissions and pardons. I would like to have the reasons in each case—though, as I have explained, I certainly do not ask for the private reports or anything of that kind. Then, the terms of sentences should be given, the date of the release and the name of the solicitor interested in procuring the release.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If I may be permitted, I may explain to the hon. genman (Mr. Foster) that it would be difficult to give the reasons for the remission. In many instances, the case has been referred to the judge, the judge has given his report, and the endorsation is simply 'granted' or 'refused' without reason given.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not ask that the confidential documents shall be brought down. In such cases as that referred to, no reason would be given.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman, then, wants the reasons as far as practicable.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, make it read 'the reasons therefor as far as practicable.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Then, the motion should be amended to read:

For a return showing the number of applications for release——

Mr. FOSTER. No, I do not want the number of applications.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think it would be well.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, yes, that would make it fuller. It would show the proportion between applications and releases.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (reading):

—the number of applications for release of prisoners and the number granted since the year 1896 by the Minister of Justice before the expiry of sentence, the reason therefor as far as practicable, and the name of the solicitor who was interested in procuring the release.

Mr. FOSTER. And it should include 'the term of sentence,' and the 'date of release.' The Minister of Justice made no objection to these.

Mr. SPROULE. That would not cover, as I understand it, the cases of those who had a portion of their sentences remitted—those who had their sentences shortened.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think it would.

Mr. SPEAKER. 'The number granted' would include those granted in whole or in part.

Mr. BERGERON. But 'the reason therefor,' I understand, is struck out?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want him to bring down the judge's report.

Mr. BERGERON. In the case of Shortis I made a demand in the House for all the papers connected with the commuting of the sentence, and the House ordered all the papers brought down and they were brought down. One report of the judge was strictly confidential and the judge had asked that his report should not be placed before parliament, but still it was brought down because the House ordered it. Every report was brought down.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In what year was that ?

Mr. BERGERON. In 1894 or 1895. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper at that time was Minister of Justice. I simply mention that to the House that no objection was taken to the production of these papers even in confidential ones.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) I think was not here when the Minister of Justice stated that there were three cases, those of Riel, Shortis and another in which all the papers were brought down. These were very exceptional cases and the exceptional circumstances made it advisable ; but as a rule the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) agrees that the confidential report of the judges should not be brought down.

Mr. BARKER. Might I suggest that the words 'as far as practicable' perhaps hardly express the meaning intended. I would say 'as far as expedient.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would agree to the suggestion.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. As my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has conceded that it would not be wise or proper to lay down the practice of publishing the names of persons who had been pardoned or released should be given to the House and the country, so also I think it would not be wise to bring down the names of the solicitors as that would be only one step from giving the names of the prisoners. If the solicitors' names were given the names of the clients could easily be inferred.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all, if you apply them to numbers.

Motion as amended agreed to.

ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS RE TIMBER LIMITS.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle) moved :

To lay on the table of this House for inspection the original applications and tenders in respect of timber berths numbers 1220 to 1226, 1238 and 1272.

He said : In moving this resolution I merely wish to state that I want the originals because I cannot do justice to the case without them. I have not the information in the copies which the originals could give me.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend was not in the House to-day when I asked the First Minister what he proposed to do with reference to those four motions. The First Minister said he would keep the matter over and give an answer on Wednesday.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I wanted to give an answer to my hon. friend as to whether they should be taken out of the paper and considered as motions without debate ; but my hon. friend is quite within his right, he can move his motion if he wants to.

Mr. LAKE. I need simply add that I have never moved for any return in this House which I did not consider it necessary I should have to enable me to carry out the duty which I owe to my constituents.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The position I took on this matter to-day was that a motion of this kind would not be granted as a matter of course but had to be accompanied by sufficient reasons to justify the unusual procedure. We are now familiar with the subject. The reasons given by the hon. gentleman are sufficient, so far as I am concerned, to justify the motion. I would beg to amend it however by adding the words :

Said papers not to be part of the archives of this House, but to be returned by the clerk to the Department of the Interior after inspection.

Motion as amended agreed to.

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington) moved :

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that a commission of enquiry be forthwith appointed to investigate the needs of Canada in respect to technical education, and to report on ways and means by which these needs may be best met.

He said : I may inform the House that this resolution has been endorsed by some of the most prominent bodies in the country. I have the honour of bringing it before parliament at the joint request of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, an association representative of a very large proportion of the skilled labour and mechanics of the country, and of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, an association which embraces in its membership a large proportion of the industrial employers of this country. Both of these bodies have given a great deal of time and thought and consideration to the subject and both have endorsed it. It has also been endorsed by some of the leading educationists in Canada, men who are at the head of our universities, and by over thirty of the leading boards of trade and chambers of commerce, representing the chief industrial centres in Canada. I mention these matters at the outset in order to show the House that the question of technical education is a very live question in Canada to-day. The shrewdest men in the country are occupying their time in considering the question, and I think it is generally felt that the time has arrived

when some definite action should be taken in regard to it, or at least some extended inquiry should be had to see whether or not a system of technical education can be adopted in this country. I would have preferred had some one more familiar with the whole subject been asked to move the resolution. I am aware that there are hon. members of the House who are very familiar with the general question and also with its details; I hope that before the close of the discussion some of these members will give the House the benefit of their experience.

I beg to place on the records the formal resolution of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada in regard to this matter It is :

Resolved, that inasmuch as the natural resources of Canada in its rivers, in its forests and in its farm lands—are of immeasurable extent and commercial value, and are urgently calling for the best and most approved means of development and utilization; and whereas the present methods of production require further scientific stimulus—more especially in the mechanical branches—of a broadly national character, through a proper and special educational system; be it resolved, that this Trades and Labour Congress of Canada place itself on record as in favour of the establishment of industrial technical schools throughout the Dominion, and it is hereby an imperative instruction to the executive of this body to use its best efforts, at an early date, in urging the importance of the subject upon the serious attention of the Dominion government with a view to the establishment of such a system of special education throughout Canada.

And from a memorandum presented by the Trades and Labour Congress to the Dominion Government I quote the following :—

The workmen of Canada are strongly of opinion that the welfare and development of Canada demand some large scheme of technical education. It is not a matter alone for the welfare of the workmen or of the employer, but of the whole Canadian people. We want Canada to be foremost in the arts and manufactures, and we are just at that stage of industrial development when the institution of technical schools would be of most value.

The Canadian Manufacturers' Association passed the following resolution :—

Be it resolved, that the Dominion government be requested to appoint a commission to report on the best method of establishing a comprehensive national system of technical education to provide Canadian industry and commerce with trained assistants from amongst the Canadian people, and thereby aid in developing Canadian industry, and do away with the present conditions of affairs, which compels employers to go abroad for men to occupy the more responsible and more remunerative positions in Canadian enterprises.

As a sample of the resolutions passed by thirty boards of trade and chambers of commerce, I beg to quote that passed by the Halifax Board of Trade, which reads :

Be it resolved, that in view of the facts that the foremost nations of the world have definitely proven that the technical education is the greatest weapon of modern industrial warfare, and that Canada's immense natural resources should be intelligently and efficiently developed by the most modern methods, and whereas, Canada owes it to Canadians to furnish them the technical training adequate to carry on such development, that the Dominion government be requested to appoint an able commission of investigation to ascertain the best measures for establishing technical education in this Dominion of Canada.

I quote these resolutions in order to show that the demand for a system of technical education in Canada is by no means local or sectional but is entirely national in its character. Great changes have taken place during the last thirty or forty years in educational methods in many of the older civilized countries of the world. Notably has this been the case with Germany, France, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Great Britain and the United States. These countries no longer content themselves with the old scholastic routine but they are annually spending vast sums of money upon technical training. They are putting forth great efforts to reconsider their methods and systems of education with a view to the peculiar surroundings of their people and with a view to the immediate needs of the people in the hope that it may assist the people in gaining a livelihood and assist the nation in maintaining its place in the markets of the world. It is a question which has all the elements of a great national, commercial and industrial problem, and it is in that view of the matter that it is now brought before this House. The demand for technical education from the manufacturer arises very largely no doubt from the fact that in recent years he has felt himself handicapped in procuring highly skilled labour in sufficient quantities for his purpose. He has suffered from the disadvantage of having to compete in the markets of the world with his manufactured product against countries where there is a large supply of technically trained artisans. The demand for technical education on the part of the workman arises no doubt from the very laudable ambition which he has to perfect himself in regard to his own trade or his own craft, in order, perhaps, that his work may become less laborious and more remunerative and that he may be enabled to fill a higher position than that which he now occupies.

Perhaps the most formidable question which will present itself in regard to this matter is to ascertain in precisely what way

the parliament of Canada can take action in reference to it, having regard to the somewhat positive language which is used in section 93 of the British North America Act. It provides :

In and for each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education.

Section 91 of the same Act provides that in matters of trade and commerce this parliament will have jurisdiction. Should the objection be raised that parliament cannot entertain this question on the ground that section 93 places it within the exclusive jurisdiction of the legislatures of the provinces I might say that the first answer to such an objection would be that the term 'education' as used in the 93rd section of the British North America Act must be construed in a popular sense and it does not mean industrial training or instruction. It may be said that all instruction is education. The master instructs the apprentice in the workshop and the journeyman instructs his helper at the forge. That instruction is educational in a sense, but no one would argue that that is the kind of education that is intended to be meant by section 93 of the British North America Act. The term 'education' as used in that section means the ordinary course of learning which is afforded to a youth in this country whereby he obtains a scholastic or academic training which will give him a certain amount of culture and refinement—training in the arts and sciences, in classics, and languages, in literature, mathematics and kindred subjects which will perhaps give him a greater appreciation of the duties and responsibilities of citizenship and a better capacity for the enjoyment of life. Such, I maintain, is the generally accepted meaning of the term 'education' and I submit that it is in that sense that it is used in the British North America Act. Technical education is an entirely different matter. Technical education is a matter of economics rather than of scholarship. It is a matter which will yield a monetary return rather than a return in culture and refinement. Such then is the broad distinction between 'education' as used in the 93rd section of the British North American Act and technical or industrial training and if possible, just to make the distinction more clear, to make the proper line of demarcation between the ordinary scholarship and industrial training better understood, let me give the House briefly a statement of the various subjects and branches of learning which are comprised in the curriculum of the ordinary technical institute. I do this because I know that not only in my own case but in the case of many other men with whom I have spoken on this subject a great deal of ignorance prevails. We have a very vague, general and visionary knowledge of what is meant or intended by the term 'technical education.' In the ordinary technical institute the following will be among the subjects which will be taught: There will be a department of physics embracing such subjects as light, heat, sound, electricity and magnetism ; a department of hydrostatics, dealing with liquids, gases, hydraulic engines and machinery; a department of mechanics, treating of force, motion, gravation and kindred subjects ; a department of chemistry where chemistry will be taught in all its branches embracing theory, practice and research; a department of mathematics so far as required for practical aplication to the various branches of scientific work; a department of freehand drawing and industrial design; a department of machine construction and pattern making ; a department of building construction including strength and value of materials; a department of architectural design and decoration, a clay modelling department and generally very full special courses in mineralogy, metallurgy, geology and engineering in all its various branches. Taking such a list of subjects and comparing it with the ordinary subjects which are taught in our instutions in Canada, one can readily see that there is a broad distinction between ordinary education as we understand the term and industrial training with which this motion has to do.

As a second answer to any objection which might be raised to the constitutional right of this parliament to deal with this motion I think one can safely argue that the whole question of industrial training is so intimately associated with the general trade and commerce of this country, subjects over which this parliament has authority, that it will have such a direct influence upon both the quantity and quality of our manufactured product, that it will bear so directly upon our national resources as regards their development, manufacture and transport, and it is so intimately connected with the general trade and commercial progress of the country that we may fairly say that it comes within the authority and jurisdiction of this parliament.

But, there is another ground upon which I think this parliament might well deal with this question. We have only to look and see how the question has been dealt with in other countries where the system of technical education has been so successfully maintained, and if the House will pardon me I would like for one moment to consider how the matter has beeen dealt with in the German empire. I am aware that the constitution of the German empire is not identically the constitution under which we live in Canada but I would like to refer to the manner in which the question is treated there. In that country where it has been successfully maintained it has been the result of united effort—effort of the individual,

effort of the municipality, effort of the state, district or canton and effort of the federal or central authority. In no country in the world that I am aware of has the federal authority assumed the whole burden and responsibility, but it has been aided and assisted by private subscriptions and private endowment. Germany is the great progenitor, the great originator of technical or industrial training. As far back as 1825 the first technical institute was established at Carlshrue in Germany. This was followed by another at Munich in 1827; by another at Dresden in 1828 and by another at Stuttgart in 1832. These institutes were the pioneers in this great work, but the work has grown to enormous proportions in Germany so that at the present day in the German empire is to be found the most complex, the most complete and the most elaborate system of industrial training that exists in any country in the world. Their system embraces all grades. They have their primary system, their secondary system, their advanced system and their technical universities. In the most important of the German industrial schools are found what are known as industrial continuation schools. These are the schools which the pupil enters after he has passed the common schools and the manual training schools. They have in Germany no less than 2,200 of these industrial continuation schools, attended by 320,000 pupils. The requirements for entrance into these schools are the completion of a common school course and several years of practical experience in a particular trade or industry, at least to the completion of apprenticeship. This is important, for this reason. The Trades and Labour Council have pointed out that they do not desire in this country the ordinary manual training school, which has the effect of turning loose an army of youthful, half-finished mechanics, who have not had any training in practical work to compete with the skilled labour of the country.

After the industrial training schools come the high grade technical schools, with specialized courses, of which there are in Germany 524, and the special courses in them are as follows : 25 in mechanics 58 in mining, 53 in architecture and construction, 10 in metallurgy, 117 in textiles, 24 in woodcarving, 27 in industrial art and design, 41 in navigation, 52 in fresh water navigation, and four in shipbuilding. All these classes are very largely attended. To give an idea of the course of instruction in some of these specialized schools, I may mention that the course in the building trades schools includes the subjects of stonecutting and laying, brick making, plastering, carpentry, scientific construction, uses, strength and value of materials, designing, modelling, ornamentation, interior decoration, heating ventilation, road and bridge building, drainage and irrigation.

The textile schols in Germany, which are the most numerous and perhaps in some respects the most important, have a special course of instruction which covers the whole process from the lowest grade of primary weaving to textile mechanical engineering, as taught at no less than eight of the best known German universities. Their course of instruction includes, weaving, spinning, bleaching, dying, machinery, properties of fibrous materials, manufactures of every description of woven and spun material.

They have also their art trade schools, where special instruction in industrial art and design is given. These schools are devoted more to what is known as industrial art, where the ultimate aim lies in the direction of technical efficiency rather than of artistical finish, and the course of instruction includes, drawing, modelling, ornamentation, painting, furniture, designing, wood-carving, pottery and leather cutting, in addition to those there are the technical universities, there being 9 general technical universities and 3 technical mining universities. All these institutions are maintained by the whole empire, and the government of the empire acts as a sort of supervising body over the whole system.

Now, how is the cost of all these institutions made up ? Partly by tuition fees, 23 per cent ; partly by municipal school funds and private contribution, 49 per cent ; and partly by state aid, 28 per cent ; showing that in the empire of Germany the great work of technical education is considered to be not by any means a local or municipal affair, but to a very large extent a matter of national importance.

It is viewed in the same way in the United States, where as far back as the year 1862, an Act was passed known as the Morell Act, whereby it was provided that every state which would establish a college where a course of agriculture and a course of mechanical arts would be taught, should receive a large land grant from the federal government. New York state received over 800,000 acres, Pennsylvania, 700,000, Ohio, 400,000, and other states lesser quantities. This Act was supplemented in 1890 by another Act of the Congress of the United States, whereby it was provided that each state which would establish a college for special courses in agriculture and mechanical arts, should receive a financial grant from the federal government of $15,000. to be increased at the rate of $1,000 a year, until the sum annually granted reached $25,000. Under this Act the federal government of the United States paid out last year directly to technical institutions in that country no less than $2,500,000 and the total amount paid by the United States since the inception of the scheme has been $31,000,000, of which $15,000,000 has been in cash and $16,000,000 in land. The United States has, under that system of federal assistance,

established something like sixty technical colleges. In 44 of these, courses are provided in mechanical engineering; in 38 courses in electrical engineering; in 37, courses in civil engineering; in 21, courses in mining engineering; in 6, courses in architecture; in 4, courses in metallurgical, railway and technical engineering. The total cost of these technical institutes in the United States runs into an enormous figure annually. I have not the total cost, but I find that the proportion borne by the various people who contribute to their maintenance is as follows: 12·8 per cent in fees of pupils in attendance, 12·3 per cent in endowments, 26·4 per cent in state and municipal grants, 40·8 per cent in federal grants, and 7·7 per cent from all other sources. The fact that the federal government contributes a little over 40 per cent annually to the cost of the maintenance of all these institutes of technology, indicates the United States views on the question. Their constitution is in some respects similar to our own. They do not view it as a municipal or state affair, but largely as a matter of national concern.

The same is the case in Switzerland, a country enjoying a constitution somewhat similar to our own, having its federal government with jurisdiction over national affairs and its cantonal governments with jurisdiction in regard to local affairs. Last year there was spent in Switzerland on technical education about 1,000,000 francs of which 75 per cent was contributed by the municipalities and cantons and 25 per cent by the federal government.

In Great Britain the question of technical education was a dead question until the year 1891. In that year the Manchester merchants became aware that their chief competitor in the textile trade of the world was Germany, which was fast overtaking them in the markets of the world. The Chamber of Commerce of the city of Manchester sent a commission to investigate the whole question of textile production and the whole question of technical education in Germany. Subsequently the British government sent a commission to inquire into technical education in Germany and another commission to inquire into the same subjects in the United States. As a result of the reports made by these commissions, the question of technical education has been taken up in England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales, and last year the Imperial government spent in England and Wales alone no less than £1,200,000 sterling for the maintenance of a system of technical education in the cities. There are now large technical institutions in Manchester, Bolton and Glasgow, and technical schools in many places, and I see by a recent article in the English papers that some English manufacturers are offering special rewards to their workmen to induce them to take courses at these technical institutions. There is no question how the Imperial government treats this matter. It treats it not simply as a matter of local conern, but as a matter of national concern.

Taking the example of these countries, where systems of technical education have been successfully maintained, I see no reason why the federal government in this country should not have an inquiry into the whole system, and if possible take a hand in the great work of industrial training that is going on throughout the world. It may fairly be said that the Canadian government has alrerdy done something in this direction. The Dominion Experimental Farm is nothing more or less than an institute of technology applied to agriculture. Experiments are there carried on, information is gathered, new subjects are investigated, and the information acquired from these experiments and from the investigation which goes on there, is distributed throughout the length and breadth of Canada. No one can deny the tremendous benefit which that has been to the agricultural classes and the country in general.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. gentleman regard it as properly within our constitutional right to start educational schools in agriculture, the same as the school at Guelph?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I was just going to refer to that point. The fact that the provinces have undertaken the work of technical education need not debar the Dominion parliament from engaging in similar work. It may be argued that every subject which is taught at an ordinary technical institute may now be taught at some one or other of the colleges and universities of this country, but the answer to this is that these colleges and universities have gone beyond what was formerly considered their sphere of education and have entered into the arena of technical and industrial training. And, as a matter of fact, these colleges and universities, few in number, are far beyond the reach of the ordinary apprentices and artisans in this country.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it be within the constitutional rights of this Dominion to start schools similar to the Agricultural College at Guelph, which come under the ordinary category of education assigned to the provinces by clause 93 of the British North America Act?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do not know that any one would suggest that the Dominion government should actually engage in the work of tuition, but I shall come to what my hon. friend has pointed out a little later on, because I intend making a few suggestions as to what the Dominion parliament might do without engaging in the actual work of tuition. But I submit that the Dominion government are now engaged in a system of technical education regarding agriculture very similar indeed to the work carried on by the museums in Germany in regard to

manufactures. Our Dominion government have engaged in technical education in the Royal Military College at Kingston, where there is a general engineering course, apart altogether from military requirements. They have also established at Kingston a school of navigation, which is purely technical education. They have established marine biological research stations at Gaspé and Georgian bay—purely technical work. They have given large grants to McGill university, through the Intercolonial Railway, for the department of applied science, which deals with industrial training. In all these matters the government have already endorsed the proposal I submit to some extent. I understand that there is no likelihood of any conflict of jurisdiction or of any objection being raised by any one of the provinces. The Manufacturers' Association have informed me that they have gone to the trouble of ascertaining the views of the various provincial governments in Canada, and that, without a single exception, they have received word from the premiers of the various provinces that they will welcome an investigation into this subject by the Dominion government. So that there is not likely to be any cleavage as between the provinces and the Dominion in so far as what is asked for in this resolution is concerned.

But it may be asked very properly, in what way could the Dominion government take up this work? That I submit is work for a commission to ascertain, and that is why we want a commission. But there are ways in which undoubtedly the Dominion government would have power to act. They could certainly act by granting financial assistance. They could establish experimental stations, similar to the Dominion experimental farm, where experiments might be carried on by experts in new and improved machinery, and thus ascertain its practical value; where experiments might be carried on in the smelting and treatment of native Canadian ore. They might establish bureaus for standardizing Canadian manufactured products, similar to those established in Berlin, Washington and Paris, where the standarrizing of the products of manufactures is carried on and where certificates are granted as to the genuineness and merits of these products. The certificates granted as to standard and merit by Berlin, France and Washington are accepted at their face value throughout the commercial world to-day. The Dominion government have established a Department of Mines, which is carrying on extensive experiments in the electrical treatment of ores; that work might be carried on to a much greater extent. There are, therefore, innumerable ways in which this government might, for the benefit of the whole country, go into this work by establishing industrial museums and experimental stations throughout Canada. I shall not say anything more on the subject, but shall simply put my motion in the hands of the House, and trust that it will meet with the approval of the government.

Mr. GEORGE SMITH (North Oxford). I do not desire, Mr. Speaker, to detain the House at this late hour with any lengthy speech. I do not know that my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) referred to me as having any special knowledge on the subject-matter under discussion, although I was for a short time connected with one of the educational institutions in Woodstock where they have a manual training department. I refer to the Woodstock College. I may say that that department in no way interferes with the mechanics, as the Trades and Labour Council suggested. It is simply used as a means of education, and not as a training for mechanics, most of the students intending to go in for other than mechanical work. I may say that at the meeting in Woodstock last summer the Minister of Education for Ontario did make a reference to his intention to ask the Dominion government to supplement by financial aid the work of technical education. This age may be described as a competitive age. We have individual competing with individual. We have probably keener competition to-day than at any period in the world's history. We have not only the competition among individuals, but what I might call a titanic struggle going on in the world for commercial supremacy. We have nation pitted against nation. We have billion dollar trusts head on against billion dollar trusts. And that nation which trains its captains of industry, which has a sufficient number of trained special men capable of taking positions as captains of industry, will win out in the struggle. Who are the men that have done most to transform the world and make it what it is to-day? I think you will admit that they are the inventors, the thinkers, men like the Stephensons, Watts and Kelvins, in Scotland; the Arkwrights, Faradays, the Thompsons and the Bessemers, in England; the Virchows, Hoffmans and others, in Germany; the Pasteurs and the Berthelots, in France; and the Edisons, the Teslas, the Marconis and the Bells, of the United States and Canada. These men have done more than all the generals, the kings and emperors to transform the world. On the banners of the old Romans were inscribed the letters 'S. P. Q. R.'—Senatus Populus-que Romanus. We could inscribe the same letters on the commercial banners of the world to-day, but they would have a very different meaning. Their meaning would be 'small profits, quick returns.'

Coming back to Canada, if we had the industrial efficiency which the carrying out of this resolution would give us, we could, with our natural resources compete with any country in the world. The assistance this government can give would enable

Canada to hold her own and if possible win out in the struggle. Germany is a country of no great natural resources, with a comparatively small coast line, with armed enemies on either hand, and with a burden of enormous taxation to support its army and navy; yet, in thirty years, Germany has forged ahead and taken a foremost place among the nations of the world in point of industrial activity. She has, perhaps, surpassed in chemistry. Take the instance of Prof. Hoffman, of Berlin University. Prof. Hoffman discovered, by experiments with coal-tar products, a method of manufacturing aniline dyes. Great Britain had the dye trade of the world by the manufacture of dyes from the indigo plant of India. But Prof. Hoffmann discovered dyes that were superior, extracted from coal-tar products, and practically drove out the British indigo dye trade. Referring to Germany, the former Minister of Education in Ontario, Hon. Richard Harcourt, in an address in the Toronto Technical School said:

The Berlin Royal Technical College has 140 professors, 260 assistants, and 3,500 students. Engineering, chemistry and metallurgy are among the subjects taught. There are free museums, art galleries and laboratories. The manufacturers of Germany employ 4,500 chemists. Wurtemburg, with 2,081,000 inhabitants, supports the State University of Tubingen, one technical school, one textile and one mechanical school, one building-trades school, three weaving schools, 231 industrial improvement schools, 18 domestic schools for women, a commercial college and an agricultural high school. In one large manufacturing plant there are 150 expert chemists, nearly all holding the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

These facts have been recognized by the leading men of the world. Lord Rosebery and Mr. Joseph Chamberlain have recognized them. England, of late years, has righted herself, to a large extent, in the matter of technical education. Mr. Carnegie has recognized these facts. In the year 1901, he gave the enormous sum of $42,200,000 for higher education and for the establishment of public libraries—or $11,000 a day. Cecil Rhodes, in his will, recognized these facts. The Ontario government has recognized them by its notable expenditures for the school of practical science and the Agricultural College at Guelph, Dr. Dewar, the president of the British Association for the Advancement of Science at its meeting in Belfast in 1902, said:

He rebuked the nation and especially our manufacturers for their comparative indifference to the cause of education. He compared England and Gemany in the matter of technical education and their zeal in endowing scientific research. German manufacturers employ some 4,500 highly-paid chemists, or nearly three times as many as are in England. The Germans take advantage of the discoveries of our exceptional men, and their average men, by reason of their scientific training, turn them to commercial account. We have the brains, the raw material and the money, but we lack the diffused education among the people without which the discoveries of men of genius cannot fructify. The appalling thing, said Dr. Dewar, is not that the Germans have captured many industries which owe their existence to chemical knowledge, but that the Germans are two generations ahead of us in general training and specialized equipment.

As I have said, England has righted herself in the matter of technical education to a considerable extent of late years—in fact since that speech of Dr. Dewar—by the establishment of technical schools in different parts of England, and by the support given to such schools. Now, with reference to the public opinion referred to by the last speaker, I would say that, some thirty or forty years ago, there was a very considerable feeling against what they were pleased to call 'college-bred men.' You know the remark attributed to Horace Greeley. 'Of all horned cattle, preserve me from the college graduate.' I am satisfied that this sentiment is very materially changed. I have spoken to men who have visited some of the leading factories and industrial establishments in the United States, who have told me that they were amazed at the young college students who were placed at the head of large bodies of men in the conduct of these industrial insituations. John Foster Fraser, writing in the June, 1903, 'Eclectic,' re 'American Manufacturers,' says:

In going through American workshops I have been staggered at the mere boys who are managers and heads of departments, boys of 24 over several thousand men. No price is too big for a boy who has brains and adaptiveness.

Now, the resolution of the Manufacturers' Association, referred to by the last speaker, was, very probably, prompted by the experience of Mr. Clergue at the Sault. Mr. Clergue had to import experts in chemistry from Germany and Switzerland. But I am glad to be able to say that we are now turning out, at McGill and at the Toronto School of Practical Science, men who can take the positions referred to by the Manufacturers' Association. Again, referring to the prevailing opinion concerning higher education in the country—for it is necessary for the politicians, and for any government, to take stock in public opinion; we are here simply to carry out the public will—I may say that, in the district in which I live, I believe the average farmer thinks the government has done its duty when it has furnished free public instruction in our public schools. Professor Cattell, of Columbia University, combats that idea in the 'Popular Science Monthly,' of June, 1902. He takes the position that elementary education is chiefly useful to the indi-

vidual, whereas higher education is chiefly for the benefit of the state, and gives reasons for his opinion. He says that in the United States, in the year 1902, the cost of sugar to the people of that country was $200,000,000. If the product had not been cheapened by inventions, by improved processes and better transportation facilities, it would have cost five times as much, making the cost of sugar for the people of the United States of that year, $1,000,000,000. The saving thus indicated would pay for all the higher education in that country from the year one until now. He further points out that the education of a single man who makes a scientific discovery with commercial applications would pay for the expenses of that institution from its inception. I believe there is a change in public sentiment in these matters to which I am referring. I observe it, for instance, in the case of the agricultural colleges. I can remember the day when, in the county which I have the honour to represent, they used to refer to the agricultural college as the 'school for dude farmers.' They ridiculed the institution, but they do not do so now. They are glad to go on excursions to the agricultural college, there to observe scientific methods and to adopt them because those methods pay. And, just as we find there is a change in that regard, I believe there is a change in public sentiment on the subject of higher education. We know, as has been stated already, that agriculture is the basic industry of Canada. The United States have certainly done their duty toward agricultural institutions and state-aided agricultural colleges. I will read from the year book of 1902:

> One of the most interesting articles in the new volume relates to the results of experimental station work. Our agricultural experiment stations now form the most complete system of agriculture research in the world, and the results they attain are influencing our farmers to a large extent. There are sixty of these stations, employing nearly 1,000 trained, scientific and practical men——

Because, these institutions are not at all academic. The men employed to perform these experiments are practical farmers, men of good, sound common-sense and judgment.

> —and they are in operation in every state and territory, including Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico and the Philippines.
>
> Their annual income last year was $1,328,847, of which sum $720.000 came from the federal government and $608,847 from state appropriations and other sources. The stations have existed as a national enterprise for fourteen years, and the outlay for agricultural investigation in that time has been at the rate of only one dollar for nearly $3,000 worth of farm products, which cannot be considered an extravagant outlay.

Now, let us look at the work which some of these institutions have accomplished We can refer with pride to what has been done at the Guelph Agricultural College. I believe that Prof. Zavitz with his experiments in new grains, wheats and other grains, has benefited the agricultural population and added wonderfully to the wealth of Canada. These institutions in the United States have done a remarkable work, they certainly have justified one hundred times over, all the expenditure that has been made upon them. Take for instance the discovery made by the California station that the alkali lands of the south-west portion of the United States of America were not salt desert, that the white substance upon them was simply an accumulation of alkali caused by the lack of rain fall and that if there was sufficient rainfall this would be washed down and there would be the rich soil. That discovery being made they set to work and covered the land with a coat of gypsum, underdrained it thoroughly, and irrigated it with the water from the neighbouring hills so that now they have there probably the highest priced land in the world, devoted to orange groves and other productive forms of fruit culture.

Take the Babcock milk tester, an invention of the Wisconsin school, given like the other inventions of these institutions free to the world. That has been an immense assistance in the dairy business.

Take the new wheats that I have referred to. In the United States it is calculated that they have added to the production by the discovery of improved qualities of wheat five bushels to the acre or about 40,000,000 bushels in a year. This alone has more than paid for the expenditures on these institutions.

Then take the experiments conducted by Prof. Atwater of the Connecticut school to test the relative value of different foods. Oxen were put in glass cases and fed on certain varieties of foods; correct and accurate accounts were kept and deductions from these figures showed the scientific values of the different foods experimented upon.

Take the dry farming system called the Campbell system of dry farming, the introduction of which added largely to the values of the lands of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company of which we have heard so much in this House.

Another matter to which I have given some little attention is the experiments with fertilizers. We find that the world's supply of nitrates is almost exhausted, and it is computed that in about twenty-five years the supply of guano from the islands of the Pacific and the rainless regions of Peru and Chili will have been exhausted. Necessity is the mother of invention. Scientists have set about the discovery of a supply of nitrogen. It is well known that the air which we breathe is simply a mechanical mixture of oxygen and nitrogen.

and these thinkers are endeavouring to discover a method of extracting the nitrogen from the air. At Niagara Falls the experiments have been carried on for some years by the Atmospheric Products Company. I have seen it announced that the discovery had been made of a method by which nitric acid can be manufactured commercially by electric currents being passed through the atmosphere in chambers, at a cost of 2½ cents a pound. In Norway, where labour is cheaper and they have apparently equally good water-power, they can make it at an even smaller cost. Sir William Crookes has also discovered a method in London by which it is claimed nitrogen can be extracted from the air commercially so that it can be used as a fertilizer. If that is accomplished it will revolutionize farming.

Surely the government would be justified in helping on such experiments or even granting a bonus to attain these ends, so wealth producing and so important to the country at large.

Take again the improvements that have been made in agricultural machinery. Let us look at the evolution of the reaper; starting with the sickle or cradle, you come to the first attempts at a reaper such as I know was manufactured by the man who is now the honourable senator from that district, I refer to Mr. Merner. In his early days he manufactured a reaper on which a man sat on a crotched upright seat with a fork and forked off the sheaf. The next stage of evolution was the introduction of the drop. It was found that you could only cut one round as the next time you passed around the horses would be stepping on and tedding the grain. The next invention was the rake, which raked off and elminated the employment of one hand for that purpose. Then came the attempts at the self-binders. First the attempts to bind by wire with the difficulties experienced in that, and then the evolution in the self-binding reaper with twine and the steel frame which we have to-day.

These things are all traceable to the inventor, to the man who thinks, the man who should be encouraged by this or any other government by reason of the immense wealth producing value of such discoveries. Take for instance the enhanced industrial efficiency of the machinery on the farm. I have here statistics which show that forty years ago it took three hours work to harvest one bushel of wheat. Now it takes only ten minutes work to harvest one bushel of wheat. Forty years ago it cost 17¾ cents to harvest one bushel of wheat, while to-day it costs only 3⅓ cents. See the enormous saving in industrial efficiency thus obtained.

A recent illustration of the value of such industrial investigation is to be found in the report by Dr. Haanel, published last year under the auspices of this government upon the question of electric smelting of ores. I commend the government for appointing a commission in December, 1903 to investigate the different mechanical processes for the smelting of iron and the making of steel in Europe. The commission visited France among other countries and the result of their investigations was the inauguration of an experiment at Sault Ste. Marie. Mr. Clergue offered the use of his factory and experiments were carried on. I quote but one sentence from Dr. Haanel's report at page 97:

> Electric smelting of iron ores in Canada in properly constructed ovens using charcoal or peat coke made from our peat bogs of enormous extent may be pronounced commercially feasible.

This is an important advance that may have a great effect on the future of Canada. I understand that the first electric smelting plant in Canada is being erected in Welland, Ont. I am not competent to go into the smelting business, but I would like to refer finally to Germany. As has already been said Germany leads the world in chemistry and in technical education generally. It has done so by reason of its system of technical education because technical education was found to be a medium by which the union between the scientist and the manufacturer was established. In the large manufacturing cities of Germany and the United States they employ expert chemists and manufacturers, tell them that they want certain problems worked out. They give them the data and they tell them that they want them to solve those problems. They are highly paid, they are highly trained experts, this work is done on a very expensive scale in Germany and it has certainly been found to pay the manufacturers notwithstanding the large expenditure in connection with it. I would like to read, in connection, a statement contained in Shadwell's work on 'Industrial Efficiency' issued about a year ago. Mr. Shadwell, after visiting Germany, writing on the progress in methods of manufacture, says:

> The industrial expansion of Germany presents another picture. It has been achieved by equally hard work, but the adventurous audacity and restless search for novelty of America have been replaced by steady and watchful effort. . . . The industrial population has not been left to carve out its own destiny, but has been guided and helped at every step. All sections of the community, from the throne to the workhouse, have contributed something. Laisser faire is dead; ordered regulation is accepted and applied with infinite pains by the legislature, government departments, municipalities and private citizens. It is seen not only in the scientific tariff, but in the careful and judicious factory code, and state system of insurance. The organization of traffic and transport by rail and canal, the fostering of the mercantile marine,

the educational provision, municipal action and poor-law administration. So the edifice has been built up four-square and buttressed about on every side. It is a wonderful achievement in which every unit has played a part, and the spirit which has brought it about is the spirit of duty and work.

In conclusion, let me say that while I am not in favour of paternalism as a rule I would be in favour of the government, as it assisted in the discovery of proper modes of smelting ores, granting aid to technical institutions, to experimenters and to investigators in attempting to solve certain problems that confront us and which, if they are not solved, will cause us to fall behind in the commercial race. With Canada's great resources and with a technically trained body of workers Canada will take a foremost place amongst the nations of the world in agricultural, commercial and industrial pursuits.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). Mr. Speaker, although the hour is somewhat late and the House is rather thin I desire to take the opportunity of saying a few words in support of the resolution that the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has brought before us this evening. The House has stayed sometimes later than this on less important matters. The attendance of the House is not always a fair indication of the importance of the subject which is under discussion. I think that the hon. member for South Wellington is to be highly commended for bringing this matter to the attention of this House and for having made the very plain and lucid statement which he has presented for our consideration. I have had an opportunity of working in connection with this matter somewhat. For several years I have been a member of the technical education committee of the board of the city of Toronto, I have acted as chairman of that committee, and for these reasons I desire to say a few words in support of the course that is recommended in the resolution that has been placed before the House. It will not be necessary for me to go over the ground at all fully as the hon. gentleman has stated most of the important facts in connection with this movement. This is not a new movement that is brought to the attention of the House. This resolution was before the House last session and I promised at that time that if I had an opportunity I would like to say a word in support of it. As it is now brought forward I desire to say that it has my most hearty approbation. The objection that I understand is likely to be urged against this course is that this form of education properly belongs to provincial governments only. I think that argument has been very fairly well met by the hon. member for South Wellington. I think the government need not hesitate to take a step in this direction without fear of offending any of the provinces concerned. The provinces, as a rule, are jealous of their rights and I for one am free to say that I am strongly in favour of maintaining provincial rights believing, as I do, that they should not be infringed upon. But this is a special case, or it is a special subject and as such it is necessary to give it special treatment in order that this movement may be a success. As far as this resolution is concerned, it only asks that we should name a committee or commission of inquiry to thoroughly investigate the subject and to ascertain what is best to be done under the circumstances. That is a simple matter which need not occasion a very large outlay at any rate at the start and it would certainly be better that one full inquiry should be made by this government than that all the several provinces should set out to make this same inquiry. There is economy in such a course. One general committee or commission of inquiry for the whole Dominion would certainly be better than appointing a committee or commission from every province. Therefore, I think it is beyond peradventure that the provinces will not be jealous of any such interference. I hold in my hand letters dated only recently from every province in the Dominion dealing with this question and one and all of these people I may say are in favour of the Dominion government taking the step that the hon. member for South Wellington asks should be taken in this resolution. I will not weary the House by reading these but I will just read the names of the writers of a few of them. The first is dated November 30, 1907, is addressed to Sir Wilfrid Laurier and is signed by Richard McBride, premier of British Columbia; the second is dated the 9th November, 1907, is addressed in the same way and is signed by Alexander C. Rutherford, premier of Alberta; the third is dated the 25th October, 1907 and is signed by Walter Scott, premier of the province of Saskatchewan; the fourth is dated October 23, 1907, addressed in the same way and signed by R. P. Roblin, premier of Manitoba; a similar letter is signed by Hon. J. P. Whitney, premier of Ontario, dated October 23, 1907; another is dated November 1, 1907, and is signed by Mr. C. W. Robinson, on behalf of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia is represented by Mr. G. H. Murray, premier of the province and the late Mr. Peters signs it on behalf of Prince Edward Island. These various provinces of the Dominion of Canada without exception have fully endorsed this scheme and are prepared to admit that in so far as provincial rights are concerned they do not enter into the question from their standpoint. That, I think is pretty good evidence that the matter of provincial rights will not very seriously interfere with this great movement. The mover of this resolution has told us how

far we are behind various other countries of the world which are foremost in industrial life. There is no doubt that in so far as technical education is concerned the German empire particularly stands first and foremost. Never has a country risen more rapidly in a commercial and industrial sense than the great nation of Germany. It owes its rise and progress almost entirely to the very methodical training that enters into all its seats of learning, its colleges and particularly its technical schools. Germany, if it does anything, does it well, does it thoroughly and in that respect perhaps the German empire stands first in having, during the last quarter of a century, emerged from the condition of an almost non-productive nation until to-day it stands as the most formidable rival of all the industrial nations of the earth. The United States makes a very good second; it has devoted immense amounts to education and has spent enormous sums in the advancement of technical training. In the city of Boston alone I think I am within the mark when I say that there are at least twenty-five technical and manual training schools and that in this city more is expended than in the whole Dominion of Canada for the same purpose. That ought to be sufficient to show us that these various countries with which Canada is entering into competition in some lines are thoroughly alive to the situation, and are spending millions of money to advance this particular object.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that by the federal or the state authority ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. In some instances it is done by the federal authority or largely by the federal authority, and in other instances by the various states and provinces; but I believe the parental government, in Germany, Great Britain and the United States at any rate, contribute large amounts.

We have done something in this country along this line, even under the Dominion government. For instance, this country has established experimental farms, to which forestry and other departments have been added; provided for general engineering instruction in the Kingston Military College ; established marine biological research stations in the Georgian bay and at Gaspé, and at Kingston a school of navigation; given financial aid to industrial exhibitions, the Royal Society of Canada, art schools, a national art gallery, and the Canadian Mining Institute; established what may be called an incipient bureau of standards, having charge also of adulteration of food stuffs ; provided for special lectures on the metric system by a university professor, also special experiments in connection with electric smelting ; provided for the education of Indians, as well as education in the territories : made some provision for a national museum : through the Intercolonial Railway pays $2,500 yearly to the railway department of McGill University. In all these respects the Dominion government has made a beginning and none of these efforts have been resented by any of the provinces so far as I know.

Canada is endeavouring to compete with various countries, and is successfully competing in certain lines ; but we might compete satisfactorily in a great many more if we had a thorough system of technical training in the country. I sometimes hold the Finance Minister responsible when our industries do not prosper, and attribute the fact to the tariff; but I admit that the tariff cannot do everything. In the last analysis we must have competent captains of industry and up-to-date methods ; otherwise we cannot compete with foreign countries successfully. Economy of production, increasing the output and reducing the cost, are the first elements of successful competition. As the Canadian market is comparatively narrow in some lines which we are capable of producing, we must naturally look abroad ; and when we have to come into fierce competition with immense industries in the United States, Germany, Great Britain, France and all the other live nations of the world, we must have the very best means at our disposal and the very best available information. It goes without saying, therefore, that we must have a skilled body of artisans in this country. I am proud to say that on this question we have labour and capital working side by side. Technical education has ben endorsed by the Trades and Labour Council on many occasions, in resolutions which have been forwarded to the ministry. The workingmen of Canada, who are as intelligent perhaps as any band of artisans in the world, know that they are capable of still further improvement, and that that can be brought about only by the adoption of the best methods of instruction on the part of men who thoroughly understand the propositions which they lay before those whom they are endeavouring to instruct. We have not in this country at the present time,when all has been said, a thoroughly equipped technical institute. Surely it is time that, in a matter of this importance, we should make a beginning by having an inquiry. As a matter of economy such an inquiry can be best pursued by one central head representating the whole country. It may be that after this inquiry has been made, a national institute of technology will be one of the first requisites. I think it is a project into which this government might well embark. It would mark a new era in Canada's industrial progress. The manufacturer and the artisan are both alive to this great movement. This government has received from time to time deputations urging the necessity of this step, and if they accede to the request of my hon. friend who has proposed this resolution, which would be going only a very little way, they will be

doing a great national good. It might be well to read a resolution which was passed by the labour convention in December, 1905:

Be it resolved, that the incoming executive be instructed to appeal to the federal and provincial governments to enact such legislation, and make such appropriations as will permit the mechanic and artisan of Canada the privilege of education on lines of electric and civil engineering, chemistry, wood-carving, modelling, &c. In spite of the fact that the Dominion government in the past has said that, according to the British North America Act, all education is relegated to the provincial governments, this matter is one of national import, and could be taken up under the Department of Trade and Commerce, and be well within their scope.

There is no jealousy in that resolution, and when I am advocating technical education, I do not wish to imply that it will turn out, and at the government's expense, what are called by some scab mechanics, who have had only a slight experience, to compete with those who have put in three years or five years at apprenticeship in some of great foundries, factories or shops. That is not what I understand is intended to be accomplished at all, but the object is to develop young men along the line of their inclination, and thus indicate to them what their calling in life should be. In my view, the main purpose of education is to give a young man that necessary training which will equip him for the battle of life. If you can give him polish as well, by all means give it; but above all, give him the skill to handle the tools of his trade and to develop the arts of the mechanic. This can be done by this government, and they will find that no objection will be raised by the mechanic or the artisan to schools of technology. I do not think that at this stage it is necessary or perhaps even desirable to expend any large sum of public money for this object. We should have first a thorough inquiry by competent men who have given a great deal of study to the subject. I do not profess to have given it anything like the study its importance demands, but I have had the honour of working with some who have given it a great deal of study. I might mention one,—Mr. J. D. Allan, chairman of the Technical Education Committee of the Toronto Board of Trade. He has visited various countries of Europe, as well as the United States, on behalf of the Toronto Board of Trade, and often at his own expense, visiting many of the up-to-date schools of technology on both continents, and is I think as experienced on this question as any other man in Canada; and on many occasions he has expressed himself as being of the belief that it is the greatest educational need of Canada to-day. That is the practical view of a man who has given it very careful study. I for one will be only too glad to see in the near future a move made which would result in placing Canada a long way ahead of where she is. We often think that we are almost perfect, that we know pretty nearly everything, that we have splendid universities and schools.

Well, while I have not a word to say in depreciation of any of our great educational institutions, there is not one which gives anything like the thorough attention to this great problem which its importance demands. That is not only my own opinion, but that of all those who have travelled abroad and have seen what is being done in the great industrial centres of the world. In those centres they recognize that every inch in the way of competition must be gained by up-to-date methods and most thorough training and skilful work. Any man who is not thoroughly skilled in his profession to-day is not prepared to take the high place that he should in whatever walk of life he has entered; and it is to be deplored that on many occasions, in the past five or ten years, many of our great railway companies and industrial establishments have had, as a rule rather than the exception, to procure their engineers and other skilled men from abroad. That is not due to the lack of intelligence of young Canadians, but because our young men have not had the opportunity of acquiring the necessary information in these technical branches to qualify them to fill the most important positions. Take our Transcontinental Railway now being built. We have had discussions in the newspapers regarding the number of young men and others brought from outside countries to direct the engineering work on that road, and we have to deplore the fact that the engineers and others who have had to solve the great problem of laying out that line have been brought from the outside. When public money is being expended, it is good policy for the government to employ, as much as possible, our young men; and in order to be able to do this, we ought to have a national school of technology which will furnish us with young men properly equipped to hold their own against those of any other country. In order to accomplish this we should first appoint a commission of inquiry and then be prepared to spend the necessary money; for it is evident that until we have a thorough equipped, up-to-date school of technology, we shall never be able to meet the requirements of this great industrial nation.

It may be said that the comparison between agriculture and other industrial pursuits is not well taken, but there are many matters, even in agriculture, not thoroughly understood in Canada. Methods are being devised every day for cheapening products and increasing the output of an acre of land. So that a school of technology will be of value in agriculture as well as in manufacturing industries and the building of railways and other great works. There is a tremendous expansion in the development

of the science of agriculture at present. The inoculation of soils and many other matters of that kind are being dealt with in a very skilful manner, and it is quite possible that a school of technology would result in a great amount of information and training which would benefit the agriculturist just as much as the mechanic. But whether it would or not, we have our national experimental farm, so that our farmers need not complain if we give our artisans the same chance that they are given. It must be remembered that we are to-day, to a considerable extent, an industrial as well as an agricultural people. We employ half a million of souls in our manufactories. Counting four to a family, that would mean a population of 2,000,000, or, taking an average of five in a family, that would mean that 2,500,000, or nearly one-half of our population, are looking to the various industries of this country, outside of agriculture, at present to provide them with a livelihood. Is it not, therefore, only right and proper that this government, having recognized the demands of the agricultural interest, should go a step further and give just as technical a training to our young men in other lines?

There is no need of endangering provincial rights. We have lost too much time already; we are falling behind in the race and though we think we are qualified to turn out many classes of goods to the best advantage, yet, if we go abroad and see what is being done there we will return home with the conviction that there are many things we have yet to learn in Canada. Lord Rosebery has for many years been delivering addresses throughout Great Britain endeavouring to arouse the people of that country to the necessity of acquiring technical education. His idea is that all they need is a high grade of technical training in Great Britain and that they do not need protection, but in that he has gone much further than I would go. I admit that a tariff cannot do all; we must have brains as well as a tariff; we must produce our goods in an intelligent way, and if we do that then with protection we are bound to succeed. I do not think any one will argue that goods should be protected that are not worthy of commanding a high standing in the markets of the world, and goods cannot be produced in the highest state of efficiency unless we have the very best skilled training the world can give. A college of technology would give to the skilled artisan, the skilled engineer, and all others engaged in occupations requiring technical skill, a training in the most recent development of industrial production. The world is not standing still; many new inventions have sprung into existence within recent years. Fifteen or twenty years ago we knew nothing of electricity but now new words have to be coined in our language to meet the requirements of that science. A technical college is absolutely necessary in order that our people should be trained in the latest developments in the science of electricity. Then in the near future it is expected that we will have aerial navigation and I understand that Doctor Bell has successfully experimented with a flying machine in Nova Scotia so that I may congratulate our friends from the lower provinces that they have and are in the lead in that invention. This is an age of rapid development, and it is developing more rapidly than we sometimes realize, and in order to keep up with the procession we must be put in a position to acquire the very best and latest knowledge that is obtainable. We cannot get that knowledge unless we have facilities for technical training of the very highest order. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that some of the monuments which this government are handing down to posterity I do not approve of, but I do believe that if they established a national technical school in the Dominion of Canada they would show their sagacity and would perpetuate their memory in a way that would merit the commendation of people of all political opinions. I cannot speak too strongly in support of this motion. I have studied the question some, and I have a mass of information concerning it here which I will not give to the House at this late hour, but I do wish to point out that the establishment of technical training in the Dominion has been endorsed by the board of trade of Toronto, by the board of trade of my own town of Brantford and by almost all the boards of trade of the different cities and towns in Canada. The Manufacturers' Association which is representative of the manufacturers of Canada has asked the government to take this step, the artisans of the country in meeting assembled have time and again passed resolutions urging the government to take action in this direction, and seeing that these organizations representing almost one half of the people of Canada, have urged the establishment of such training college I think the government should not hesitate. Now is the time to act; we have already lost too much time, let us lose no more, let this step be taken immediately. I have great pleasure in heartily concurring in the resolution of my hon. friend. He should be thanked by this House for having brought the subject up for discussion, and I regret that he has not had the encouragement to-night, by the attendance of members, that he should have on this great question. I am sure however that all the members of this House will be a unit in backing up any intelligent action that may be taken by the government in reference to this matter. I trust that in the near future we may have established a national school of technology which will be worthy of the industrial people of Canada.

On motion of Mr. Sproule the debate was adjourned.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What will be taken up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. In accordance with the understanding arrived at on Friday afternoon, a motion will be made for Supply with the intention of affording an opportunity to discuss the question of the seed grain regulations. There is another matter which the hon. gentleman from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) mentioned in connection with the Railway Department, that he desired to bring up on Tuesday. The House will be moved into Committee of Supply for the discussion of these subjects, and in committee the estimates of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be taken up.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 11, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I beg to move that on Thursday next the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution, standing in my name on the Order Paper. His Excellency approves the substance of this resolution and commends it to the consideration of the House :—

Resolved, that it is expedient to make better provision for the exercise of admiralty jurisdiction within Canada in accordance with the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890; and also to provide that, by way of compensation for loss of salary or emoluments of office, there may be granted to each of the present judges in Admiralty of the Exchequer Court who held office on the first day of September, 1907, and to the Marshal of the Quebec Admiralty district, an annuity equal to two-thirds of his salary, to the registrar of the Toronto Admiralty district, the sum of $750, to the registrar of the Nova Scotia Admiralty district the sum of $1,000, to the registrar of the New Brunswick Admiralty district the sum of $1,500.

Mr. H. GERVAIS (Montreal, St. James). I think we ought to have the delay extended until the next week, as the Montreal bar is quite interested, and I would like to give it a chance to be heard from. It would not be possible for me to discuss this next Thursday. The Montreal bar is quite opposed to the principle of this resolution. The Montreal admiralty district has now more cases than all the other districts put together. The council of the Montreal bar is having to-day a meeting to protest against this would-be legislation. That proposed Bill, should it become law, would be detrimental to the maritime interests of Montreal.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is merely formal.

MANITOBA BOUNDARIES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask my right hon. friend, the First Minister, if he can inform the House when the Bill for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba will be brought down ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am sorry that I cannot give any information to-day to my hon. friend.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I wish to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to the fact that the return which was brought down on an Order of the House in 1906, sessional paper No. 113, for original tenders in the case of leases 1158, 1175, 1192, 1219, 1213, and 1232, and which seems to have strayed from the knowledge of the minister, has been all the time safely stowed away in the record department of this House under the care of Mr. Colwell, their proper custodian. I took upon myself, seeing that the Minister of the Interior would not, to look up this return, and I found there was one number, 1213, in which the original tenders were not brought down. I would ask my hon. friend if he would bring down the original tenders in that case so as to complete the record. I have great pleasure in telling him that he will find the lost articles in the record department.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). It is interesting to know where they are, but I have no authority to replace them in the department.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to the fact that the papers ordered with reference to the Hillsborough bridge and Haney claim have not been brought down, so that it is impossible for me to take that matter up to-day as I intended. I have received a note from my right hon. friend with reference to it. The other matter to which I refer, we shall defer until the next day in view of the absence of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). I thought we would be able to go on with the Hillsborough matter, but now find it impossible.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). I do not recollect that the papers were moved for.

Mr. FOSTER. They were moved for on the 22nd January, and I called attention to it the other day.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I moved for the papers two weeks ago.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the right hon. the First Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), what is the authority of the latter for stating, as he did, in reply to a question in this House a few days ago, that certain expenses of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper in connection with the Behring Sea Commission in Paris had been paid by the British government. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper says the statement is quite unfounded, and I should like to know what authority the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had for making that statement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will call his attention to the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), and in his absence to the right hon. the First Minister, to the fact that the hon. gentleman has not brought down a single return asked for, by myself at least, during the whole session, and has pleaded on several occasions that he was hard up for time and clerks. On December 8, and December 18, and later on certain papers—not very important, many of them—were called for and the returns ordered, but I have not yet received a single one. Among these were papers with reference to travelling expenses which could be got up in fifteen minutes. The estimates of Marine and Fisheries are to be on this afternoon, and I will urge the hon. minister to have more expedition used in his department.

I. C. R. EMPLOYEES.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I wish to repeat a question which I put to the right hon. the First Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Railways, some time ago. I then read the following circular:—

Intercolonial Railway.
Office of the General Manager,
Moncton, New Brunswick, December 23, 1907.

Circular No. 381.

To employees.

The Minister of Railways, having been requested to allow employees of the railway to offer themselves as candidates for and to accept municipal offices, has carefully considered the matter, and his conclusion is, that, generally, it is not in the interest of the railway that this should be allowed and that only in such very exceptional cases as the minister may determine, the public interest can be served without the interest of the railway being prejudicially affected, shall employees be permitted to offer and accept such offices. This decision is based upon the usual policy of railways in such matters, such policy being considered on the whole as best adapted to serve the respective interests most concerned.

D. POTTINGER,
General Manager.

I understand that two employees of the Intercolonial Railway, Mr. Blair and Mr. Munro, have been candidates for councillor in the municipal elections in Stellarton. What are the exceptional and justifiable reasons in their case which enabled them to run in open violation of that circular?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I dispute the concluding remark of my hon. friend, that there has been a violation of the circular. The circular is a repetition of one issued before my time in the department. It will be readily understood that there are circumstances under which it is better for employees of what we might call public corporations not to take part in municipal affairs, the chief reason being that the holding of such office might interfere with the business of the railway, and another reason that it might interfere with the performance of their duties. There are places I am told on the Intercolonial Railway where really the men whom the people want are employed on the Intercolonial Railway. It is a hard proposition to say to any man that because he happens to be a carpenter or something on the Intercolonial Railway, or any other railway, he must therefore of necessity give up his citizenship. I hesitate to do that unless some harm is likely to come to the business of the railway. A cast-iron rule cannot be made without being unjust to the men and unjust sometimes to the locality. I do not want to be that. If it is going to interfere with the business of the railway or with the efficiency of the work performed by the employee, I say the employee should not take part in municipal politics; he should say whether he will work for the railway or for the municipality. But belonging to a municipal council does not take up so very much time, and I would hesitate to step in and say to any man: You must give up your citizenship because you happen to occupy some subordinate position on the Intercolonial Railway or any other railway.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the minister misunderstood me; I simply asked what were the exceptional circumstances in this instance which justified the action of these men?

Mr. GRAHAM. That circular, I presume, is by the manager, not by the minister.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes; signed by Mr. Pottinger.

Mr. GRAHAM. The real reason I imagine would largely be shown in the result of the election. These men were chosen by large majorities as really the men the people in that locality wanted to transact

their business, as being best fitted to do so; and unless there is some reason shown or that they will neglect their duties, I do not think we are justified in depriving them of citizenship because they are working for the Intercolonial Railway any more than for the Grand Trunk.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the minister mean that the extraordinary reason arises after the election?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend says the extraordinary reason.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am quoting the circular.

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is 'exceptional.'

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend did not say that, he said 'extraordinary,' with the emphasis on the adjective.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will repeat the question with the word 'exceptional' substituted.

Mr. GRAHAM. I imagine that the majority was exceptional. My hon. friend knows the position I take without playing upon words. The Grand Trunk in my town allowed one of its employees to be for years a member of the town council and of the school board; and I repeat that I hesitate to forbid a man to take part in such work because he happens to have some employment on the railway.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. CLAUDE MACDONELL. On Nov. 28, 1906, Orders of the House were issued for the following returns which have not yet come down:

For a copy of all correspondence, documents and other papers had or passing between the government of the province of Ontario and the Dominion government relative to the application of the Ontario government for a subsidy to aid in the construction by the Ontario government of the Temiscaming and Northern Ontario Railway. —Mr. A. C. Macdonell.

And also:

For a return containing a copy of the correspondence between the Imperial government and the Dominion government in regard to taking over the naval dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt.

On the 28th of January, 1907, returns were ordered regarding the merchant marine of Canada and for a copy of correspondence between the imperial authorities and the Dominion government regarding the establishment of a Canadian naval reserve. About a month ago I mentioned these returns, and the Prime Minister said he would look into the matter. I gave him the particulars of the returns, but they have not yet been brought down. I should like to have them at a reasonably early date. They were asked for over a year ago.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has inquired whether the return concerning the accounting of the books of the Department of Marine and Fisheries has yet been brought down. I have had inquiries made again, and find that it has been written and a comparison is now being made. It is a very voluminous report, but it will be ready immediately.

Mr. FOSTER. There are three or four others which are not voluminous.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have one here.

SUPPLY — POSTMASTER AT WOODSTOCK.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. OSWALD S. CROCKET (York, N.B.). I desire to call attention to an answer made by the Postmaster General yesterday to a question standing in my name on the Order Paper, with reference to which it seems to me there must be some mistake. The question was as follows:

1. What is the salary of Mr. Charles L. Smith, postmaster at Woodstock, N.B.?
2. Has the Postmaster General's attention been called to statements to the effect that Mr. Smith has been taking an active part in the general provincial election campaign now in progress in New Brunswick, and that he was one of the speakers at a political meeting held at Woodstock in the interests of the government candidates in Carleton county on February 1?
3. Does the department allow its officers to take such part in either federal or provincial elections?
4. If not, what action has been taken or is it proposed to take in the case of Mr. Smith?

The Postmaster General replied:

1. Salary and allowances, $3,376,96.
(Out of this amount the postmaster provides for the salaries of his staff and the expenses of his office.)
2. No.
3. No.
4. Answered by 2 and 3.

It will be seen that in answer to the second question as to whether the attention of the Postmaster General had been called to the fact that the postmaster had been taking part in an election and had addressed a political meeting, he answered: No. I may say that I myself addressed a letter to the Postmaster General on February 6, before I put the question on the Order Paper, inclosing a clipping from the Woodstock 'Press,' to the effect that the postmaster had addressed a meeting on behalf of the Liberal candidates at that town, and stating furthermore that I had received a letter from Woodstock reporting that he had done so, and asking me to bring the matter to the

attention of the Postmaster General. I received from the Postmaster General a letter dated February 7th—Friday last—acknowledging receipt of my communication and referring to the inclosed clipping. And yet, notwithstanding that, the minister in the House——

Mr. LEMIEUX. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) please read the letter.

Mr. CROCKET. The letter is as follows:

Ottawa, February 7, 1908.

Dear Mr. Crocket,—I have your letter dated February 6, inclosing a newspaper clipping from the Woodstock 'Press,' in which it is stated that Postmaster Smith was the principal speaker at a government party rally, in connection with the provincial elections in New Brunswick.

In answer, I beg to state that postmasters are not allowed to actively engage in politics, and Mr. Smith will, therefore, be written to at once in regard to your complaints.

Thanking you for bringing this matter to my attention, I remain,

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) RODOLPHE LEMIEUX.

Oswald S. Crocket, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Notwithstanding that, the Postmaster General yesterday put upon record in this House an answer to the effect that his attention had not been called to this matter. It seems to me that this calls for some explanation.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I do not think the two statements are contradictory at all. I received, the other day, from my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket), a letter inclosing a newspaper clipping which stated that the postmaster of Woodstock, N.B., had addressed a public meeting. The hon. gentleman did not call my attention, by stating that he knew the fact that this postmaster had taken part in a political meeting, but he simply sent this newspaper clipping. I answered promptly and said that, if it were true that the postmaster had taken part in politics, he had no right to do so, and that his attention would be called to the point. But, when the question is put whether my attention had been called to the fact that the postmaster had taken part in the public meeting, I answered that my attention had not been so called—that is, no complaint had been made.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Well, where is the contradictions? Did not I give my hon. friend the answer he wanted? He brought to my attention a newspaper clipping making a certain statement, and I said that, if the statement was true, the postmaster of whom the statement was made was in the wrong, and that I would tell that postmaster that he must not take part in political meetings. I think I was perfectly candid in my answer.

Mr. CROCKET. The question was not: Has the Postmaster General's attention been called to a fact, but has it been called 'to statements to the effect that'—and so on. So, the ground which the Postmaster General now takes falls away. His attention certainly was called to the statement made in the newspaper published in Woodstock. Notwithstanding that, the Postmaster General answered 'No.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. With your permission, Mr. Speaker: I am not accustomed to play upon words, and, even were that my custom, my knowledge of English is too limited for me to play upon words in that language. I might be able to play upon words in French, but not in English. If my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) had complained to me personally that the postmaster at Woodstock had taken part in a political meeting, I certainly would have answered that my attention had been called to the fact. But a newspaper cannot call my attention. The clipping was inclosed in the letter sent to me, and I think I dealt fully with that clipping when I said that if the statements made in it were true, the postmaster was in fault.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the Postmaster General tell us what is the population of Woodstock, N.B., and what is the salary of the postmaster there?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I stated yesterday in my answer the amount of the salary of the postmaster. This postmaster receives a salary based on the revenue of the office. It is on what is called the 'semi-staff system'—out of the total amount, the postmaster pays his employees. This is the rule in many places.

Mr. BENNETT. Will there be an investigation as to the charge? And, if the postmaster is shown to have been guilty of addressing a public meeting, will he be dismissed from the service?

Mr. LEMIEUX. First of all, I have answered that there is no charge. Even my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) has made no charge. He says simply that he has received a clipping from a newspaper stating that the postmaster there had taken part in a political meeting—

Mr. CROCKET. And also a letter stating that he had done so.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has the hon. gentleman sent me the letter? Has he even given me the name of the writer?

Mr. CROCKET. I stated that I had received a letter from Woodstock, asking me to bring the fact to his attention.

Mr. LEMIEUX. But I have no such letter and no such charge is made. If my hon. friend will send the letter, and will make

a charge, an investigation will take place and justice will be done.

Mr. CROCKET. What I reported surely should be enough to put the minister upon inquiry and cause an investigation to be made.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I think the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) takes a rather extraordinary position in this matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh,

Mr. LENNOX. Surely the government is not going to take the position in every thing that we have to be constantly making charges in order to keep them up to the mark. Surely, the government, if they have reasonable ground to believe that some infraction of what is right has taken place will feel it their duty to inquire. In this case first, the minister has a statement forwarded by a member of this House. It is true this statement is in the form of a newspaper clipping. But that newspaper clipping is accompanied by a letter from a member of this House. This means, if it means anything, that the member who writes the letter desires to call the attention of the minister to the statement.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What was my answer ?

Mr. LENNOX. We will come to that. It means, too, that the member who writes the letter thinks there is something in the statement, or he would not forward it to the minister. The minister's answer is satisfactory for the time being. But, yesterday, the minister answers a question in this House in a way which, I am bound to say, is not satisfactory. And I am bound to say also that, if this be the measure of the reliance we can place upon answers which we cannot test, it is very unsatisfactory. In the majority of cases, we must take the answers as we get them, and we do not know whether they are correct or not. Here a newspaper, containing serious charges against the postmaster is forwarded to the Postmaster General, and within a day or two the Postmaster General is called upon to answer the question :

Has the Postmaster General's attention been called to statements——

Not to the fact.

—that Mr. Smith has been taking an active part in the general provincial election campaign ?

And the minister answers 'No.' Now, in addition, the hon. member (Mr. Crocket) states that he has a letter from the riding making a complaint to him of the circumstances. And the minister says to the House that no charge has been made, and therefore he will not have an investigation. I do not suggest that we should have a commission appointed, or anything of that kind but I do submit that, when statements of this kind are brought to the attention of the minister, he should not insist upon a formal charge being made, but should inquire into the matter. That is the least we should expect. I regret very much that the minister has taken the position, which, I think, has been taken here too often. I regret to hear again this taunt flung across the House, 'Make your charge.' We are not bound to be detectives and accusers on all occasions. We discharge our duty if we bring these matters to the attention of the government. The government ought to be able to find them out themselves, but they do not seem to be able to do so. We give them the information, and then in answer to our questions concerning the matter, they give us information that is faulty. And, when it is shown that complaints have been made by a member of this House, the minister tells us that no charge is made. He folds his arms and says : 'I will make no investigation.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. I did not say that.

Mr. LENNOX. He says that no charge is made and that there is nothing to investigate. I say it is not our duty to make a charge. An hon. member has brought the matter to the attention of the House, and it is the duty of the minister to be on the alert, to learn the truth of the matter, and, if it prove true, to see to it that the postmaster who is at fault shall receive the punishment which he deserves.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is exactly what I have done. I received a letter from the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) stating that he had received a newspaper, making the statement that the postmaster at Woodstock, New Brunswick, had taken part in a political meeting. I immediately answered that I would call the attention of the postmaster to the fact that he was not allowed to take part in political meetings. Now, the least we can do is to await the answer of the postmaster. As regards the answer that I gave yesterday, of course, perhaps I did not read the question very——

Mr. FOSTER. Carefully.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not carefully, but very closely. I simply took the question to be if my attention had been called to a statement made and I answered, 'Yes,' instead of 'no.' I thought that my hon. friend meant if any charge had been made against that postmaster. No charge has been made.

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS IN MUNICIPAL POLITICS.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to this circular again because it is the second instance that we have had lately where, in my judg-

ment, there appears to be a disposition to violate the amenities which should exist as between employees of the country and the people. It is only a few days ago that I drew the attention of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to the fact that one Mr. Fitch, down in Nova Scotia, who is an inspector of fruit and who had a particular duty to do in that locality was running for the municipal council and was a very strong and active partisan as well. I then stated that, in my judgment, this man could not properly do his duty as between those who were friends of his and working hard for him and those who were opponents of his and working hard against him, because of the fact that he was obliged to perform a duty to the country which was to inspect the packing of apples belonging to both. It is not human nature to expect that he will be as friendly towards his opponents as towards his friends. It is not human nature to expect that he will not be more kindly disposed towards one than the other and in view of that fact I asked the Minister of Agriculture if he did not think it his duty, or the duty of his department, to instruct this man that it was not a proper thing for him to be running for public office in the locality in which he lived and in which he was to perform his duty as an officer of the government. The minister passed it over, I thought, with a rather insignificant or cursory reply in which he said that he did not think that there was anything wrong in it and that it was not his place to look after it. Now we have another example in the Department of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does my hon. friend say that the case to which he referred was in New Bunswick?

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) the right to speak twice on the same question?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, we are going into Committee of Supply and this is a grievance.

Mr. SPEAKER. On the former occasion the hon. gentleman merely asked a question on the orders of the day being called.

Mr. TALBOT. But the hon. gentleman's former speech was made on the same point.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all. I, simply to establish a basis for the question, was obliged to read this notice, and if the hon. gentleman had been paying any attention to it, should have recognized that. Here is a specific circular issued by the manager of the road on the 23rd of December, 1907, for some purpose or other. The purpose is disclosed in the circular. It reads :

To employees.

The Minister of Railways——

I assume that means the present minister because I think he was minister at the time.

The Minister of Railways, having been requested to allow employees of the railway to offer themselves as candidates for and to accept municipal offices has carefully considered the matter, and his conclusion is, that, generally, it is not in the interest of the railway that this should be allowed and that only in such very exceptional cases as the minister may determine——

Is it allowable. I put two questions, first, Did the minister determine that it should be allowable and upon what grounds, or what very exceptional circumstances were present in this case that justified these two employees of the Intercolonial Railway in running for office ? The minister seemed to pass it off in a somewhat indifferent way and did not think that it was a matter of importance for him to consider at all. But, I assume that he has considered it because of the fact that we have this notice, and I assume that there were very exceptional circumstances which justified it. In my judgment it is not a good plan. Take this particular case. There is a municipal council and there are two employees of the railway who are running for that municipal council. They might be prominent members of that council and cases might arise where the interests of the railway were at variance with those of the municipality. Does the minister then think it would be right to allow employees of the government or of the railway to run that municipal council ? He says that it is only in very exceptional cases that they ought to be so allowed. He has given no strong exceptions that exist in this case which would not apply in other cases and by which he might justify this departure from what appears to be sound policy. But, these two men have been allowed to run. I do not know whether they were elected or not ; presumably they have been elected and if so they must have been elected on the advice of the minister that there were exceptional reasons or circumstances in their case that justified them in offering themselves as candidates, as otherwise, he would not have allowed it. Then it is assumed as well that he did consider it. Did he consider these cases ? The circular says that it is only in such cases that they have considered that they are permitted to go on and stand for election to a municipal council. I think the minister has not given us all the information that he should in this case. I think he should give us more grounds as well why, as a matter of general principle, it is wise to allow employees of the government to run for municipal councils in their respective localities because there are questions which come up from time to time and, in my judgment, it would not be proper to have a council loaded up with the supporters or employees of a railway company where the interests of the municipality have to be considered by that council, and where, undoubtedly, the em-

ployees of that company would be most likely to give more consideration to the interest of the railway than that of the municipality. I think the minister should give us a further explanation of it in order to justify his action in allowing these two men to run for municipal office. It was either right or wrong. As a matter of general principle he admits it or he does not admit it. I rather understood from his remarks that personally he had no serious objection to it at all. It was because of the scarcity of men down there that he had no serious objection to it. If there were no serious objection to it why issue this circular and say that there are serious objections to it and that it is only where there are very exceptional circumstances that will justify it that it will be allowed. I think that he should tell us what were the exceptional circumstances in this case that did justify it.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). Mr. Speaker, whatever blame or credit attaches or whatever may be said of the judgment which is displayed in that circular, the responsibility is mine. One or two years ago this matter came before the department and after a great deal of study I concluded that, generally speaking, employees of the Intercolonial Railway should not engage in civic politics particularly where there was a conflict between their duties as employees of the railway and their duties as officials of the citizens. I can very well understand that it would be very reprehensible in the interest of the railway to allow certain officials to seek the popular franchise at the hands of their fellows. It might affect the discipline. If they held certain positions it might affect them in the discharge of the duty which they owed to the railway. There are other officials whose duty in no way conflict with their duties as civic officials.

Mr. SPROULE. Part of the duty of the municipal council is to revise the assessment roll. I do not know whether this railway property is assessable or not, but if it be, the duty of the municipal councillors would be to revise the assessment roll and perhaps to tax the railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) was a lawyer he would know that the Intercolonial Railway is not subject to taxation.

Mr. BERGERON. Was that circular issued when my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) was minister?

Mr. EMMERSON. The rule was laid down by me some few years ago and it seems to have been renewed by the general manager as a reminder. The rule was in harmony with the rule adopted by the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. I remember distinctly that an application came from Stellarton for permission for certain Intercolonial Railway employees to engage in civic politics, because the population of Stellarton is almost wholly composed of railway employees, and the citizens asked that certain of them should be allowed to take official positions. I looked into the question, and judging by the nature of the employment of the men, I concluded that the interests of the citizens would be advanced by granting the permission and that at the same time no injury could accrue to the railway. I assume that the gentlemen who are in question in this case are the same employees who are continuing in office. There have been some cases in the city of Moncton in which I refused this permission, because the employees who were sought to engage in civic politics had such a relationship to other employees that it would endanger the discipline of the road in my opinion and so I withheld consent. The same is true with respect to other sections of the Intercolonial Railway. It is my opinion a fair proposition to lay down as a general rule that railway employees shall not engage in civic politics, but there are circumstances under which it would be in the public interest as well as in the interest of the railway that permission should be given employees to accept municipal office. I followed that rule, and I do not think the present Minister of Railways could have any very strong reason for departing therefrom.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). The remarks made by my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) are no doubt very instructive from the standpoint of the public interest and from the historical standpoint as well. This circular may follow the lines of one previously issued by him, but it is dated the 23rd of December last when he had ceased to hold the office of Minister of Railways. No one is finding fault with the terms of the circular and no one denies that in certain cases government employees should have this permission. But it has been brought to the attention of the minister that in Stellarton or New Glasgow, I don't know which, two candidates for municipal office are employees of the Intercolonial Railway and the Minister of Railways is asked: What are the circumstances that place these cases among the very exceptional cases which are referred to in this circular? Surely that is a proper question to ask of the minister in charge of the department, but for some reason known to himself, the minister has not yet given an answer. The subject has been brought to the attention of the government on two or three occasions and during the illness of the Minister of Railways we understood the information could not be given, but now that he is present he should be prepared to give the information

at once or to say that he will procure it at the earliest possible moment. It would save the time of the House if the minister would take that course.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). As the question of my hon. friend from East Grey relates to my constituency I wish to say a word. I might first point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) that a conflict between the interests of the railway and the interests of the municipality in reference to assessment cannot possibly arise along the line of the Intercolonial Railway, because all that property is the property of His Majesty and is exempt from assessment. I cannot fancy upon what principle the Railway Department should restrict the railway men in the smaller towns along the line of the Intercolonial from exercising to the fullest extent their right to represent the community in which they live in the municipal council. The department seems to have adopted some rule, following the example of the larger railway companies dealing with their employees, but personally I cannot see much reason for it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is in consequence of that rule the question has been asked.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I know. However, in the case of Stellarton there are conditions which not only warrant the minister in permitting these men to run as municipal councillors, but which would cause him to adopt a very unfair and improper course towards the railway men of that town if he refused permission. Stellarton has a population of about 3,000 and with the exception of the merchants in that community the population is divided betwen the employees of the Acadia Coal Company and the employees of the Intercolonial. The railway men living in Stellarton have good homes; they are splendid citizens, and altogether they are high-class men. To say that these men should be debarred from taking part in civic affairs because they happen to be government employees would be unfair under the circumstances. The Acadia Coal Company is probably the largest individual taxpayer in that town, and if the employees of that company are the only people to be permitted to occupy seats on the council board, the House will at once see that the railway men who have property interests would be put at a great disadvantage. There are, therefore, circumstances of an exceptional character existing in Stellarton. I see no reason at all why these railway men should not be allowed to take part in municipal affairs.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BERGERON. On the 16th of December last I put two questions to the Minister of Public Works which I thought could be very briefly answered, but he asked me to move for returns, which was done. The returns have not yet been brought down, and as the minister is not in his seat, I would like some of his colleagues to call his attention to the matter. They are very short and should have been brought down long ago.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What are they about?

Mr. BERGERON. About dredging in Quebec, in the river between Charlemagne and Terrebonne and in the Rivière la Graisse at Rigaud.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. In December last I moved for a return in regard to fishing licenses in the province of Saskatchewan. This is an important matter to the people who are depending this hard year on the privilege of going out to fish, and I would ask the minister to bring the return down as soon as possible.

Mr. BRODEUR. The return was brought down yesterday.

SEED GRAIN FOR THE NORTHWEST.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, when the estimates to make provision for supplying seed grain to the settlers in the northwestern provinces were put through the House last Friday, it was done under somewhat unusual circumstances. Those estimates had been brought down at a very late period, and it was realized that there should be no delay in enabling the government to take the necessary steps to have the seed grain made available. The work of purchasing grain, testing its germinating powers, and making all the other arrangements necessary for the distribution would inevitably take considerable time and the gentlemen on this side of the House considered it advisable to allow the estimates to go through at the earliest possible moment. For that reason no discussion took place on the regulations for the distribution. Those regulations were brought down at the very last moment, and it was quite impossible for persons who then saw them for the first time, to acquaint themselves thoroughly with them in order to discuss the question intelligently. They thought it was essential to ascertain to whom advances were to be made, and the terms and conditions under which those advances were to be made. It was on the understanding that the regulations would be subject to full discussion in this House that the estimates were allowed to be put through so speedily. I have looked through those regulations during the last few days, and while I find that in many details they are open to improvement, there is one very important detail which I think this House should discuss at length, and in respect to which it should arrive at some decision. I refer to the provision that the money advanced for the purchase of this grain shall

be repayable in one year. Before I sit down I propose to move that in the opinion of this House the time should be extended in order to make it three years. I do not intend to make this motion a vote of want of confidence, and I sincerely trust that the government will not consider it as such. Indeed, if the governement would agree to the suggestion I make, I would not be prepared to press the amendement to a vote. But this seems to me to be the only opportunity which is likely to be given to us under the circumstances of bringing this matter forward in a definite way, so that the opinion of the members of this House can be arrived at in regard to it. If the regulations had been in our hands for some time previous to the estimates being brought down, and those estimates had been laid before the House at an earlier day, no doubt we could have discussed this question to very much greater advantage in committee than it is possible to do under the circumstances at the present time. But the estimates have already been put through, so I find it necessary to take up the matter in this form at this stage. I wish to point out, first of all, that the prices of seed grain of all kinds are abnormally high at present in the west. In the latest papers which we have received from Winnipeg, I notice that the prices of wheat of the various grades mentioned in the regulations vary from ninety-three cents to $1.08 a bushel, and the prices of oats are relatively as high. If you add to these prices the additional expenses which are to be charged against the seed wheat, you will find that it will come to a very high price to the settler. According to the regulations you have to add to the cost, the storage, commission, insurance, sacking, freight and all other proper charges. The prices of grain at present are abnormally high, but there is no reason to suppose that they will continuue so high for any length of time.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Are those Winnipeg or Fort Williams prices?

Mr. LAKE. I think Fort William. They are given as the closing prices on the Winnipeg Exchange. If the prices should drop to the average or below the average, it will be found that the settler will have to repay in the fall two or possibly even as much as three bushels in order to cover the price of one bushel which he received. Further than that, if the yield be only the average or below it—because in those districts where there is necessity for seed grain, it was mainly due to the fact that it was owing to the heavy crop of straw on the ground that the grain itself was so badly damaged—if the yield in those districts should be the average or even below the average, it will be found a most serious drain on the resources of any farmer to repay the seed he has received out of his one year's crop. It will take the whole of his profits to do that. I have pointed out that it is the financial stringency which has existed throughout the Dominion which is responsible for the necessity of the government intervening in this matter. If there had been no such financial stringency, we should not have heard any thing about the necessity of the government coming to the assistance of the people of the Northwest and providing them with seed grain. The fact that there have been very good paying crops in the greater portion of the Northwest has in itself caused a very large demand for the repayment of the indebtedness of the Northwest to their creditors in the east. The remarkable speed at which new districts in that country have been opened up in recent years, chiefly by new comers, many of whom have very limited means, make it necessary that the development of the country must be carried on to a very large extent upon borrowed money. If you double the population in a certain area in two or three years, as has been frequently the case in recent years, and the crop on which everybody is depending should fail, not merely the farmers themselves but the business men of all kinds have to suffer and the financial conditions in that part of the world become such as to make it absolutely necessary that there should be some assistance from the outside. The fact that the pressure for repayment of the indebtedness of the Northwest has been greater this year than ever before has made it absolutely impossible for the people in those districts where there has been a failure of the crop, to help the new settlers as they have been accustomed to do in the past. Under these regulations, which provide for the repayment in one year of the seed grain advanced, practically one year's crop has to provide for two years' expense, and in the case of newcomers—many of whom have comparatively small amounts of land under crop—their position at the close of the present year will be pretty nearly as bad as it is now. In addition it is pretty widely rumoured that the provincial governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan propose to take chattel mortgages on the crop as security for the grain advanced to settlers who have patents for their own lands. These mortgages are payable out of the first crop. That is to say the crop is to be hypothecated before even the seed is put into the ground. I protest against any such intention being carried into effect, if any such intention exist. Such a course would be a heavy blow to the financial interests of the districts concerned. Not only the farmers themselves would suffer throughout the whole of this year and practically to the end of next year, but the business men, the dealers of all kinds, would be put to most serious disadvantage.

There are some other features of these regulations to which I desire to refer briefly although I do not propose to embody any suggestion in a motion. By regulation No. 15, it is provided that no seed shall be given where no crop was sown in 1907. I would point out that the financial stringency affects new homestead settlers to the same extent practically as those who have been longer in the country. The business men in the neighbourhood, and even the farmers, have been accustomed, when a new settler has shown himself to be energetic and industrious, to give him credit so as to help him out and see that he had good seed. But when there is no seed in those portions of the country and when the business men and the older settlers are hard pressed for money, they will be unable to do any thing for the new settlers. It seems to me that if the land is improved and ready for crop the government have ample security on the land itself for an advance of grain sufficient to sow it. The principal object of this expenditure for the provision of seed grain should be to ensure that no portion of land in the Northwest now ready for crop should fail to be sown for lack of seed. But I fear that object will not be attained if the regulation remains as it is, and if no one who had not a crop on his land in 1907 is to be allowed this advance of seed grain under the usual conditions. Of course it is provided later in the clause that if the government find they have a considerable amount of grain on hand after distribution, they may distribute it to these people for cash. We all regret that there should be necessity for the distribution of seed grain and that this distribution will be cited by people, who do not realize the terms upon which it is made, as a proof that there is necessity for the government to come to the aid of settlers through charitable motives. While we all regret that state of affairs, still good may come out of the matter, if it be looked at from a somewhat different point of view.

That the government are prepared to make this distribution to the newer settlers, those who have been only one or two years upon their lands, and to do this upon the security of the improvements, the settlers themselves have placed upon the land. I cannot conceive that any better advertisement could be made of the lands which we offer immigrants to the northwest than to say that the land is so rich that, after the government have made a free gift of 160 acres to any settler who comes in, and after that settler has put improvements upon the land, within one or two years that land has become so valuable that the government itself is prepared to advance sufficient money to enable the settler to carry on his operations in the way of putting in seed.

Then I desire to call attention to the other provision of the same regulation—that there should be no seed given to those whose crop last year was marketable and gave a reasonable return. Now, 'reasonable return' is a very elastic term, and I think it would be desirable that something more definite should be fixed by this parliament. I think the House will agree with this when I mention that the price paid for grain last year ran from 15 cents or less to 95 cents or over, per bushel. The yield varied in an almost equal degree. Then, with reference to rule 24. According to that rule, homesteaders residing outside of the local improvement district who wish to make application for seed grain shall make application to the Dominion lands agent, sublands agent, homestead inspector, immigration official or member of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police in the district in which the applicant resides. I have no objection to the application coming through these individuals, but the rule goes on further to provide that these persons shall adjudicate upon the matter :

—and such officers shall perform the duties assigned to the secretary-treasurers and the councils of local improvement districts and municipalities as herein provided.

That is to say one of these officers to whom application is made shall decide whether the application shall be granted or not. It seems to me that is putting the decision in the hands of a very large number of individuals, some of whom do not hold such high official standing as would warrant such an important matter being placed absolutely in their hands. I trust the government may see their way to modify that provision to some extent, or at any rate, will take some steps to make it absolutely certain that there shall be no cases of tyranny in regard to the distribution of this seed, that justice will be done to all who apply and that all cases will be thoroughly inquired into.

I have called the attention of the House to several different points in these regulations. I have already stated that with one exception—the term of repayment—I do not feel it necessary for me to put the matter in the form of a motion before this House. These other points may be left to the government who are, of course, responsible for the whole administration of this seed grain distribution. But I conceive it my duty to my constituents to press this particular question of the repayment of these advances. And, for that reason, I beg to move :

That all the words after the word 'that' in the said motion be omitted, and that the following be substituted therefor :

In the opinion of this House, the regulations respecting the purchase, sale and distribution of seed grain in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan should be amended by providing that payment for such seed grain

shall be made in three years by three annual instalments, instead of in one year; and by further providing that any person desiring to make repayment at an earlier date may do so.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). In arriving at an understanding concerning the various provisions contained in these regulations, we were in consultation with the two provincial governments. The regulations, as they stand, are according to the views of these two provincial governments, as expressed by their representatives. This proposed advance of seed grain differs entirely from any advances previonsly made, in that, on former occasions, the only advances made by the Dominion government were to homestead settlers—that is to say to settlers who had not yet become entitled to a patent, and who were, therefore, not in a position to give sceurity to any other than the Dominion government. On this occasion, by far the greater part of the assistance to be given is to be given through the provincial authorities, and they are responsible. It was, therefore, thought desirable that, in framing the regulations dealing with homesteaders, it would be well to make the regulations conform, as nearly as might be, to those that would be found necessary in dealing with the settlers who are occupants of purchased or patented lands. The provincial government having to take security, may find it necessary to look to the crop for its security in the first instance. And, in discussing the matter with representatives of the provincial governments, they pointed out that, whenever owing to the circumstances in which they found themselves they were compelled to take security on the crop grown from the seed—that is, to take security which would terminate at the end of the growing season —it was hardly fair to them that the settlers with whom they were dealing should be in a position to put them at a great apparent disadvantage as they would be if the homestead settlers were given more than one year.

Mr. LENNOX. Would the minister kindly explain why the local governments have to take security on the crop ? I am not saying that it is not so, but I would like to understand why it is. I understand the local government would be lending the money or the grain to settlers who had already obtained their patents. Why could they not take security upon the land ?

Mr. OLIVER. In some cases of course they could, but unfortunately in a very large number of cases the occupants of the land are tenants or parties who have bought on an agreement of sale. For instance all the Canadian Pacific Railway land is bought on agreements of sale which run for ten years, so that a very large proportion of the land held under that tenure is not patented and therefore is not in a position for the provincial government to take a direct security upon it. There is also a system of purchase on what is called crop payment, under which the occupant of the land, the purchaser, pays from year to year out of his crop. He also holds under an agreement of sale and has no title upon which the provincial government can take security, and so while there are a number of settlers upon whose land the provincial government can take security and therefore do not need to look to the crop, with a very large number of these with whom they have to deal the crop is the only immediate security available. As I understand what they propose is to take a lien upon the crop and then after that make such further adjustment as may be necessary and possible in order to take the security upon the land. In those cases where they can, they no doubt will, but in many cases they cannot and if they are to get their money they must get it out of the crop. Unless they get their money they lose it, because they must pay this government anyway. It was therefore thought reasonable that their position should be considered to that extent and after all it is not so seriously unfair that the homesteader who, as far as this parliament is concerned, is borrowing the money from the government should be required to make reparation at the end of the crop year when he has had ample opportunity to turn that crop into money. Of course the history of such transactions in the past has been that inasmuch as the Dominion government holds an absolute security upon the land as against the settler, there is no necessity to press him for payment, and payment in the past has not been pressed for. A lien is taken upon the homestead and possibly the homesteader does not pay; the interest accumulates but still he does not pay and at last he becomes entitled to a patent and applies for it. When the patent is isued the indebtedness is set out upon the face of the patent, the patent is issued to him subject to that indebtedness but no attempt having been made to take drastic means to recover the money, whenever he desires to use that patent as a means of security for further advances of money from private individuals of course the first thing he has to do is to pay off the government's lien. That is the worst that can happen and that being the case the government has never in the past pressed homesteaders for a settlement, and I do not know that perhaps they can be expected to do so in the future. At any rate their circumstances are not the same as those of the provincial government which must get a direct security or they stand to lose the money in a great many cases ; and acting in conjunction with the provincial governments it seemed fair that we should take a position that would not be unfair to them.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If the provincial governments saw fit could they not extend the time for another year, as the resolution now stands ?

Mr. OLIVER. The provincial governments can do whatever they please, but they have to pay this government at the end of the year and if they do not pay at the end of the year their agreement is that this government is entitled to retain the remaining amount of the indebtedness out of the subsidy. Therefore it is a business proposition that they must get their money from the people to whom the grain has been advanced, and I assume that it is also a business proposition that this government should get its money at the time arranged for.

My hon. friend referred also to section 15 which provides that advances are not to be made to those who have not had any loss of crop. My friend (Mr. Lake) thinks that this should not be.

Mr. LAKE. The part of the regulation to which I referred is :

No seed grain shall be applied to homesteaders who had sown no crop in the season of 1907.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a great deal to be said in favour of the position of my hon. friend from a certain point of view. He recognizes that in coming to parliament for this very large advance on the terms and conditions proposed we felt that it was necessary that we should show a case that would appeal to the mind of those who were not directly interested in the supply of this seed grain, as well as to those who were ; and I am sure that as a matter of logical argument I am at a loss to offer to the House a good and sufficient reason why those who have not suffered any loss should have the advantage of these advances.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Supposing they give security for it, what difference does it make ? Were they not brought in by the government?

Mr. OLIVER. I can assure my hon. friend it makes no difference to me in the position I occupy and no person in Canada would be so glad to do it as I would.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Well, then, play the game.

Mr. OLIVER. But I am addresing a House composed of careful, cautious business men and if they would be willing to make the amendment, which I notice my hon. friend has not moved in this connection, I certainly will be very glad to accede to it ; but I must say that in presenting this rather large proposition to the House I felt it desirable that we should rest on as safe and logical a ground as we could find. It seems to me to be much more reasonable to ask the House to vote for such an advance in the case of men who having made expenditures in the expectation of a return had failed to get that return, and therefore were not in a position to carry forward their operations, rather than to ask the House to provide in the case of men whose condition had not been changed by the climatic circumstances of last season.

Mr. BRODER. The local conditions are changed surely ; they are not able to get seed grain from the neighbours, generally speaking.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, as I have already said, no person will be as pleased as I if the House will agree to advance grain to settlers in that condition, but it was modesty, Mr. Speaker, on my part and not good will towards the settlers that led me to agree to the provision as it appears in the regulations. It will be observed that in the latter part of clause 15 provision is made that grain may be sold to such parties for cash.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Where will they get the money to buy it ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not prepared to say where they will get the money, but they will have just as much money to buy grain this year as they would have whether there was a crop or not.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not at all.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, if it is their own crop they certainly will. They did not sow any crop ; they were not disappointed in getting a return so that whatever arrangements they have made in regard to finances to secure seed to sow I presume still hold good because they would in any case have to buy their seed ; they have an opportunity to buy it and if we have seed we will be glad to sell it to them.

Mr. TAYLOR. They may have worked for some farmers and not have received their pay.

Mr. OLIVER. I am glad to hear so many of our friends taking such a generous view and I can assure them that while I would very strongly urge that these regulations be passed in the form they are, because they are as agreed to with the provincial governments, if it should seem to be the humour or temper of the House to go a step further and to permit of advances to the class of settlers debarred under section 15, I would be very glad to make that proposition to the House at an early day and to ask that it should be agreed to.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Before the minister goes on I would like to draw his attention to two or three points here and to ask him what they mean. The first is section 21 :

The duplicate copy shall be retained by the secretary-treasurer and be by him submitted on a day fixed to the council of the local improvement district or rural municipality for its approval, modification or rejection.

I would like to know what that means. How can they approve it, modify it or reject it? Second, section 25, line 3:

The secretary-treasurer shall be expected to take the declarations therein provided, and to perform all other work required to be done.

&c. Has the secretary treasurer authority to take declarations? Then, the last two lines of section 27:

—as nearly as may be, in schedule 'A' of these regulations, but slight deviations therefrom shall not vitiate such security.

What is a slight deviation? Then we find that the oath set out in schedule A is to be taken before a commissioner for taking oaths. These gentlemen are not too plentiful in that country. Is the secretary-treasurer authorized to take these oaths?

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to deal with the remarks of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake).

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I thought the hon. gentleman was done.

Mr. OLIVER. No, there are some other matters that he would like to have dealt with. I did not catch what he said or what his point was when speaking of the officials outside of local improvement districts who are authorized to supply forms and accept applications. Would he mind making the point a little clearer?

Mr. LAKE. The point I made was that they not only accept the application, but they also, apparently, as I read the regulations, adjudicate thereon. Some of these individuals do not, of course, occupy a very high official standing, and I think that very good care should be exercised to see that these decisions are not altogether final and that there is no hardship or injustice done to the settler.

Mr. OLIVER. There is necessary some provision to deal with applications outside of local improvement districts. There is no objection, I presume, to the forms of application being sent to the persons mentioned here or to their receiving applications, but what the hon. member for Qu'Appelle objects to is that they should have any right to revise or amend the applications.

Mr. BORDEN. Or reject.

Mr. OLIVER. Or reject. What we are doing in that section is——

Mr .SAM. HUGHES. Why not answer my question with regard to section 21 at the same time? The two run hand in hand.

Mr. OLIVER. That is what I am going to say. Our idea is that there should be as far as possible some person having knowledge of the facts to give his approval or to give his disapproval of the application. These two provinces are very large in extent. We send out these forms of application and we ask them to be filled in and sent to the central office. The person in the central office can have no possible knowledge of the merit of the application, and after discussing this matter with the provincial governments it was thought well by them, particularly that within local improvement districts, the council of the district, which would necessarily be much more familiar with the conditions of the district, would have the right to adjudicate, as you might say, upon the applications made within the district.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is just the point in regard to which I wish to ask the minister. What does the approval, modification or rejection mean?

Mr. OLIVER. It means this: Smith is a homesteader within a local improvement district. He wants seed grain; he goes to the secretary-treasurer; he gets an application form and that application form is filled out. One copy of the form is sent immediately to the central office so that we may arrive at a knowledge as quickly as possible of the amount of grain that is required. That is for the information of the purchasing agency. The other form is retained by the secretary-treasurer of the local improvment district and in due course a meeting of the council of the district is held and Smith's application as all others which have been filed, is passed upon by the local council. The local council will have more or less personal knowledge of Smith's circumstances and of the conditions prevailing there and will be in a better position to verify the correctness of Smith's statement than will the man at the central distributing office. If it should be so that Smith has made incorrect statements, or, in their opinion, has made incorrect statements as to the value of the crop that he grew, or as to the area of the land that he has under cultivation, the power lies in their hands to revise Smith's application and to cut it down if they think it is over the mark.

Mr. FOSTER. Or reject it?

Mr. OLIVER. Or reject this application.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is every homesteader going to be at the mercy of these tu'penny ha'penny councils? If he has so many acres ready for seed grain why should he not get his grain?

Mr. OLIVER. Again I wish to say that this was a point that was very strongly insisted upon by the provincal authorities in regard to the land holders or occupants with whom they had to deal. So far as the homesteaders are concerned we do not have to have their applications passed upon by the council of the local improvement district, but it did seem to us that as the provincial governments felt that for their own

protection it was necessary that the council of the local improvement district should pass upon the applications in regard to non-homestead land, it would not be unreasonable that they should also pass on the homestead land.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the words 'approval, modification or rejectment' simply mean to apply to verifying the statement of an applicant that he has so many acres ready for seed, and needs the seed, well and good. But if the words give them the right to say: We don't think that fellow Jones is entitled to seed, he is not a friend of ours that won't do and there must be no game of that sort.

Mr. OLIVER. What we are afraid of is that if we rest only upon the opinion of the central distributing officer who can have no personal knowledge of the facts, and he grants every application that comes in, we shall be accused of unduly abusing the liberality of parliament.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. All that should be required is that these people would give a certificate of the facts of the case.

Mr. OLIVER. On the other hand if we should undertake to cut down any applications we would be accused of acting unfairly for political or other reasons. We think that when we place the responsibility upon the local council elected by the people we are getting as near to a fair basis as we can, and we will possibly avoid accusations of political partisanship. At the same time it is a fair protection for the public treasury.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand the criticism to be that there should be some limitation of the words 'modification or rejection.' No doubt it is intended that there should be, as the minister says, but it is not very explicitly stated and it may be felt that there is an indiscriminate power as to modification or rejection.

Mr. OLIVER. I admit that the section may not be fortunately worded in that respect, but the principle is as I have stated and I do not think there is any danger.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The principle is a perfectly sound one.

Mr. OLIVER. It seems to me to be fairly sound, and I do not think there is any danger of the attitude which has been suggested being taken by the councils, because they will be under instructions from time to time by the provincial governments, and whatever shortage there may be in the wording of any of these sections will be supplied by the prompt and direct supervision of the provincial governments over their transactions. What my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle contended was that the officer of this government who would have authority to certify applications outside the local improvement district, should not be given power of revision or rejection. That is a point which is quite arguable. All I can say is that the provincial government for its own protection desires to have the responsibility of some person who is familiar with the facts so that there may not be any undue demands for advances.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I presume the provincial governments will administer the greater part of the funds.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it the idea that the regulations under which they shall act shall be promulgated by themselves, but shall follow the same lines as these?

Mr. OLIVER. The idea was set out fully in a revised edition of the papers which were distributed this morning. From these papers it will appear that it is desirable there shall be only one system of distribution and one set of machinery, as regards the homesteaders and the other settlers intermingle, and in order that there shall be an intelligent handling of the business, it is desirable that the regulations which apply to homesteaders shall to all intents and purposes apply to those who are not homesteaders. Therefore we have made our regulations for homesteaders conform so far as possible with the ideas of the provincial people as to the requirements of those who are not homesteaders.

Mr. FOSTER. They do not act outside of these regulations.

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. LENNOX. But they have to take a different class of security.

Mr. OLIVER. That is their own business and we have nothing to do with that. These regulations have nothing to do with the security they take; they must look to that themselves.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In a word, the regulations are exactly the same whether the grain is distributed under the administration of this government or under the administration of either of the provincial governments.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Plus the consideration that the security to this government is covered by these regulations and the security to the provincial governments will be covered by some additional regulations to be made by them.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I can understand it thoroughly now.

Mr. OLIVER. The machinery organized for the purpose of distributing to homesteaders is authorized by the provincial governments to distribute on their behalf, and therefore we have to have the regulations alike for all. The provincial people thought it was well that applications from outside of local improvement districts should be passed upon by a person with some measure of responsibility who might be supposed to have personal knowledge of the facts, and we agreed with them and sections 20 and 24 are the result. The principle is that there shall be some person who may reasonably be supposed to have personal knowledge of the facts and who it may reasonably be supposed will act without prejudice and will stand between the settler who wants the grain and the government which is distributing the grain.

Mr. KNOWLES. Do I understand that the objections by the local improvement councils, if objections there be, will be final, or will there be an appeal? Section 22 says that when all applications have been dealt with by the councils they shall be transmitted to the central office at Regina. It does not say 'approved' applications, but 'all' applications, and it might therefore be inferred that whether accepted or rejected they would eventually come before the central official, and so the decision of the local improvement council would not be final.

Mr. OLIVER. The idea agreed upon by the provincial governments and ourselves was that the decision of the improvement council would be final because it was thought to be the best information that we could get on the subject. They being on the ground would know the circumstances as neither the provincial government itself nor the representative of this government could possibly know them. Of course the provincial government and our own officers will be in close touch in this whole proceeding, and if it should come to our knowledge that the action of any such council was unfair or unjust, it would be quite in order and quite proper for us to take some action; but we have not contemplated that, and that was not our idea. Our idea was to take advantage of the local commissioner as far as we could, to have a close supervision of the applications.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I take for granted that the minister, in putting in these words was aiming to get some guarantee of the 'bona fides' of the applicant, and if the applicant is a 'bona fide' homesteader who has his land ready for seed, there is no possibility of rejection.

Mr. OLIVER. That is right.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Has the minister any information from the provincial authorities as to what proportion of these districts are organized into local improvement districts or what proportion are unorganized?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able at the moment to answer my hon. friend's question; but there is no doubt that where there is any density of settlement there is an organized local improvement district. A large part of the province of Saskatchewan, of course, both south of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway and north of the Canadian Northern, contains practically no settlers, and of course is not organized in any form; but the body of settlement is fairly dense and compact and I think I am safe in saying is entirely organized. It is only the outlying parts that are unorganized.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are the secretary treasurers authorized to take the declarations provided for in section 25?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. The local governments have agreed to authorize the secretary treasurers as commissioners to take affidavits.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Section 27 provides that slight deviations shall not affect the security. What constitutes a slight deviation?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think there is no objection to that. That is a common phrase where a bill of sale or a statutory form of deed is used. Without some provision of that kind, a slight deviation, like a mere clerical error, might affect the security. I think that is a wise provision.

Mr. OLIVER. The gentlemen acting in these cases are not learned in the law, and it has been thought that there might be unintentional errors, and that this would be a saving provision to make.

Mr. LENNOX. I notice that the vote appropriates a certain amount to go to the provinces and a certain amount to be handled by the Dominion. Does the Dominion government purchase all the grain required, or only as much as comes within the limits of the vote appropriated for the Dominion?

Mr. OLIVER. As soon as the Appropriation Act becomes law, the several provincial governments will pass orders authorizing the Dominion machinery which has been provided to purchase and distribute the grain for the settlers for whom they are responsible. They will give that order to us, and we will carry out their instructions, and the money for doing so will be provided from the funds loaned to them.

Mr. LENNOX. That is to say, the Dominion will make the entire purchase, and keep an account, and charge the portion which it supplies to each government?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. And it will do that at the actual cost price, I understand, without charging any thing for administration ?

Mr. OLIVER. In the printed papers which have been brought down to-day my hon. friend will find from page 31 to the end, the agreements made in that regard between the provincial governments and the Department of the Interior.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the minister any estimate as to the number of farmers in the two provinces who will require this assistance ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is not possible to make an inteligent estimate of the number. Calculations have been made based upon areas of cultivation in localities where the grain is known to have been damaged ; but no person can tell, until we get the returns from the forms of application which we have sent out, how many people will desire to avail themselves of the proposed seed grain advances.

Mr. CROCKET. How do you arrive at the amount required ?

Mr. OLIVER. We have figured on the areas of cultivated land in the districts which have not produced seed suitable for resowing.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In regard to the security, has the minister considered the plan adopted by the State of Minnesota and other states where the state sells binder twine to the farmers every year, and takes in payment the notes of those farmers, several farmers being required to sign each note ? These notes are held by the state, and the state has never lost a dollar. Would it not simplify the machinery and be a more certain guarantee of repayment if the government were to require a group, say of ten or more farmers, to go jointly on the security for the repayment of the loan ? In such a case, would not each guarantor see that his neighbour did his share in paying up ?

Mr. OLIVER. The suggestion is not one which appeals to my mind.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Think it over. It worked well in Minnesota.

Mr. OLIVER. It is hardly fair to require that a group of men shall be bound for the indebtedness incurred by one. If the ten men must go on a joint note and each one is indebted for the full amount of the note, that bears a very close resemblance to what is called kite flying in banking, and is not really good security.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would you not have the same security as now ? Have you not the homestead of each man as security, and the additional guaranty that each man will be interested in seeing that the others pay, and each man will be helping to assist his neighbour to obtain the seed grain he requires.

Mr. TURRIFF. We had a little experience along that line in one of our former distributions of seed grain. Some could not give security and got their neighbours to go as bondsmen.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am not asking the neighbours to go as bondsmen.

Mr. TURRIFF. It is the same thing. They give a bond that they will be security for the payment of the neighbour's debt. Three men would go on the bond. One or two would pay off their indebtedness to the government but they would be still held for the indebtedness of the third who was either unable or unwilling to pay. In the end the matter was brought up in the House and the bondsmen were relieved of their indebtedness, and the man who received the grain and failed to pay was held alone for the liabiliy.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose the main object of the proposed assistance is that all the land capable of being seeded for next year's crop shall be seeded. Having that in mind, there does not seem to me a great deal in the point mentioned by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), although he has not embodied it in a resolution, namely, that persons who have taken up land, say within the last six months, should have a share in the proposed distribution. Of course my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) put his finger on the strongest objection to that. He said that those people are in just the same position as if there had been a good crop last year. That is true in one sense, but having regard to what I understand are the local customs and situation of the western people, there are two circumstances, namely, the well known financial stringency and the consequent difficulty of borrowing money and also the crop failure of 1907 and the consequent inability to borrow grain from neighbours, which make the lot of the new settler harder than it would otherwise be. If it were not for these conditions, these new settlers would be able to go to a bank and get a small advance to pay for a supply of seed or they would be able to borrow the seed from their neighbours. It seems to me therefore there is a fairly reasonable case for including these men. After all you will not in all probability subserve the main purpose of this vote, which is to be repaid with interest, unless you vote that money under such conditions as will enable all western land ready for crop to be seeded. My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) has given his reasons in this connection so fully that I need not dwell upon them further.

Then comes the other consideration, as to whether or not you will to a certain extent defeat the object of this vote in some cases and impose unnecessary hardship if you insist on repayment in one year. At present no one can give any absolute assurance as to what next year's crop will be. We all hope it will be an abundant crop, but it may be a medium or a poor crop. There may be in some parts a partial or even a complete failure ; and you must consider the circumstances that out of one year's crop, not only have these people to provide seed for two years, but for the sustenance of their families during two years, and, as my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has pointed out, they will in addition be subject to the payment of a very much larger price than they would be called on to pay under ordinary conditions. Under these conditions, is it wise to compel these men to repay in full in one year ? I understand that in the distributions in Ontario in years gone by, there was never any attempt to obtain repayment in one year, and you are dealing in the west with conditions very similar to those which then prevailed in Ontario. Would it not be better to give these men, who have been face to face with adverse conditions during the last few months, a fair chance, and spread these payments over three years ? I think it would be wise for the government to take that course.

My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) has taken the opportunity of moving this as an amendment to going into supply. He is not moving it as a vote of want of confidence in the government, but is simply moving it now because he has no other opportunity of doing so. We have acceded, in the public interest, to the proposal of the government with very little discussion. We have done so because we all believe in giving assistance under present conditions to the men in the west who are building up that country. But we acceded to it on the condition, and on the understanding, that we should have ample opportunity to discuss the whole situation upon a motion to go into Committee of Supply and after these regulations had been brought down. My hon. friend from Qu' Appelle (Mr. Lake) has no other opportunity than that now afforded to make his motion and place himself upon record on the subject. He has expressly stated that he does not desire to make this motion as expressive of any want of confidence in the government, because he and all the hon. gentlemen on this side have acquiesced in the course the government propose, my hon. friend's only object in making the motion, being so to perfect the regulations that they may be wholly in the interest of the people of the west and of the public as well. For, the public interest after all, is very much bound up in the prosperity of the settlers of Alberta and Saskatchewan for the next three or four years. I should be glad indeed if the government would accept the suggestion made by my hon. friend, and would amend the regulations accordingly. In saying that, I do not overlook what the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has very properly urged with regard to the position in which the provincial governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan will thus be placed. I concur entirely in his view that you could not very reasonably expect these governments to undertatke the distribution of seed grain upon the basis of payment in one year when this government was administering a similar fund on the basis of payment in three years. But I hope—and indeed I very little doubt—that the provincial governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan could readily find the means to provide some security satisfactory to them and such as would suit the conditon of repayment in instalments covering a period of three years. The hon. minister speaks of security upon the crop. Well, if next year's crop is of no value, if it turns out to be a perfect failure the provincial governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan will not have very much security. But if the crop is good, the settler will plant more land next year, and, with increasing hope and confidence, he will sow more for some years afterwards, and it does seem to me that, if the provincial governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan are inclined to regard as satisfactory their security on next year's crop, it might well take a lien upon the crop of three years. I cannot see that it will be much risk. Further than that, there are various forms of security which will be present to the mind of every hon. member, and the details concerning which could be worked out by the provincial government in each of these provinces. Of course, they accept a certain responsibility when they undertake the administration of this great fund. They must be prepared to discharge that responsibility, and to accept all risks that are incident to it; and part of the responsibility with which they should be charged in administering this great fund is to see that the public, whose money is advanced shall have reasonable security that the money shall be repaid with interest at 5 per cent, as the regulations require. So, I think the duty of dealing with the matter might reasonably be left to the gentlemen who are undertaking to do this business, acting on behalf of these provinces, and they might work it out to their own satisfaction. I have no doubt that, if this government takes that view, the provincial governments will be able to comply with the situation along the lines proposed by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle.

There is another point—that mentioned by my hon. friend from Victoria and Hali-

burton (Mr. Sam. Hughes). I understand perfectly the intention of the government in framing regulation 21. I should be inclined to think the municipal councils would construe it as indicated by the minister, though, if a lawyer should read it in a very technical light, it might not be sufficient for the purpose. But, as the Minister of the Interior has said, we are not dealing with it from a strictly legal standpoint, and the common sense and good judgment of these parties will cause them to understand, no doubt, exactly what was intended by the regulation. But, it does seem that, when you authorize officers of this government to deal with the settlers and adjudicate upon their right to receive advances of seed grain, you are creating, to say the least of it, a rather delicate situation. I do not reflect upon any of these gentlemen. I do not know whether those who are to be called upon to make this distribution of seed grain include any of those upon whom animadversions have been made in this House from time to time; I pass that by. But I say that this regulation does create a delicate situation, and I should think that, if it were possible, where adjudication has to be made by such an official, that some appeal might reasonably be allowed to some higher official. I do not know how far that might be practicable. The time within which the work must be done is limited. I understand that many difficulties of administration will be encountered. I am only putting this forward as a suggestion which I would like the Minister of the Interior to consider. I understand that the farmers of the west who have come into contact with Mr. Castle, the purchasing agent, have very great confidence in him. I have heard at various times that he is regarded as a very capable man and a good officer. I am glad that the government have appointed him for this purpose. He is spoken of as a man who would have only one object in view, and that is to do his duty in a straightforward way, without regard to anything but the performance of that duty. If it is possible for Mr. Castle to hear appeals, or if it is possible to find some man who equally commands the confidence of the people of the west and to whom would be given some power of settling appeals in cases of dissatisfaction, I would regard it as a good move not only in the public interest but also in the interest of the government as well for it is obvious that they would not desire that any dissatisfaction should continue. If this could be brought about, I should be glad; but we must leave it to the discretion and judgment of the government.

I hope that the precautions which seem to be pretty thorough, to secure grain that is free from noxious weeds, will be carried out. I believe this particular matter is under the administration of Mr. Castle, and I have no doubt that the necessary precautions will be taken. It is of the utmost possible importance, as, I have no doubt every man from the west will agree. And I express the hope, in conclusion, that the government will see fit to adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle, and will give persons in need of this temporary assistance opportunity to repay in three years instead of one.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The amendment of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) deals with one phase of the regulations, and that has afforded an opportunity to discuss the whole question, in accordance with the understanding arrived at several days ago. And, although this has served a good purpose, I hope that he will not consider it his duty to press this motion to a division. For, as I have said, he is dealing with only one phase of the regulations and the discussion here rather suggests that, while it is a very profitable subject to consider, it would hardly be the part of wisdom for the House to attempt to deal with the regulations in detail. For instance, several hon. members in the course of the discussion have suggested several points upon which they think the regulations may well be amended. All this seems to me to point to the conclusion that the proper course would be that there should be a full discussion of the subject, especially by hon. gentlemen from the west on both sides of the House who are familiar with the situation; that the matter should then be left to the consideration of the Minister of the Interior and his officials who might take up the suggestions made in the House and see how far it may be necessary to amend the regulations.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Or make a supplementary agreement.

Mr. FIELDING. Or make a supplementary agreement. My point is there may be a number of points arising out of the discussion on which it might be proper to make an amendment. That would be a proper course to take even if we were dealing only with the Department of the Interior and with the money of the Dominion government, but a further reason arises because we are acting in common with the provincial governments, not only for the portion provided by the Dominion, but also the portion furnished through the provincial governments, as they are to be administered under similar regulations. The provincial governments are necessarily, therefore, parties to the agreement, and I think it would be a pity if we should commit ourselves to the details of the agreement until a further opportunity has been had for a discussion of the matter between the Minister of the Interior and the gentlemen who represent the provincial governments.

If we were proposing by legislation to say that these moneys should be repaid in one year it might be necessary for the House to intervene and say that is a harsh procedure and that we should have said two or three years; but I call attention to the fact that in the resolution adopted and in the Bill passed by this House there is nothing in regard to the particular time in which the moneys shall be repaid. That is left entirely to be governed by the regulations, and it would be quite consistent for the Minister of the Interior at a later stage to amend his regulations, especially after having an opportunity to consider the matter with the representatives of the provincial governments. There is no reason to suppose that either the Dominion or any of the provincial governments will desire to act in a spirit of harshness towards any of the settlers who may receive seed grain. If next season we should have a good crop, as we all pray, there would be no trouble; every man who receives temporary aid would be in a position to return it; and if the crop should not be good, no one would suppose that the government of Canada or the government of any province would desire to press the people unduly. It is a financial transaction; we are lending a large amount of money under exceptional circumstances, which may not occur often and which make a very inconvenient precedent, so that it is very desirable that in taking this exceptional course we should surround the transaction with all reasonable precautions. It is the part of wisdom to say that the money shall be loaned only for a short time, and then, if exceptional circumstances arise which show that the people cannot repay it in that time, to leave that to be determined as it then would be in the light of the information that might come before the government. We have said, for example, that the provincial governments must return this money to the Dominion government within a little more than one year, and we have got them to agree that if it be not repaid within that time we have a right to levy on the subsidies payable to them, upon allowances or any money that we may have payable to the provinces. I think it is the part of wisdom in making such an unusual arrangement, in lending the credit of the Dominion to help out a provincial government—something I believe we have never done before—to surround the whole transaction with the best restrictions possible. Suppose the crop next season is bad; suppose the settlers cannot repay the advances to the provincial government, and that, therefore, the provincial government cannot repay this money to the government of Canada, is it conceivable that we would at once stop the whole subsidy of the province of Saskatchewan? Is it conceivable that we would do anything to stop the wheels of government out there? Surely that is a matter that can be safely left to the judgment of the government and of parliament.

I think in the proposal we have made asking the provincial governments to return the money in one year, it is only a reasonable and proper precaution, but we do that with the full understanding that if the provincial government should fall into difficulties we will have to help them out as any business man would help out a customer. In like manner, if the Minister of the Interior requires in his regulations that the money should be paid in the year, and if the homesteader cannot then make payment, if he makes an honest effort and by misfortune, by another bad crop, he cannot repay, who imagines for a minute that any Minister of the Interior would enforce the regulations in a harsh manner? Therefore, instead of the House undertaking by a vote to interfere with the details of this agreement, I think the proper course should be that we should have a free discussion, especially by hon. gentlemen from the west who are so familiar with that country; that the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) should withdraw his motion and that the Minister of the Interior, in consultation with the provincial governments, should consider then whether it may be possible to make any further amendments to the regulations.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (West Assiniboia). I wish to say a word, not so much upon the amendments proposed by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), as upon the other point mentioned by hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the expediency and wisdom of making an arrangement by which the new homesteader, the man who last year did not have a crop, might be assisted in the same way as a person who had been longer in the country. I find that I am of the same mind as the hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken. I would wish that always they might speak words of which I could approve as heartily as I do on this occasion. On several occasions I have brought this matter to the notice of the Minister of the Interior myself, and I think that my hon. friends from the west who sit on this side of the House and myself have done a great deal in our discussions with the Minister of the Interior in the last few days to bring him to the frame of mind in which he gives so ready an ear to the words of the hon. gentlemen opposite in that regard.

My reasons for supporting it, as I have on different occasions submitted them to the minister, are, in the first place, that the labour market this year in the west has been of such a nature that the new settler has not had that opportunity for making a few honest dollars to equip himself for going on his homestead in the spring as in

ordinary years he would have. A very large proportion of our good class of homesteaders, hard-working, industrious homesteaders, go to the farms of men who have been longer established and engage themselves with these farmers for a period of months, and in that way have a few dollars laid by with which to buy seed and otherwise equip themselves for going on a homestead. This year the labour market has been such that there have not been the openings along that line that there would be in other years.

Another factor that has influenced other hon. gentleman from the west and myself to favour this view is that homesteaders in the west have been led to expect that they would participate in the same provision that has been made for the men who have been longer in the country. I am sure that since this matter has been mentioned in the House the western homesteaders have had no other idea, neither have I, but that they would have the same provision made for them as the men who have been longer settled there. It would be exceedingly unfortunate after the winter is nearly gone and the spring is opening if their plans were to that extent done violence to, if they find that they have been disappointed in this provision. As has been well said by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) the main object of the resolution now before the House and of the present discussion is to make provision by which the lands of the west will be put under crop for next season. It is not a technical matter, it is not a party matter; we are all of one mind that it is noncontentious and we are of similar views with regard to the expediency and wisdom of the legislation now before the country and the House. The common object is that for the benefit of Canada every possible acre in the west that is ready for seed should have seed planted, and I am sure that no one can gainsay that. The homesteader, even if he put in no crop last year, will need seed, and if it is not forthcoming his acres are just as liable to remain unseeded as if he had raised a crop last year. Whether he raised a crop or not is not an important circumstance.

I have no doubt that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) will take this matter into his serious consideration. I do not know how it can be arranged; I suppose a larger vote will be necessary to make provision for it, but I have only to repeat that I think it unfair and undesirable from the point of view of the interest of the homesteaders, and unwise in the interest of the country, that the original homesteader of last year who had no crop should be overlooked. In that way I am entirely in accord with the views expressed in this discussion by my hon. friends opposite. Regarding the motion to extend the time to three years I have this to say that no government will be unreasonable in demanding payment, and the homesteaders will get all the time he needs, therefore the motion is quite unnecessary.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think that every hon. member of this House is most anxious that every acre of land in that western country which is prepared to be sown should be sown. I understood the minister to say that the regulations were prepared by this government and the provincial governments, that the three governments were parties to them, but I understand that of the money which we voted on Friday night part is controlled by the Dominion government and that the provinces have nothing to do with this part. I think the minister might say in reference to the part of the money that we control that payments should be made in one, two and three years. I would go further and say, let the provincial governments, administering the loan which is made to them, distribute the grain, and should there be a loss by reason of extending the time for repayment the Dominion government will assume that loss. Let them extend the time and we will take the responsibility of any loss that may occur. Liberate the provincial governments to the extent of saying that if they extend the time for repayment over three years we will stand whatever loss may occur. I am satisfied that the whole country would rather take this risk than see one farm unsown. I hope that the minister will get up and say: I will amend these regulations, in so far as the Dominion government is concerned, so as to provide that the homesteader will have one, two and three years in which to repay this advance, and I will ask the provincial governments to do the same. We, in administering one portion of this fund, will grant this condition, we should ask the provincial governments, in administering the other portion of the fund, to do the same, and we should say to them if there is any loss the people of Canada will stand it. I, for one, want to see the whole country sown. The men are there, the ground is prepared, and if they do not get the seed grain to sow the loss to the country will be greater than any loss which might occur by reason of the extension of time which I have proposed. We would rather trust them than take the chance of the farmers of the west being idle.

Mr. GALLIHER. If I understand the Bill aright its prime object is to provide seed for the farmers in the new provinces of the west. The Bill was brought down to provide seed because of the fact that there had been, in some portions of that district, a failure in the crops with the result that proper seed could not be obtained; in fact, I do not think that we would have this Bill before us if it had not been for the crop failing. If we had had a good crop in the west last year there would have been no

Bill such as this before the House for discussion. Therefore, the prime object of the Bill is to provide seed for those who were unfortunate enough not to have reaped the benefit of their sowing last year. While I do not wish to be understood as objecting at all to extending the benefits of the Bill further, namely, to those of our new settlers who did not sow a crop, I think there are one or two things that we have to consider in connection with it. Is the grant of money voted to be expended either by the provinces or by the Dominion sufficient to include this class ? If it is not sufficient to include this class then one of two things happen ; either we have to vote more so as to provide for this class or else some one in the class that it was originally designed to benefit will suffer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The grant is based on the total acreage, I understand.

Mr. GALLIHER. Including those who did not sow a crop last year as well as those who did ? Then would not these latter come in under the clause which says that they can purchase ?

Mr. LENNOX. But they would have to buy and pay.

Mr. GALLHER. Yes, they would have to buy. There is that distinction. What troubled my mind was the question if the money was sufficient to include all these classes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Apparently it is.

Mr. GALLIHER. Then I do not see any serious objection. It is not going to discriminate against the particular class of people whose case it was originally intended to meet.

Mr. HERRON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my hearty approval of the general principle of this Bill, and to say that I am in accord with the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake). I am pleased to say that there is very little need for this supply of seed grain in the district in which I live. But, I think there will be considerable seed grain required in the northern part of the province. You must remember that there is a lot of good grain all over the country for both milling and feed purpose, but that, for some reason or other unknown to me, it has not the germinating quality that makes it fit for seed grain. I think that is going to be one of the very serious problems which will have to be solved in that country. A man might be in a position to buy seed grain if the grain was available in the country but he cannot get it because of the poor quality of grain that we have. That will apply, I think, with a fair measure of force, to the discussion that took place regarding a settler of the first year or the man who has just come to the country and prepared his land to be sown next year. It will be very hard on him if there is no seed grain in the country and he has made preparation for a certain amount of expenditure for seed grain but which, on account of the scarcity, has doubled or trebled or perhaps more than trebled in price as compared with what it might be bought for under ordinary circumstances. I think this man should be provided for in the same way as the man who has attempted to raise a crop and has failed. I understand that the provincial government will take a lien upon the crop of next year to secure the repayment of the moneys advanced for seed. Does not this House think that that will work a great hardship on many settlers, merchants and business men in the country? People who lost their crop last year have had to sustain their families and they have had to continue through the winter and to make preparations for the sowing of their crop next spring. Such people have had to look to some one for credit and they have got it from their merchants and neighbours. If a merchant, or whoever has been helping these people, finds that there is a lien upon that crop to the Dominion government in one case and to the local government in the other, do you not think that it is going to be a great burden or hardship on these people for the next year of two. I do not think under ordinary conditions these people should be expected to pay back this money out of next year's crop. The time limit is the 1st of March, 1909. I do not think it is too much to ask that this provision should be inserted so that the people may know where they are, and that they shall have the opportunity of repaying in three equal yearly instalments. I think it would help the people and the country as a whole, if the period of repayment were spread over a term of three years.

Mr. SPROULE. The security given for repayment is a chattel mortgage and by this you destroy all the man's security upon which he may raise money from other sources. Neither the banks nor individuals will lend a man money if they know there is a blanket mortgage on his crop, and so you deprive him of the means whereby he can get the money while at the same time you compel him to pay it back in one year. I think that is a great injustice. Where, in Manitoba and Ontario, we have formerly been obliged to help farmers under somewhat similar conditions the experience has been that the money was not paid back in one year, or in two years, or in three years, but in some cases it took eight or ten years. Can we reasonably expect that there will be some magic in the farmers' position next year which will enable him to do what experience has shown in the past he has never been able to do.

Mr. TURRIFF. If I thought for one moment that any farmer would be coerced either by the local government or the Do-

minion government to pay back the value of the seed grain I would be in favour of inserting such a clause as is suggested by the hon. member (Mr. Lake). But in our past experience it has always been provided that the repayment should be made early, and in no single case that I know of did any large number of the recipients of seed grain ever repay at the time arranged for. The settlers of the west, as elsewhere in Canada, understand very well that neither the Dominion government nor the local government will send a sheriff after them the moment the amount becomes due.

Mr. SPROULE. How do they know ?

Mr. TURRIFF. They know it never has been done and my hon. friend cannot point to a single case where any government ever took stringent measures to make settlers pay back a loan for seed grain. The money will be paid back just as quickly under these regulations, and no quicker, than if the period were extended to three years. As regards the taking of a chattel mortgage, it is a good deal better for the settler, if he has to give a seed grain mortgage on his crop, to pay only five per cent interest than to have to go outside the government and pay a higher rate, because he cannot get money from any one else at the present time at anything like that rate of interest. If he wishes to give an additional security on his crop he is always at liberty to do so, because the seed grain mortgage of the government will only be for the value of the seed put in the ground. Now, as to the officers of the government outside of local improvement districts having the right to approve or disapprove of the applications made ; these officers are around through the country all the time, I know a good many of them, and I am absolutely satisfied that their whole object will be to help the settler in every case in a legitimate manner. I do not expect there will be one single case of a man being turned down, except where he makes an application for more seed grain than he has land to sow. That regulation is necessary because I know in the past men have applied for and received more seed grain than they had land to sow, and used the seed for other purposes.

Mr. SPROULE. Did they make a declaration to that effect ?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it not absolute perjury ?

Mr. TURRIFF. I do not know exactly what declaration they made but I know that some got more seed than they were able to sow and disposed of it in other ways. I do not know who better could be got than the North West Mounted Police and the other officials who know the conditions of the individual settlers, and who I am absolutely certain will deal with the people in an absolutely fair and proper manner. I am thoroughly satisfied that no settler will be coerced even if it takes him three years or five years to repay. Past experience is that they repay only when it is very convenient for themselves, as they know perfectly well that neither this government or the local government will take stringent measures to force them.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 19) to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—Mr. Bole.

Bill (No. 23) respecting the Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Mr. Henderson said : Since yesterday I have looked into this Bill (No. 23) and I am perfectly satisfied with it. I withdraw the objection made then.

Bill (No. 61) respecting Patents of Montague Moore and Thomas James Heskett.—Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 60) respecting Patents of the Goodwin Car Company.—Mr. Osler.

SUPPLY—DISTRIBUTION OF SEED GRAIN.

House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Fielding, that the House do now go into Committee of Supply, and the motion of Mr. Lake in amendment thereto.

Mr. GEORGE E. McCRANEY (Saskatchewan). Mr. Speaker, when the House rose this evening, there seemed to be a doubt in the minds of some of the members as to the class of security which would be taken for the advance of seed grain by the Dominion government, and there was considerable discussion regarding chattel mortgages. If I understood the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) correctly, he seemed to think that we, representing the Dominion government, were going to take chattel mortgages from settlers to whom advances were made. I wish to make it perfectly clear that the only security which the Dominion government is taking is a lien on the unpatented homestead, and that the only reason that the Dominion government is undertaking to make any advance for seed grain at all is that it is in a position to take that lien. If any one looks at the correspondence which has been laid before the House, particularly the communication addressed by Mr. George Harcourt for the province of Alberta and

the Hon. J. A. Calder for the province of Saskatchewan, to the Minister of the Interior he will see that the position is very clearly laid down that the Dominion government is assuming a responsibility because it is responsible for the immigration policy and because it has the power to take a security on the unpatented homestead. Let me read an extract from that communication, in which these gentlemen say :

It may be argued with a good deal of force that the duty of handling the problem which is largely local in its nature should rest solely on the provincial authorities. Still it must be remembered that the vast army of homesteaders who have poured into western Canada during the past three or four years and who have not as yet secured the patents for their lands are, in a sense, wards of the Dominion government. Heretofore they have always been regarded as such and when they required assistance or relief it has been their custom to look to the Dominion authorities. To this extent therefore, it would appear to be the duty of the Dominion government to interest itself directly in the matter and thereby continue the general policy that has been pursued for many years. It must, therefore, be admitted that so far as homesteaders are concerned the Dominion should accept the whole responsibility.

The homesteader, however, is not the only person requiring assistance in the way of seed grain. Owing to a peculiar combination of circumstances which now exist for the first time in the history of western Canada, thousands of farmers who have their patents must also be temporarily accommodated with seed. Doubtless the responsibility of providing for these rests at the door of the provincial governments and that responsibility they are prepared to assume.

So that there is no doubt that the representatives of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan only came to the Dominion government for assistance because that government was able to take the security which the provincial governments themselves could not take. I think the principle is further admitted in the Act of the Manitoba legislature, chapter 154 of the Revised Statutes of Manitoba, which makes provision that municipalities may supply seed grain, and is along the very lines of the legislation which we are enacting to-day, only it is more local in its character, because while we are advancing money to the provincial governments for the purpose of providing seed grain, the government of Manitoba provided money for the municipalities to make advances. So that we may say that as time goes on and patents are issued, if a similar occasion arises the Dominion government will not be applied to for any advance to the settler direct, although they may be applied to by the provincial governments for loans of money to enable these governments to make such advances.

In former times the Dominion government made gifts by way of charity, not only to our own people but to people who suffered loss in other countries. They may do the same thing to-day or at any time; but when we are discussing a matter of business, when it is a question merely of an advance to help some of our own people who are expected to repay, the business principle seems to be admitted, namely that it is the provinces which should come to the rescue and not the Dominion government, except under the exceptional circumstances I have mentioned,

Let us look into the question of the proportion of interest in this matter as between the Dominion and the provincial governments. After the discussion we have had, hon. members will pretty well understand that the Dominion government is making provision only for those settlers who have not yet received their patents, and that the care of any other sufferers remains with the provincial governments. As regards the proportion of interest, if one consults page 22 of the correspondence, he will find there an estimate given by Mr. George Harcourt for the province of Alberta and Mr. J. A. Calder for the province of Saskatchewan, and it works out in this way. By compiling the figures, hon. gentlemen will see that the Alberta government needs for its own purposes, in supplying seed grain, the sum of $440,000, and the Dominion government will require to expend for that purpose in the same province the sum of $110,000, making a total of $550,000. That is to say, the Dominion government will require an expenditure of only one-fourth of the amount which the provincial government finds it necessary to expend for this purpose. With regard to the province of Saskatchewan, the figures are very similar. The Saskatchewan government requires for seed grain $1,825,000 and the Dominion government $475,000, making a total of $2,300,000 to be expended in that province. In other words, the proportion which it is estimated the Dominion government will require to expend as compared with the provincial government is very little more than one-quarter. To anyone, especially in the west, it is most apparent that, whatever conditions be attached to the distribution of seed grain, those conditions should be uniform in their character. Our settlers see very little difference between the man who goes to town, having recently received his patent and to whom the provincial government must make an advance, and the man who has not quite earned his patent; and they will discuss these matters and will come to understand them and help each other in the procedure. But if there are two methods or systems, if the provincial government is to have one procedure and one term and one method of giving the advance and the Dominion has another term and another procedure and another method, I can only see confusion for the very people they want to assist and a great deal of confusion among those who

must administer the law. It seems to me that the view taken by both governments that the administration should be a joint one, is a wise view. It is wise for the reasons I have given and the further reason of economy in the administration. So that I do not believe there can be any doubt on the part of members of this House, especially on this side, that whatever may be the conditions of distribution, they should be uniform, as nearly as possible, and particularly so with regard to the greater features of the distribution. If we admit that, for the sake of convenience there should be uniformity, we should have to consider whether the views of the Dominion or the provinces should prevail. I pointed out only a moment ago that the interest of the Dominion government, as compared with that of the two provincial governments, can be estimated, as nearly as can be—and unfortunately we are dealing only with estimates in this matter—at about one to four. That in itself is an indication, but there is another reason why consideration should be given to the views of the provincial government, and that is the class of securities which it will be necessary for the provincial governments to take for their own protection. We want to make it very clear that this assistance is not given as charity. Speaking for my own people, I would emphasize this point that none of them wants any charity, and their desire is that whatever transactions may take place between the provincial governments and the Dominion government and themselves, should be on a business-like basis. Our hon. friends opposite have discussed this question of chattel mortgage security, not only as if that class of security were to be taken by the Dominion government but as if it were to be almost the sole security of the provincial governments. Let me point out further that, in my opinion, there will be comparatively little chattel mortgage securities taken. Let us examine for a moment the kinds of securities which the provincial governments may take, and which they always will take in preference to a chattel mortgage, because if they get a real estate security, it requires no looking after since it cannot disappear or be carried away. We have a large class of people who have received their patents and who can give a first, second or third mortgage on their lands. I think therefore that the provincial governments would be perfectly safe in taking such security ; and if they do take it, there is no necessity for their taking any other.

Others of our people have purchased lands, perhaps from private owners, perhaps from the Canadian Pacific Railway or some other land corporation of the west. It is a very usual thing for us in doing business in the west to take an assignment of a contract for sale by way of security, and to file a caveat in the registry office and secure our rights in that way. I should think that such a security, if there is any fair bargain of principal paid on account, would be a very fair security for the provincial government to take, and that there would be no necessity for chattel security. Then, the other security, which may be taken is a chattel security, and I presume that hon. gentlemen are right when they say that it is the intention of the provincial authorities of both provinces to take a lien on the crops. Now, we are objecting in this House to the provincial governments taking chattel security. Hon. gentlemen have discussed it, and I have discussed it, but I say it is not our business what kind of security the provincial government may wish to take for any advances which it makes. It may be a matter of interest to us, but, so far as our action goes, we can only refuse the advance to the provincial government which is further advanced to the settler. And I speak in these terms because I am discussing the matter as it would have been discussed had the vote not gone through. Now, if there is any question in the mind of any hon. gentleman with regard to the security on the crops of the settler to whom advances are made, I would refer him to the Manitoba statute, 154 of the Revised Statutes, section 16. I will read it :

> Any municipality, having accepted a promissory note or promissory notes in pursuance of the last preceding section or of any such Act as aforesaid shall have power to institute, maintain and carry on all actions, suits and proceedings necessary for the due collection of the said promissory note or notes or any part thereof; and, upon a copy of the said promissory note or notes being filed in the office of the clerk of the County Court for the judicial division in which the land on which the seed is used is situated, the same shall create a lien in favour of the said municipality upon all grain grown in said municipality by the person who has received such advance until the full amount of principal and interest shall have been repaid.

So that the statute of the province of Manitoba incorporates, as a matter of business, the very principle to which some objection has been made in this House. I thiuk it is a good provision. I think it is a provision which might well be considered by any authority making an advance for such purposes, and which has no better security to take. If it is thought that there is any harshness in the provisions of section 16 which I have just read, those who think so will be horror-struck at the provisions of section 18, which also I will read :

> At any time after a promissory note has been given to a municipality under this or any other Act as aforesaid, the municipality may declare the same to be immediately due and payable, whether the said note is due according to its tenor or not; and thereupon the said note shall be due and payable and the

municipality may take possession of and forthwith, on one week's notice, to be posted at the place of seizure, sell the crop or a sufficient part thereof upon which the municipality has a lien for the amount of the said note, and may bring action in the proper county court, by writ of summons, attachment or otherwise within the powers of the said court, for the due recovery of the moneys payable under said promissory note.

Mr. STAPLES. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCraney) when that Act was passed ?

Mr. McCRANEY. It is contained in the Revised Statutes of Manitoba, and I see that the note under that particular section refers to 57 Vic., chap. 31, and to 1 Edward VII., chap. 46. Perhaps the hon. gentleman knows better than I do when it was passed.

Mr. STAPLES. Is that Act now in force?

Mr. McCRANEY. I cannot say as to that. Perhaps the hon. gentleman knows.

Mr. STAPLES. I think it was passed only for temporary purposes.

Mr. McCRANEY. I am not discussing the Act with regard to its enforcement, but with regard to it as a precedent. So it does not matter for my present argument whether it is in force or not. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Staples) were to point out a subsequent Act in which some similar provisions were not contained it might have some force. But I do not know whether it has been repealed, and, for the purposes of my argument, I do not need to inquire. I am simply pointing out that the Manitoba government thought it necessary not only to empower the municipality to take security on the crops, but thought it desirable at the same time to provide that, notwithstanding the due date of the obligation, it might be declared due by the municipality at any time. That is not an extraordinary provision. I think that in the west in all chattel mortgages we draw and all the lien notes we take we have a provision which is almost similar in its terms for declaring due the chattel security which is given before date of payment.

Now, with regard to the due date. The regulations state that this money must be repaid to the provincial government by the settler, and to the Dominion government by the settler, on March 31, 1909. The reason that occurs to me for that is that the Dominion government is making these advances repayable at the end of its own financial year, and, if it is doing that, it wants to get the security on the provincial subsidies on which it has taken a lien under clauses 3 and 4 at page 25 of the correspondence. It appears to be a very businesslike proposition that the provincial government, which has agreed to pay a very considerable sum of money to the Dominion government should require that the advances made by them to the settlers should be repaid at the same time.

Mr. STAPLES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCraney) is a lawyer I understand?

Mr. McCRANEY. Yes.

Mr. STAPLES. In what position would the province be in a case in which there was a mortgage on the land or a judgment rendered against any particular parcel on which seed grain was loaned? Would the seed-grain loan take precedence of the mortgage?

Mr. McCRANEY. I should hardly think that that would be fair to the person who has advanced his money. I would not expect that it would.

Now, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) suggested that the advance be repayable to the Dominion in three years, and that it was as easy to make a chattel mortgage repayable in three years as in one. The difficulty about a chattel mortgage is that it is not the best of securities, and in this I include securities by way of lien. Any person who is acquainted with conditions in the west will recognize that the western population is a moving population, and that we have not those settled conditions of residence that are to be found in the east. Our own district is settled very largely by people from the province of Manitoba. People are moving into Alberta in large numbers, and I have many inquiries as to the Peace River country. To count on any settler being for three years in the same place is taking a hazard that, living out there, I would not want to take, and I believe that to have a security which would not be due before three years would not be acting in a businesslike manner on the part of the authority which makes the advance of the money.

With regard to clause 15 of the regulations, I sympathize very much with the position which hon. gentlemen have taken. So far as I am aware, there will be no need for government action in the supplying of seed grain in the riding which I represent, but I see by the newspapers which come from my riding that there are discussions as to the fertility of seed grain which is now in the hands of the farmers. In the Saskatoon 'Phœnix' of January 9, I find this statement at the end of an editorial :

Mr. W. Robertson of the Goose Lake district who has farmed for thirty-five years, between Canada and Dakota and has 800 acres to seed in the spring, said yesterday: This is a year I would not sow a bushel of grain of any kind without testing it.

Men who are making a success of farming are those whose methods are worth noting.

On the 18th of January this paper published this paragraph in an editorial :

It is gratifying to learn that large numbers of farmers are arousing themselves and awak-

ening to the importance of the subject of their seed. Doubts have been sown in their minds regarding the fertility of the grain in their bins, and they are applying the test with varying results. These are most marked in the case of oats, which, as we pointed out recently, are more liable to damage from frost than wheat. A case came under our notice yesterday of a farmer who sent two samples of oats to Ottawa for inspection. They looked of good quality and were well filled. In his own mind he did not doubt when he sent them that they would pass muster, but what was his surprise to learn that of one sample only 16 per cent sprouted in twelve days, and of the other, 69 per cent. These were startling and go to prove how absolute is the necessity for a careful examination. If that grain which showed 16 per cent had been sown, only an odd head would have struggled up amongst the weeds and the farmer would have had some tale about his crop having dried out or of the weeds getting the start of it.

I point this out, because altogether apart from those who lost their crop last fall there are a large number who, having got a crop, are unable to use some of it for the purpose of seed, and for that reason I sympathize with the desire of some of those hon. gentlemen who would like to have regulation 15 so amended that some assistance could be given to settlers of that class. Of course, so far we are working only on estimate, and it is only after we get all this information for which the regulations provide, that we can arrive at any conclusion as to whether or not the amount we have voted is sufficient. I am very much in hopes that the reports have been exaggerated, and that the Dominion government and the two local governments will find that there is a surplus in their hands which can be used for purposes other than those for which the advance is actually made, and that it will be possible to supply seed grain to the class of settlers I have mentioned. I have thought that if provision is to be made for that, it should be the result of a further vote and further consideration after we get all the information, so that we will know just what we are doing.

Another point arises in connection with the provision that no seed grain shall be supplied to homestead settlers who have sown no crop. I sympathize with the view that those homesteaders should be supplied with grain if there is grain available. I think that under all the circumstances the settler should be supplied first who, having seeded a crop and done all he could to obtain a crop, has failed to obtain it; and I would point out that while I think it would be a good thing to assist those who had not sown a crop along with their neighbours, it would be creating a precedent that should not be followed. It is one thing for a government to assist a community where there have been climatic conditions which have brought about disaster and where the loss is considerable in its extent; but we might have a question raised at some future time as to whether the government should come to the assistance of those who have not sown, either from their neglect or from any other cause. I am only pointing out the danger which might arise from any such precedent being created.

In the course of my practice as a lawyer in the west I have had a good deal to do with seed grain liens which have been given by settlers on unpatented homesteads to the Dominion government. I have never known of the government pressing any settler; I have no recollection, in fact, of the terms of payment of the lien, because we never paid any attention to it. The farmer got his advance, he gave a lien, and the lien stayed on the homestead until the homesteader received his patent and either sold his farm or put on a mortgage when it was necessary to get rid of the lien. I think that in the future that will be the practice. I do not think it matters in the slightest degree what terms of payment we may put on the advance by the Dominion government to the settler; I do not think the advances will be paid when they are due, and I am quite sure that the government will get its money, every cent of it, because it has the very best of security. For these reasons, I will oppose the motion of the hon. gentleman that the time be extended. I think it is better both for the government and for the settler that if he is able the settler should pay back the loan as soon as possible; but so far as the settler needing to fear pressure from this government is concerned, I think that past experience will be altogether against it. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) stated that in the province of Ontario these advances which had been made by the government to citizens in misfortune had sometimes stood for seven and eight years without repayment.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say by the government; I said by the municipality.

Mr. McCRANEY. Very well, that will suit my purpose. You do not know as to how long the time of payment was?

Mr. SPROULE. Speaking from memory, I think it was three years.

Mr. McCRANEY. That a security which was taken by a municipality for three years was not paid for six or seven years, just shows that whatever be the term of the provincial government they will all act alike and whether they are given time or not they will no doubt be guided by the circumstances. I think for that reason we should adopt the regulations as they are and I have no doubt at all but that they will prove satisfactory to both provincial governments and to every one else concerned.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Mr. Speaker, the hon. mover of this resolution (Mr. Lake) was appealed to by my hon. friend the Minister of Fin-

ance (Mr. Fielding) during the discussion as to whether he was willing to withdraw it or not. He did not give an intimation that such was his purpose. If it is his intention I have no desire to say anything but if not I would like to make a few remarks.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What would the tenor of the hon. gentleman's remarks be ?

Mr. PATERSON. My remarks would be these ; it has been explained by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that this is no measure to be taken as a vote of want of confidence in the government. There is a more serious consideration involved in this resolution, it seems to me, than that. It seems to me that this resolution implies a want of confidence in a very large portion of our western country and I think it is rather a serious matter that this House should give its endorsation to that. The very best advertisement that our western country has had has been the glowing pictures which, in a large majority of cases have been true, of teeming wheat fields, of golden wheat fields and of the large fortunes that have been made in a very short time. There is no advertisement more captivating. I would fain believe that it is to be the regular—almost, shall I say, the regular, for we have vicissitudes and fluctuations—result of the cultivation of our western lands. It is unfortunate that the exceptional circumstances last year produced the present condition of affairs. It is unfortunate because we wish to have that country settled. We are all one in that. We are all agreed upon this measure of relief, heartily agreed, I believe, under the circumstances, although we have to deplore the necessity of it. An arrangement has been made whereby a temporary difficulty, as I believe it to be, will be tided over that there may be seed grain supplied to the people who require it in our western provinces. I look upon it as a temporary relief. Nevertheless, I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that the railway companies that have lands to dispose of in the United States, that are fighting our agents who are seeking to get immigrants into the Northwest—perhaps there has been more prominence given to this than is desirable in the interest of the country and more than should have been given to it—will overlook that fact, that they will place before a man who may meditate coming to our country a gloomy picture, saying : That is a land in which special arrangements had to be made to supply the people with seed. I might answer by saying that it is a temporary state of affairs that might happen anywhere. But they may say : Ah, yes, the country will be all right. But, will it be all right ? Did not one of the members from that very part of the country, living there for years, whose interest it is to maintain the prosperity of the country, feel himself impelled in the House to move a resolution that they should not be required to pay this seed back, borrowed for a temporary purpose, out of the next year's crop, but that there would be a latitude given to them because of the necessity for it and that for three years they must toil and labour before they are able, out of their fields, to return the seeding for one harvest. That is a question that will be difficult to answer. That is a situation that I believe the people of the Northwest would not like to have presented to those who were seeking in foreign countries to hinder the development of this country. That, it seems to me is a circumstance so serious that I cannot help thinking that it would be a most unfortunate thing for the country now if such a suggestion should receive the sanction of hon. members from the Northwest and if members of the opposition should record their votes in that direction. That is what I want to say and I add no more.

Mr. LAKE. The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and the hon. Minister of Finance have asked if, under the circumstances, I would not withdraw this resolution. I can only say that as the discussion has proceeded I have felt more strongly than ever that it is most desirable that this House should place itself on record on this matter. I think it would be a very great misfortune to the country if this payment is insisted upon within one year. The more the discussion has proceeded the more convinced I am of that opinion. I therefore feel that it would be necessary in the interest of my constituents that I should press that motion to a vote.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Mr. Speaker, before the motion is voted on, I desire to emphasize what has been said so well by others before me of the necessity of not pressing the unfortunate settlers of the west who have lost their entire season's work through frost and who are to be provided with seed grain by the loan which we have agreed to make with repayment within a year. I think it would be an unfortunate thing to lay down a hard and fast rule that this money should be paid during the first year. We have not heard from the government or from the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) or the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) any other statement than that the matter is to be left in the discretion of the minister to say whether any term beyond one year should be permitted or not. I think it would be a most unfortunate thing if such a condition should be left at the discretion of the Minister of the Interior or whichever minister has charge of this matter. I think that these people should know exactly when they receive the seed grain how long they are to be allowed to pay for it. I do not think it would be well that the agents of the government should go through that country and insist on the pay-

ment of the money within the short period of one year. We know very well that there is a great deal of business done upon credit in that country, and that the tendency is for people to practically mortgage even an abundant crop before it is reaped, with the object, I fear, not so much of paying their direct obligations as to invest more money in land. However, we must understand that these people will have the obligations of this and the past year to meet, and if they are to be called upon to pay for this seed grain in addition, I fear we are asking them to do more than we reasonably can expect they are able to do. I would prefer that no money would be asked from these people before two or three years, but others think it would be well to divide it into three payments, not equal payments, but the first a small payment and the second and third larger. I feel strongly that we should not make any hard and fast rule by which the government would demand the payment of this money inside of two or three years. As to the securities, I regret very much that that country is to be blanketed with so many chattel mortgages. We know that one of the most detrimental things to a man's credit is a chattel mortgage, and I had hoped the government would have discovered some other method of security than this costly system.

Mr. McCRANEY. The hon. gentleman understands that the Dominion government takes no chattel mortgage.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand the provincial governments take the chattel mortgages, but the result of our policy is to bind the settlers to repay that money within one year, and I regret very much that some other system had not been discovered, so as to avoid blanketing Alberta and Saskatchewan with a huge chattel mortgage. There must be a very large number of farmers in these two provinces whose notes for $200 or $300 would be perfectly good without a chattel mortgage, and it is a hardship that these men should have a chattel mortgage recorded against them and their credit practically destroyed when there is no necessity for it. I think we ought to insist that the Minister of the Interior should stand up and give the House distinctly to understand that so far as the homesteaders are concerned the payment will spread over three years, and that the federal government will use its influence with the provincial governments to see that the settlers are not pressed within that time for repayment of that money. I shall have no hesitation in supporting the motion of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). It is ten weeks since the session opened and there is no information in possession of the government to-day with regard to this matter which could not have been in their possession at the opening of parliament. Hence, ten weeks of valuable time have been lost, and I have no doubt it will be two weeks more before the machinery can be put in force to give relief to the farmers of the west. The Minister of Customs said that if the period of repayment were extended to three years it would show a want of confidence in the people of the west, but to my mind the fact that we are advancing this money at all is a splendid exemplification of the confidence which the people of Canada have in the people of that western country. This advertising we have had of 'golden wheat fields' is all very true, and if the Minister of Customs had passed through the west last year he would have seen as fine wheat fields as the eye ever rested on, but examination would have shown him that the wheat was totally ruined in some places and in others partially ruined Of course, that was due to peculiar causes last year. In the first place the seed grain was not delivered in time owing to the partial breakdown of the railway systems because of the coal strike and the extremely inclement weather. The spring was very late, the seed could not be gotten into the ground in time, and as every one knows the season was the most peculiar that has been experienced in that western country for sixty years as the records show. The experience in the western states was similar, and in these states where they are accustomed to take three crops of alfalfa in a year, they could only get one. More than that, almost every state of the American union north of Mason and Dixon's line knows what it was in former days to have early frosts in the fall which retarded the maturing of the grain. Hence the conditions in our western provinces last year are thoroughly understood by them. I was glad to hear the Minister of Customs encouraging the Minister of the Interior in his efforts to obtain American settlers from the western states into our Northwest. If rumours are true, the Minister of Customs and some of his colleagues have not always lent a helping hand to the new Minister of the Interior. Of course, the old Minister of the Interior had a free hand, he was the boss and could do what he had a mind to, but when the new Minister of the Interior came in he had to lay his plans before his colleagues and not on all occasions did he meet with that hearty endorsation which he expected. However, I am glad to hear the Minister of Customs encouraging the policy of bringing in American settlers into Canada, because they are an up-to-date people and among the very finest people that can come to this country. As I have said, last year was an abnormal one in the west. It is true that not by any means even a large percentage of the people are in need of seed grain, but nevertheless there are enormous areas where there is no grain fit for seed. My hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. McCraney) has stated that his district requires no seed grain as they have grown plenty to supply themselves, but I can

assure him that there are many hundred acres in his riding which produced grain last year which is absolutely unfit for seed. There may have been a few fields that would yield seed grain, but they are very few. In the older parts of the country, where the soil had been turned up to a greater extent than in the isolated districts, the grain was not caught by the frost and as in the case of Manitoba, we find that the settlers do not require assistance.

But there are thousands of settlers in that country who do require the seed grain, and these are the people the government should look after. The price these men will pay for the grain will be at least $1.25 a bushel, and many will pay a good deal more. That is twice as much as they will get for the grain they will market next fall. In other words, for each bushel of seed they get they will have to repay two bushels of grain. Therefore, it would be only fair to allow them two years in which to repay their indebtedness to the government. It should be remembered that there has been no work during the last year at which the settlers could earn an honest dollar, and they have been practically only marking time owing to the small amount of railway work in progress. Moreover, it is too often the case that the men who do the railway work are not the settlers who are going to build up this country, but labourers imported under contract, such as Chinese and Japanese, and exported when their work is over, taking with them money that should be left in the country to benefit the settlers and their families. I maintain that all the railroads in the west should be encouraged to employ homesteaders who cannot in their first few years, as could the settlers in Ontario, find employment in winter. The North Atlantic Trading Company has brought to our Northwest thousands of settlers who when they came had practically not a dollar; and these are the people who are expected to repay the government for their seed grain at the end of a year. They will do very well if they can make both ends meet at the end of a year without paying this indebtedness. If the Minister of the Interior or the Prime Minister will undertake to have the order in council amended to extend the repayment over three years. I am sure the hon. member for Qu'Appelle will be only too glad to withdraw his amendment.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Lake.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn.
Ames.
Armstrong,
Avery,
Barker,
Barr,
Beattie,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Boyce,
Brabazon,
Bristol,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Cockshutt,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Elson,
Foster,
Fowler,
Ganong,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Kemp,
Lake,
Lancaster,
Lefurgey,
Lennox,
Leonard,
Lewis,
Macdonell,
MacLaren,
Maclean (York, S.),
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Monk,
Northrup,
Osler,
Owen,
Paquet,
Perley,
Porter,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Stansfield,
Staples,
Taylor,
Ward,
White,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington.)—58.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adamson,
Archambault,
Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Beland,
Bickerdike,
Black,
Bole,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Boyer,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Calvert,
Carney,
Caron,
Cash,
Clarke,
Copp,
Crawford,
Cyr,
Delisle,
Demers,
Desjardins,
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Emmerson,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fortier,
Gauvreau,
German,
Gervais,
Girard,
Graham,
Greenway,
Guthrie,
Harty,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne (Drummond & Arth.),
Lavergne (Montmagny),
Law,
LeBlanc,
Lemieux,
Logan,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McColl,
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McKenzie,
McLean (Huron),
McLean (York, C.),
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Pickup,
Power,
Proulx,
Ratz,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Robitaille,
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Rousseau,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Oxford),
Templeman,
Tolmie,
Turcotte,
Turriff,
Verville,
Walsh (Montreal, St. Anne),
Watson,
Zimmerman.—98.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Telford,	Tisdale,
Parmelee,	Worthington,
Tobin,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Loggie,	Lalor,.
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),	Haggart,
Grant,	Seagram,
Caldwell,	Morin,
Galliher,	Wright (Muskoka),
Fisher,	Pringle,
Sifton,	Clare,
Macpherson,	Marshall,
Talbot,	Clements,
Pugsley,	Forget,
McIntyre (Strathcona),	Martin (Queens, P.E.I.),
Hall.	Thompson.

Amendment negatived.

PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I wish to bring to the attention of the House the present state of the Order Paper. Under the new rules, public Bills and orders can only be called on Mondays and Wednesdays, and on those days only after the notices of motion are disposed of. This session, however, these notices are very numerous, and up to the present have taken up the whole time of the House on the days I have mentioned, so that there is apparently no prospect of public Bills and orders being reached this session. Under the old rule, on Wednesdays, public Bills and orders were the first thing, whereas this session, although there are now forty-one public Bills and orders on the notice paper, it is impossible to reach them. Yet many of these public Bills and orders are of more importance than the notices of motion. The Bills are supposed to be founded on resolutions which have passed the House, so that they should have precedence over the notices of motion. Again, these public Bills and orders, hitherto at least, have been the training ground for very important legislation, and many of these Bills, after they were debated in this House, were adopted subsequently as government measures. But if these Bills are to be now ignored, I do not know where the government will get their policy hereafter. I would therefore suggest that the leader of the House and the leader of the opposition should agree to some slight change in the present rule, and the one I would suggest is the following :

That rule 25 governing the business of the House from day to day be so amended that on alternate Mondays and Wednesdays after the first four weeks of the session, public Bills and orders shall have priority over notices of motion.

I am debarred from submitting this motion to the House, but I offer it as a suggestion to the right hon. gentleman. If he will only look at the Order Paper he will see how important many of these public Bills are. There are at least half a dozen of amendments of the Railway Act, there are also Bills for the amendment of the Criminal Law, the amendment of the Canada Shipping Act, the amendment of the Fisheries Act, the Immigration Acts and the House of Commons Act, and there is the Bill of the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) to amend the laws with regard to the conduct of elections. All through, these forty-one Bills and orders are the most important that have so far been brought before the House this session, and I therefore suggest that a change should be made in our rules in the way I have indicated. As far as I can gather, the situation was overlooked in this respect when the rules were changed a year or two ago. I am not able to say whether the subject was then brought up or not, but inasmuch as we have changed the rules, and that, owing to that change, this situation has been brought about, there should be some relief given, and I have much pleasure in sending over the motion I have read to the right hon. leader of the House for his consideration.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think the rules of the House require any change. If my hon. friend will look at them, he will find that the orders of the day for Thursdays is first questions and then public Bills and orders during the first four weeks of the session. Some gentlemen have taken advantage of this rule ; and if my hon. friend will look at the Order Paper he will find that the first order of the day for public Bills is the third reading of a Bill to amend the Copywright Act. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) has a Bill of his own for third reading, and the next time the House reaches the order of public Bills, this will be read the third time. One of the Bills, a Bill of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), has actually gone to the Senate, and I think there are some members whose Bills were called once if not twice, and they were not here.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, I was here.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But this year there has been an unusual number of notices of motion. In former sessions, we usually disposed of the notices of motion in one day and then came to the public Bills and orders, but this session, owing to the unusual number of notices of motion, we have not been able to do so. If I can accommodate my hon. friend, I shall be glad to arrange a special day for him, and have public Bills and orders made the first order of that day, so as to give those who have such Bills an opportunity to reach and dispose of them.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am not only speaking for myself but for other members.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will set a day apart next week for public Bills and orders.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When the question of the disposition of the Thursdays was before the committee which had under consideration the revision of our rules, it was suggested that Thursday should be made a government day altogether. Some gentlemen on the committee, however, did not see their way clear to consent to it, and as a matter of compromise it was finally agreed that, during the first four weeks of the session, public Bills and orders should precede government orders on that day. We did not quite anticipate as a result of beginning our work in the autumn that a portion of these four weeks is taken up by the Christmas vacation, so that the four weeks are not available in their entirety as intended. Perhaps some alteration might be made in that respect, so that members, who have Bills of a public character to propose, would have four clear weeks in which to bring forward their work. This session the House met on the 28th of November, and in something less than three weeks we adjourned for the Christmas holidays, so that there was a distinct loss there. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister might take into consideration the question whether that particular rule might not be amended in that regard.

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

Ocean and river service—further amount required for the construction of an ice-breaking steamer for Northumberland strait, $150,000.

Mr. E. PAQUET. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I think it my duty to make a few remarks about the steamer 'Montcalm.' I am satisfied that the services of this ice-breaker are required in the interest of the trade of the city of Quebec, as well as of the districts of Quebec and Montmagny.

The agricultural and business progress of the county of L'Islet and of the surrounding counties is intimately connected with that of the city of Quebec, which is our market.

I made inquiries from several Quebec merchants, business men, and representatives of large commercial concerns, and I was told that the formation of an ice bridge in front of Quebec, inflicts on the city and surrounding counties a loss of $500,000 to $1,000,000.

Had it not been for the work done by the 'Montcalm' last winter, there would have been an ice bridge. Nobody can deny that.

I say then, that the presence of that steamer is necessary in order to prevent the formation of the ice bridge.

Merchants, importers and exporters, and shippers generally, have been discussing for a long time the possibility of winter navigation on the St. Lawrence. Everybody desired to have such a scheme experimented, and the government has complied with the request. The experiments of the 'Montcalm' have perhaps not been very complete, but I am inclined to think that winter navigation on the St. Lawrence is an impossibility. Underwriters would charge excessive rates on boats and cargoes, on account of the great risks.

The experiments carried on by the 'Montcalm' at Cap Rouge have not been conclusive. While they obtained some measure of success the steamer at times was powerless. However, I am satisfied that the 'Montcalm' would be of service in hastening the opening of navigation.

From a business standpoint, the 'Montcalm' has proved its usefulness in the maritime provinces, in opening the way to freighters.

As you are aware, the north eastern district of Quebec is lacking in railway facilities. In winter time, the north shore is absolutely without any means of communication. The Dominion government has never granted subsidies to that part of the country.

Would it not be just and fair to put these people in closer touch with the rest of the country, with the trade centres, not only in the interest of the people themselves, but in the interest of the trade of that district and the country as a whole? We ought to do something for that outlying country.

The 'Montcalm' can carry the mails in that part of the province of Quebec. She can be of help to the people, when famine threatens. We are helping the Japanese, helping our brethren in the west; why should we not do something for our brethren in the east.

I think I have shown how useful and even how necessary the 'Montcalm' is to us. In summer, she is looking after the lighthouses. Could not that service be done by a cheaper boat?

Mr. CROCKET. There is an account in connection with the steamer 'Curlew' concerning which I would like to ask a question——

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I may explain that the 'Curlew' is engaged in the fisheries protection service while we are dealing with ocean and river service. If the hon. member (Mr. Crocket) will ask his question when the officers of the fishery service are here, I shall be more certain of being able to give him an answer.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many ice breakers are there?

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Minto,' the 'Stanley,' the 'Montcalm' and the 'Lady Grey.'

Mr. J. D. REID. I see on referring to the Auditor General's Report, that the

'Lady Grey' has been pretty well fitted up. Page P—28, under the account of Cuddy & Brodeur Company, Montreal, she has been provided with two brass cuspidors at $3.50 each and two others at $4; she has nickel bread trays at $2.50; a silver coffee pot at $9.40; 2 dozens teacups at $6; a coffee server at $8.50 and entree dishes, 2 at $10.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item now under discussion does not refer to the 'Lady Grey.'

Mr. J. D. REID. She is an ice breaker—

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Lady Grey' comes under the head of St. Lawrence ship channel, while we are at the ocean and river service.

Mr. J. D. REID. Yes, but I asked what ice breakers there were and the hon. minister gave a list including the 'Lady Grey.'

Mr. BRODEUR. But the expenditures of the 'Lady Grey' are voted under the head of the St. Lawrence ship channel.

Mr. MONK. We are discussing the item of $150,000 for the construction of a new ice breaker, and, surely, we can discuss all the ice breakers under that, no matter whether they are used in the St. Lawrence ship channel or any where else.

Mr. BRODEUR. The only icebreaker mentioned in the item under discussion is—

Mr. MONK. The one we are going to build?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. MONK. Yes, but we want to discuss those that are built.

Mr. BRODEUR. That does not come under this item.

Mr. FOSTER. There is only one resolution which has been divided up into several items for convenience.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The custom is that once the committee divides a resolution into different items, if one of these items has been passed that is the end of it.

Mr. MONK. Are we not on the item of $150,000 for the construction of a new icebreaker for the Northumberland straits?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. When did the first item pass?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The meeting before last, but I allowed discussion at the last meeting after it had passed.

Mr. J. D. REID. It was understood that the other item was to stand. Can we not discuss the other item on this?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. What progress has been made with the construction of the boat intended for this service?

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like an answer to my question before we go on.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This gentleman has the floor.

Mr. J. D. REID. I asked a question, and I think I am entitled to an answer.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule in this matter is clearly laid down. I find in Bourinot:

> Sometimes there are a number of items in vote or resolution and then these may be generally discussed as forming part of a single question. Each item may then, if the committee think proper, be taken up as a distinct question, and so discussed and amended. The debate in such a case must be confined to the item, and when it has been disposed of, no reference can again be made to it when the subsequent items are under consideration.

If you divide a resolution into items, then when you dispose of one item that is the end of it.

Mr. MONK. You must first divide it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That has been done for the convenience of the committee.

Mr. LEFURGEY. If I understand it, that means that when one item is under discussion you cannot discuss one that has already been passed; but before the item as a whole is passed you can discuss any particular sub-item in that resolution, even if it has been passed. In connection with this vote for $150,000, I would like to ask just what position the construction of the new steamer is in and some particulars as to her size power, &c.?

Mr. BRODEUR. I gave the other day the information about these two ice-breakers, but I have no objection to repeating it. The vessel proposed to be built will be 250 feet long, 46 feet breadth, 27 feet deep, 18 feet draft, 1,800 tons and 6,000 horse-power. This matter has engaged the attention of the department for some time. Two years ago an English naval architect, recommended to the department by Lord Strathcona, was sent to Prince Edward Island to study the local situation and at the same time to give advice as to the construction of an ice-breaker. There are to-day two ice-breakers in service between the island and the mainland. It is considered, however, that these two ice-breakers would sometimes not be strong enough to cope with the situation; in fact several times they were caught in the ice, but it is thought that an ice-breaker of 6,000 horse-power will be able to cope with any situation caused by the ice of the strait; in fact when I was in England I was so advised by the representatives of the principal builders, such as Armstrong & Whitworth and Vickers & Maxim. I may say to my hon. friend from Kings, P.E.I., that notices have been published calling for tenders for this ice-breaker, and that it is expected that we will have several tenders,

because several shipbuilders have expressed to me their intention of tendering, and as soon as these tenders are in we will award the contract to the one who may be entitled to it.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Are the plans complete for tendering ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What tonnage did the minister say this boat was to be?

Mr. BRODEUR. 1,800 tons.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Some time ago a question was asked in regard to that boat and the minister said that if tenders were called for by the end of last month the boat would be ready by the first of next December. Now, I understand that a month has gone by, that the plans are ready but that we have not yet got the tenders. According to that they will not be called for until after the middle of winter and before we can hope to get this boat over another year of usefulness will have gone by. There is no doubt that we need a winter boat and that we need it right away. I cannot understand the failure of the department for two years to adopt a more vigorous course so that we might be absolutely sure that we would have this boat to take up the navigation of the straits next winter. As the hon. minister has consulted with shipbuilding authorities in England and, as I understand, has taken a trip to the Baltic to look at some vessels which are doing a similar service there, I would like to know if this boat is to differ in construction from the boats we have now down there—the 'Stanley' and 'Minto.'

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, there will be a difference between this boat and the boats that we have to-day in regard to construction. In regard to the new boat we have taken the advice of builders in England and Germany. I thought there were some builders also in Russia but there are none. The only builders are in Germany and England. They made some suggestions which were submitted to the naval architect and also to the admiralty. It is only within a short time that all the papers have reached the department. As soon as they were put in form and the specifications and plans prepared and printed they were sent out and tenders were called for.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The minister stated that the builders over in England advised him that a boat of 6,000 horse-power would cope with any condition of ice that would ever be found in Northumberland strait. I would like to know how these people ever had an opportunity of knowing what the conditions in Northumberland straits from year to year are. The Department of Marine and Fisheries, which has had control of the navigation of the straits for the past thirty years, does not know very much about the conditions of the ice down there, and a great many mistakes have been made and are being made in the handling of the present service. I do not understand how these people could give the minister any assurance that any boat we could possibly put on there will at times cope with the conditions in the Northumberland straits. There are times, when the ice is rafted to the bottom of the straits, that Pictou harbour is closed up so that it is impossible for any boat, no matter of what power, to cope with the ice conditions there. Of course, I am not saying that we do not need a boat. We do need additional transportation facilities because we have not sufficient to carry away the produce of the island at the present time. The summer boats, long past the time of their usual service, were obliged to continue the service with the winter boats this fall. While we need this boat it is only postponing the day when the question will have to be dealt with because some other means of transportation will have to be provided. It is necessary that every possible despatch should be given and in letting this contract, speed should be one of the determining factors, so that we may feel assured that we will have a continuous service from the closing of summer navigation next year and so that the people of the island may be able to get their products to mainland.

Mr. BRODEUR. In regard to the information which the builders on the other side may have given on this question, I may say that I had the good fortune to discuss the matter myself with these people. Perhaps my hon. friend may say that I am not myself aware of the situation in the straits of Northumberland, but I had with me Captain Brown of the 'Stanley,' Mr. Ferguson, engineer, and Mr. Thompson Smith, who had occasion also to meet some of these builders, and it was after the interviews that these different persons had and that I had myself with these builders that they assured me that a boat of 6,000 horse-power would cope perfectly with that situation. My hon. friend says that we should proceed as quickly as possible with the building of this boat. He is perfectly right. At the same time it is the opinion of the naval architect who is here just now that we should not go too fast because we might build that boat too rapidly to obtain the best results, and that it would be better to give more time and be thoroughly satisfied that we had a first-class boat. We are not only building for a few months or years, but we are building for many years to come, it is important that this boat should be a success and we have not spared any pains to make it a success.

Mr. BENNETT. What will it cost ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know.

Mr. BENNETT. Approximately ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not like to say just now because tenders are being called. I do not think it would be advisable.

Mr. MONK. Where is it going to be built ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know ; it may be built in England, Germany or Canada.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Where are the tenders being advertised ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In Canada and Great Britain.

Mr. MONK. In what papers are the tenders being advertised ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In Great Britain, in the Glasgow 'Herald,' in 'Engineering' and in the 'Standard, and in the 'Canada Gazette' and Canada.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Does not the hon. gentleman think that in matters of this kind Canadian industries should be favoured to the extent or confining, at all events for the time being, the tenders to Canada? We have shipbuilding industries in Canada suffering for want of work and which are capable, I understand, of building ships of any kind and of the best quality. The steel shipbuilding industry of Canada is discriminated against. The Canadian ship builders have to pay duty on all material imported for the construction of ships, and they have to compete against ships built in the motherland which—including everything that goes into their construction and equipment, furnishings and all—are allowed to come into Canada free of duty. The British ship and her equipment comes in here free, but if the materials and furnishings in that ship were brought in separately they would all have to pay duty. That seems an injustice to the Canadian shipbuilding industry, and that is a matter which is being discussed very generally in Canada to-day. It is not so long ago since the shipbuilding industry of the maritime provinces was of very great importance, and when Nova Scotia ships navigated all the seas of the world. Since wooden shipbuilding has almost disappeared we have been establishing in Canada a steel shipbuilding industry which is struggling in the face of adversity by reason of the fact that the materials used in construction have to pay duty entering this country, while these same materials if put into a ship made in England are admitted free of duty. Does this not call for some remedy from the government of Canada ? Does it not seem to be fair that when the government is inviting tenders for the construction of ships the government should say to the Canadian shipbuilder : We will give you a rebate of the duty on the material which goes into the construction of the ship which you build for us. I say it is the duty of the government to consider this phase of the Canadian shipbuilding industry. Then there is another matter which equally deserves the consideration of the government, and that is in regard to the question of putting a duty on repairs made to ships in foreign countries. As the law is at present, a ship can go to a United States yard and can be repaired there and can float back to Canadian waters free of duty, but if an American ship is repaired in a Canadian yard the moment she goes back to an American port she has to pay duty on the repairs. You can buy an old hull for $40,000; you can put so-called repairs on her in an American yard, which practically means rebuilding, for the repairs may cost $100,000, and you can float the ship back into this country and all you have to pay duty on is the $40,000 original price. That is not fair to the Canadian shipbuilding industry. I say that the government has now an opportunity to do something for Canadian shipbuilding. I understand that this is not the only vessel that will be built for the different departments of the government, and it seems to me that some inducement should be offered to Canadians to undertake their construction. The growing traffic from the west should be carried through the great lakes in ships built in Canada, but unless the industry receives encouragement from the government that desirable end cannot be reached. We are told that the government is asking tenders for these vessels abroad as well as in Canada. The labour market in England is cheaper, they have free coal, they have free steel, they have no duty on anything that goes into the ship built there; that ship can be built in England and taken into Canada duty free, whereas if the material which enter into the construction and equipment were imported piecemeal a duty would be imposed upon it.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the hon. gentleman was in favour of the British preference.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. So I am, but there is a difference between the preference and the free list. There is nothing to hurt the preference in the suggestion I make.

Mr. SPROULE. But the present system is to give a preference which goes to the whole extent of removing the duty.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. You may put it that way if you like. Personally I would like to see a bar placed on seeking tenders in Great Britain with respect to all work that can be done in Canada, in order that the industry may be fostered. But if you are not prepared to go that far, I am suggesting a method by which you can aid the Canadian shipbuilding industry without affecting the preference in any way and

without discriminating against Great Britain. I want the government to say to the shipbuilders of Canada: We will rebate the duty which you have paid on everything that goes into the ship which you are building for us. I say that if that policy were adopted by the government it would be a wise, and a fair, and a judicious policy.

Mr. SPROULE. What difference would there be between doing that and putting a duty on the ships when they come in here?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. We cannot put a duty on the ships.

Mr. SPROULE. Why?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I am not familiar enough with the law to explain it just exactly to my hon. friend, but the Minister of Justice will tell him that under the British Merchant Shipping Act a duty cannot be placed on British ships. Is it not a manifest discrimination that the shipbuilding industry is the sole industry of our country which does not receive some measure of protection?

Mr. LEFURGEY. You have had petition after petition and resolution after resolution for the last ten years before this House asking the government to take some action in this matter and this is the first time we have heard the hon. gentleman (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) opening up, simply because the Collingwood ship yard is closing down.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The Collingwood Shipbuilding Company is not closing down. It is suffering under adverse conditions, but it is doing as well as it can under these conditions. Let me tell my hon. friend that I have moved in this matter year after year and time after time to the extent of making myself almost objectionable, and I think he will find that there are five or six members of this government who would rather not hear me talk about the shipbuilding business so often have they heard me speak about it to them. One does not have to go around the country with a brass band when he is moving in the direction of obtaining a reform which will benefit the industries of the country or of his constituency.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens). Between Collingwood and the St. Lawrence is there water enough in the canals to float a ship of 18 foot draught?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. No, but a ship of very large size can be brought through the canals, and in this connection let me tell the hon. gentleman what happened last year. The Canadian Pacific Railway, which probably has received as much assistance from this country as any other enterprise, wanted two ships for the lakes and they had them built in Great Britain. These ships were too large to go through the canals and when coming up the St. Lawrence one, if not both, were injured. The ships were cut in two at Quebec; they were taken through the canals to the upper lakes and when they got to the upper lakes one would imagine that a Canadian shipbuilding yard would be employed to put them together and to repair their injuries. But that was not done. These vessels were taken to an American shipbuilding yard, $50,000 or $60,000 were spent on them, and the ships were floated into Canada in the month of December absolutely free of duty.

Mr. SPROULE. Why was that done?

Mr. BENNETT. The fault of the government.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I do not know. It can be done under our law. I may say it is not fair or right, and is not encouraging to the industries of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it not because there were not large enough dry docks in Canada to put them in? Would the dry dock at Collingwood be large enough to take in one of these vessels? I understand that it is not long enough.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I am astonished that the hon. gentleman, who lives only a few miles from Collingwood, should ask that question. If he would take the trouble to drive over to Collingwood and see the dock, I would not have to answer it.

Mr. SPROULE. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I have been there. I took my information from an item which I saw in one of the papers, and which I presume was founded on fact. It is no discredit to me, because I live close to Collingwood, not to know whether the dock was long enough or not.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I am not casting any reflection on the hon. gentleman. I only say that it is astonishing that he, living so close to Collingwood, has not realized the extent of the development there during the last few years. The Canadian Pacific Railway ships should have been built there. The dock was more than long enough and the plant more than sufficient for the purpose. As a matter of fact, the plans and specifications for those ships were given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and were passed upon by the company, and then the company determined to have them built in Great Britain. I understand that the excuse that they gave was that they understood that they could not get them finished soon enough in Canada, and that they could get them cheaper in Great Britain.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why did not the hon. gentleman oppose that item in the tariff which allows ships to go to the United States to be repaired and to come back free of duty?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. There is no such item in the Canadian tariff. The law has been altered in recent years, and the duty on repairs has been taken off. There is no duty on ships coming to this country from Great Britain.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like the hon. gentleman to explain why the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers went to Buffalo to be repaired. Was it not because the tariff imposed no duty on repairs ?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to finish the sentence ? My information is that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company did not get the ships built as cheaply in Great Britain as they could have had them built in Collingwood, and did not get them delivered any sooner than they could have got them here. There is no item in the tariff that could be invoked in that regard. What the tariff has done in recent years has been to take the duty off necessary repairs, because it was supposed at that time that there was not plant enough in Canada to do the repairs.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why does not the hon. gentleman move to get that item in the tariff changed ?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I have been moving heaven and earth to get it changed, and I have been trying to get assistance.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is too subservient a follower of the government to get such a change.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman is the last who should say that I am a subservient follower of the government. I have supported the government in many things because it has been right. If you want progress and development, you must support this government. It announces a policy of progress and development that appeals to any young Canadian, and that is the reason I have supported it on many occasions.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a great evidence of independence.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman has stumped in North Simcoe, but he has not yet defeated me. I invite him to come back.

Mr. SPROULE. The last time I spoke, the hon. gentleman's majority was reduced to sixty.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.). Would the hon. gentleman support a policy to bonus shipbuilding ?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Yes, in a certain way. I am preaching that doctrine now, though not in the way of a bonus. I say that in regard to ships for the government, which could be built in Canada, the government should not charge a duty on the materials necessary to build those ships. I think you will have shipbuilding plants immediately springing up in the maritime provinces if a policy of this kind is announced. We have on the upper lakes most important shipbuilding plants, the magnitude of which hon. gentlemen cannot realize unless they see them. I say that the government should encourage the building in Canada of the ships and dredges they require for departmental service, and one way they can do it is by providing that the duty on the materials will be rebated.

Mr. BENNETT. Speaking about ice-breaking, might I ask the minister whether he has considered the question of putting on an ice-breaker at Port Arthur and Fort William?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes ; there is an item in the estimates providing for the breaking of the ice at Fort William and Port Arthur.

Mr. BENNETT. To build a vessel?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. BENNETT. It is high time that the minister looked into that matter. Will anybody believe that, although navigation was closed at Port Arthur nearly two months ago, there is some power behind the Throne which influences the Department of Marine and Fisheries? I am told by a gentleman whose reputation is undoubted that within a week, with the ice formed for eighty miles from Port Arthur, there is a firm, the main member of which is a son-in-law of the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee), keeping a tug boat there plunging up and down the river breaking ice at a cost to this country of thousands of dollars. Last year we paid over $20,000 to that concern for breaking ice there ; and to-day, will the country believe it—and I challenge the minister to deny it—although navigation closed aout December 1, there is a tug kept smashing up and down among the ice ; and the Minister of Marine and Fsheries is perpetrating this act of supreme folly at a cost of $150 or $200 a day. I ask the minister if that is not a fact ?

Mr. BRODEUR. If the hon. gentleman will wait until we reach that item, I will be glad to give him any information.

Mr. BENNETT. Surely the minister will not allow that statement to go unchallenged. Does he contradict it?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think we should carry on the discussion of these estimates in some regular way. If my hon. friend will turn to page 69 he will find an item to provide for breaking ice in Thunder bay and Lake Superior and other points. When we reach that item, we will discuss the question he has raised.

Mr. BENNETT. As a member of the House I am going to protest against one dollar being voted to this minister to con-

struct a boat at any point if he is not prepared to deny that he is perpetrating this act of supreme folly. He knows it is so. How much has been paid up to date for that tug? Is it $150 or $200 a day, and that after navigation has been closed in the river for months?

Mr. BRODEUR. At the present moment that boat is not employed by the government.

Mr. BENNETT. Has she been within the last week ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. BENNETT. What time did she cease to work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. About the 17th of December. If she has been doing any work there since she has not been paid by us.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. We would make better progress if the discussion would proceed along some regular lines. I do not think the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) should bring up a discussion on the subject he has referred to at this point. What we are considering now is the construction of an ice-breaking steamer. It has to be a special steamer for a special work, and there is not a ship building establishment in this country that could construct a boat of that description.

Mr. SPROULE. Why ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Because they have neither the machinery nor the facilities nor the experience. I question if there are many firms in the old country which can construct a boat of that description. The minister is to be much commended for the course he has taken in order to get the best steamer obtainable. We are building this boat, not for a few years, but for many years, to perform a very difficult service, and we want the very best we can get. While the calling for tenders may be all right as a general rule, especially in view of the fact that our opposition friends are very censorious and liable to see wrong doing where none exists, I believe it would be false economy in this instance to accept the lowest tender or to accept a tender from any except the best known and most reputable firms in the old country. It would be false economy to try and save a few dollars or a thousand dollars or even fifty thousand dollars in the construction of a boat for this work. The best that can be obtained will be the cheapest in the long run, and I believe that the country will sustain the minister in following that course. I would ask him now if he can tell us when the tenders are to be opened, and when the contract is likely to be made, because, if at all possible this boat should be ready for next winter's service. But I would avoid anything that would give us an inferior vessel. We have been waiting some time but no loss has been suffered, because I think the information obtained by the minister, while in the old country last year, when he had these experienced men with him, will enable the department to get the best boat that can be constructed for that service.

Mr. SPROULE. Had not the hon. minister better tell us first whether we have the facilities for building such a boat in Canada. It is claimed by many that we have,

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Most of us have a reasonable amount of common sense and I have a fair knowledge of questions of this kind. This is not a matter for experiment, and if my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) will listen to me perhaps I can give him some information. I am making a statement which, I think, is fairly reasonable.

Mr. SPROULE. No doubt.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. And I repeat that economy in this instance might be false economy. This is a service which must be kept up and which we are bound by solemn contract to keep up.

Mr. J. D. REID. Could not the Arctic' do that work ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. My hon. friend is somewhat facetious. This may be a trifling and a laughable matter to the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid), but it is not so to myself and a few other people in this country. I would ask the hon. minister again when the tenders will be opened.

Mr. BRODEUR. My impression is that they will have to be in by the 15th of March.

Mr. FOWLER. I understood the minister to say that no vessel has been breaking ice at Fort William since the 17th of December. Is that correct ?

Mr. BRODEUR. What I have said is that the government has not paid anything for breaking the ice since the 17th of December. It may be possible that some vessels are breaking the ice there.

Mr. BENNETT. In the employ of the government ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. FOWLER. I happened to be in Fort William yesterday, and a vessel was breaking the ice there and has been since the 17th of December. And my information from residents of Fort William is that every day she steams out about fifteen miles—although between the point to which she steams and open water there is at least fifty to seventy miles of solid ice. It may be that she is doing this for the fun of the thing, but she happens to be the same vessel that was breaking the ice in the fall. If she has got into the habit of ice breaking

and cannot stop, that is a very remarkable circumstance. Of course we must accept the minister's statement and conclude that these people are doing this for the fun of the thing.

Mr. PARDEE. I have been listening to the remarks of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) regarding the tug breaking ice in Fort William harbour. I went to a gentleman who is interested in the matter, and made inquiry concerning it. I asked if it were the fact that the tug 'James Whalen' had been since December 17th breaking ice in Fort William, and he said it was a fact. He said also that it is not being done at the expense of the government, but at the expense of their own company, to try whether or not, by keeping the ice open as much as possible, they may not be able to get in earlier in the spring and go on with their dredging. So the government is not responsible for this work since December 17th.

Mr. BENNETT. I am charmed to know that Mr. James Whalen, the son-in-law of the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) is doing something of benefit to the country for which he is not paid by this government. Surely, something will happen to-morrow for that spontaneous act of patriotism on the part of Messrs. Bowman, Whalen & Co. Did the minister say that there was a contract for this work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We had a contract, which was awarded after tenders had been called for.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the amount of the contract ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Thirty thousand dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. What is she going to do for this $30,000 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Break the ice in the early part of the season. This year it was December 17 when we found there were no more boats ready to leave the harbour, and so we decided to discharge her from working for the government. I suppose hon. members know the reason why we started this work. We were requested by the shippers, especially by those of Winnipeg, Port Arthur and Fort William, to keep the channel open as long as possible so that the grain of the west might be carried as late as possible by Georgian bay, Buffalo or Port Colborne. Some years ago, the work was undertaken by the government. At first, we used to pay a certain amount of money for each day of work done. We decided last year that it would be better to call for tenders and make a formal contract, by which they would keep the channel open during the fall as long as the Sault Ste. Marie canals were kept open. In the spring, they will have to do the same class of work.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask who is the member of the House interested in this company referred to by my hon. friend from West Lambton ?

Mr. PARDEE. Not a member of the House. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) wants to know, it was Mr. Charles Bowman.

Mr. BENNETT. We have heard of him.

Mr. PARDEE. You ought to hear more of him ; he is a good man.

Mr. BENNETT. We understood the hon. gentleman to refer to a member of the House.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I was glad to hear the hon. member for North Simcoe speak as he did of encouraging shipbuilding in Canada, though I am not able to think he was sincere when he spoke of the building of ice breakers.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. This was only an 1800 ton vessel, and they build them four or five times as large as that.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I wonder the hon. gentleman (Mr. Leighton McCarthy) has remained so quiet in this House during the years of decline in the shipbuilding industry. This decline went on right under the government's eyes, and petition after petition, and resolution after resolution came in from boards of trade and other organizations, and this is the first occasion when the hon. gentleman has raised his voice on the subject. I am thoroughly imbued with the idea that some support should be given to the shipbuilding industry of this country. As the hon. gentleman said, we have seen the shipbuilding of Canada go down until from holding a place among the leading shipbuilding nations of the world, we have almost wholly lost that industry. I would almost go so far as to say that the government should have a bonus system for the promotion of shipbuilding. They bonus almost every thing else. Steps should be taken along the lines suggested by the hon. member, but we should give a bonus to shipbuilding as well. With regard to the vessel under discussion, I do not suppose that any member of the government would say that any of our ship yards are sufficiently up-to-date to build such a vessel in this country. I agree with the hon. member for Kings (Mr. J. J. Hughes) that the best builders should be given the contract for this vessel. The 'Stanley', which was built under the Conservative government was built in a good yard. This government gave us the 'Minto' which was built in an inferior yard with the result that, every year, she has made more or less extensive repairs. I believe $30,000 or $40,000 was spent on her

after she came over to this side. I hope that the minister's confidence in his experts may be justified, but some of the experts he had on the other side are not such as to cause the people to become enthusiastic over their capabilities. I hope the minister has taken the best means in his power to make sure that when the boat is built she will be able to give the service she is supposed to give.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I have listened with great interest to this discussion, and wish to say a word in support of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Leighton McCarthy). I think some hon. members do not realize the progress we have made in shipbuilding in Canada. I was somewhat surprised, myself, on visiting Collingwood some weeks ago to find the splendid equipment they have—not only their dry dock, but machinery for turning out large ships. In proof of it all, there was a ship of over 3,000 tons, built last season, a splendid specimen of the ship builder's art. There is also a ship yard in Toronto where they have good appliances. My opinion is, and I submit it with all earnestness to the minister, that the government should give the preference to Canadian ship builders. It is unfortunate that our shipbuilding is disappearing year by year. If you look over the returns, you will find that we have this year fewer ships than last year; and if you go back fifteen years you will find that this is the story all through. There are many reasons for this state of affairs. I quite believe we shall not be able to start this business successfuly until something is done to rectify the present state of affairs. There are some articles that enter into the construction of a ship that are admitted free but very few. The large number of articles are not admitted free, but are heavily taxed, making it impossible for the Canadian shipbuilder to compete on equal terms with the shipbuilder in Britain.

When the vessel is launched on the ocean, she has to compete with all the world for business, and a handicap of so many dollars a ton means that she cannot earn dividends for her shareholders. Something ought to be done by the government, either in the form of a drawback, or in some other way, to give the Canadian ship builder a fair chance to compete.

I made inquiries of some builders as to the articles on which they are compelled to pay duty and I have a list here. Among the articles are iron castings, brass castings, common iron, bar iron, rivets, paint, pipe fittings, galvanized fittings, locks, screws, bolts and nuts, packing, babbit, electric wire, belting, leather, shafting, force pumps, ship supplies, side lights, life boats, and a large number of other articles that are heavily taxed. The result of this is that a Canadian shipbuilder is unable to compete for the building of ship for the Canadian owner or the Canadian government with British shipbuilders, and unless you put him on the same basis as other manufacturers and give a drawback equivalent to the duty he pays on his raw material, it is practically impossible for him to carry on his business to-day. If a boilermaker, for instance, is making a boiler for export he pays duty on the material he uses in its construction; but when he exports the boiler he receives a drawback of practically every dollar he has paid to the government in duties. Put the Canadian shipbuilder on the same basis and he will have a chance to live, because when his ship is on the ocean it is an export, it has to compete for trade with the whole world, and he should receive the same drawback as other manufacturers on their exported products. If we are ever to start shipbuilding in Canada we should give a preference in the case of ships built by the government to the Canadian builder. It may be that no Canadian builder is now ready to undertake the building of this ice-breaker, but this is a policy that the government ought to adopt in future cases. Permit me also to suggest that they should have a marine architect to draw the plans of the ships so that you could put an exact plan before the Collingwood, Halifax or St. John or New Glasgow builder, showing him what is wanted. Under the present system the contractor is asked to submit a plan but our people are not expert in that, it is difficult to get naval architects here.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have to prepare our own plans in this case.

Mr. SINCLAIR. We should have an architect in the employ of the department able to prepare all the plans, giving all details so that we could place before the Canadian builder exactly what is wanted by the government. This would give the Canadian a far better opportunity to compete for the business. I wish to support as strongly as I can the idea of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) that the Canadian builder should have the preference, even if the ship should cost 25 per cent more we should build it at home.

Mr. J. D. REID. Personally I am anxious to support any vote necessary to build the very best steamer that is required for the service between Prince Edward Island and the main shore; anything that can be done to improve that service should be done by the government and I believe every member in the House will support that. I believe that there are in Canada shipbuilding concerns that could build this boat; but as to building it on the upper lakes there is the serious handicap that after building her they would have to cut her in two and take her in sections down the lakes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. What sized ship can pass through the locks?

Mr. J. D. REID. I understand she draws 18 feet and there is only 14 feet of water in the canals.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Does my hon. friend say 18 feet when empty ?

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister said 18 feet.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. That is in ice-breaking trim.

Mr. J. D. REID. I was assuming that she is longer than 250 feet.

Mr. BRODEUR. The draft is 18 feet loaded.

Mr. J. D. REID. What beam is she ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Forty-six feet.

Mr. J. D. REID. The width of the locks is only 45 feet.

Mr. BRODEUR. I was told by a Canadian builder that she could be built on the lakes and could pass through the canal if they could remove something from the sides of the ship to enable her to pass through.

Mr. J. D. REID. If she is not longer or wider than the locks I am satisfied she could be built in this country ; and so long as the price was not unreasonable I think we should build her. We have as good men in this country as on the other side. The difficulty in competing is owing to their cheaper labour, the freight on the material, &c. I do not believe our builders can compete in price but if possible we should give them a preference.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. J. J. Hughes) contended she could not be built here.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Did we ever build an ice-breaking vessel here ?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. That is no argument.

Mr. SPROULE. If we never start we will never succeed. I have at various times advocated the principle advocated by Mr. L. G. McCarthy to-night, and I have been surprised that he has so long hidden his light under a bushel and not let the people know where he stands. That principle has been advocated by gentlemen on this side for many years and one of the places we had in view was the shipbuilding yard in Collingwood, in the hon. gentleman's riding. We regard it as very important to establish the shipbuilding industry here and if we can build these ships in Canada it is our duty to give any reasonable aid we can for that purpose.

Mr. BENNETT. How many tenders were received for that $30,000 ice-breaking contract at Port Arthur ?

Mr. JOHNSTON.

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall obtain the answer but it would be better to leave that until that item comes up for discussion.

Mr. BENNETT. The officers are all here.

Mr. BRODEUR. They are outside, but I do not think it is fair to ask me to discuss this question at the present time.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I think we are all glad that this item has been placed in the estimates. I agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that some encouragement should be given to shipbuilding in Canada. I know that an effort is being made in the maritime provinces to establish iron and shipbuilding industries. But I think that the conditions will not permit, in so far as I am informed, of the building of this ship to-day in Canada, although I believe that in future we should have our ships built in this country. We should have the best ship that can be procured no matter whether it is procured in England or Germany. I do not think we have in Canada a yard where a ship suitable for this purpose could be built. I know that the St. Lawrence canals will only admit of a ship passing down 45 feet wide. It is necessary that we should go to England where the builders are conversant with the conditions which have to be met. We should go to the best ship yard in the world, no matter which shipyard it is. I agree with the remarks which have been made in reference to encouraging the shipbuilding industry in Canada, and I think that a bonus should be given to our own shipbuilders to encourage them, because shipbuilding is an industry we desire to establish here. Too much money is sent away to the old country for ships, and I think that if some encouragement were given towards the establishment of shipbuilding yards it would be a great benefit to the country.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the minister positively assure the committee that there is no bargain or contract, implied or otherwise, with Whelan & Co. for the service of this company's tug since the 17th December?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have already stated and I will repeat that there is no contract covering that period. We are not bound to pay anything either directly or indirectly in connection with the work which may have been performed since the 17th December.

Mr. BENNETT. The question has not been discussed between the minister or any one on behalf of his department with the people who own this tug?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, it has never been discussed.

Mr. BENNETT. The statement made by Bowman & Whelan through the hon. mem-

ber for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) will go before the country, and it is to me a matter of the most supreme wonderment that these firms, Conmee & Whelan and Bowman & Whelan, should to-day, in the interest of the country and in the interest of themselves, be plowing up and down the waters of this harbour for a distance of 15 miles for the purpose of seeing whether or not dredging operations can be carried on during the winter months. We will have to wait until next session to see whether there is a bill in the meantime for this service. It will be very strange if there is not. If you refer to the Auditor General's Report of a year ago there will be found bills from these people for a similar service performed or alleged to have been performed years before, and when the Auditor General sat tight on them and would not allow them to be paid did these gentlemen prosecute their claims? Not at all; they simply dropped them. It will be a matter of wonderment if these gentlemen who are engaged in doing this work do not claim some compensation for their services. I will accept the statement of the minister that there is no bargain in connection with it that they are to be paid for any service performed by them subsequent to the 17th December and the minister says that there is not.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will assure my hon. friend once more that there will be no money paid for work performed since the 17th December.

Mr. DANIEL. The matter of shipbuilding and the want of encouragement on the part of the government in regard to the tariff are very important. It is a subject which has been brought before this House for the last year or two. I remember referring to it myself, instancing the case of a large vessel which had then only recently been launched at Collingwood or somewhere on the great lakes. At that time I had in my mind what the builders of the vessels had to pay in duties. I think the vessel was one of 10,000 tons and the amount that the builders had to pay in duties on the materials that were used in the construction of that vessel was enough to build a good sized vessel. There were some drawbacks, but the drawbacks were small in amount. That is a matter that the government should take into consideration. The shipbuilding industry has gone down in the last twenty years from over a million tons of registered shipping until last year when it was little more than about 600,000 tons. The industry is rapidly disappearing with the exception that the tonnage in the province of Ontario is holding its own and perhaps within the last year or two has slightly increased, but take it all over the Dominion, the tonnage has been gradually lessening from year to year. It certainly is time that the government made some arrangement whereby the duties on articles used in shipbuilding should be reduced or removed so that vessels constructed in this country could compete on a more even footing than they are able to do to-day with the shipping of the world. In regard to the ability of any shipbuilding yards in Canada to construct an ice-breaker I am not in a position to express much of an opinion, but from the fact that any vessel of that kind built in the great lakes will have to be taken apart or the canals through which it goes will have to be partially dismantled in order to allow a vessel of that size to get through it would appear to me, more especially taking into consideration the further fact that none of our people have so far attempted to build a vessel of this class, to make it advisable that we should go to the best shipyards available, even though we had to go outside of Canada to find them. As far as the matter of shipbuilding is concerned I agree with the remarks of the two or three gentlemen who have spoken, and I hope the government will take the matter into such favourable consideration that they will be able to arrange the tariff in such a way that articles necessarily entering into shipbuiding that are not produced in this country may be admitted free for that purpose. That will be at least one help towards stopping the great deterioration which is going on so rapidly with regard to our Canadian tonnage.

Mr. KEMP. There is no doubt that the Canadian shipbuilding industry has a very precarious existence at present. We can build vessels in Canadian shipyards with a capacity of 200,000 or 250,000 bushels of grain, and I have no doubt whatever that we could build this little ice-breaker here.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. 300,000 or 400,000 bushels capacity. The 'Midland Prince' was built in Canada, and I think she carries over 300,000 bushels.

Mr. KEMP. We can very well build this ice-breaker in Canada and give employment to Canadian labour. I notice that the Minister of Customs has been having quite a discussion with the member for North Simcoe, presumably about the shipbuilding industry, and he might give us the benefit of his views on the subject. Has the Minister of Customs any views on the subject?

Mr. PATERSON. I have spoken once to-night already.

Mr. KEMP. On this subject?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kemp) will understand my difficulty now.

Mr. KEMP. I sympathize with my hon. friend (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) if he cannot get a more satisfactory answer from the Minister of Customs than I can. Let me

point out the development of Canadian shipping on the great lakes ; up to the year 1897 the capacity of grain-carrying vessels on the great lakes was 616,000 bushels in one trip, while now it is 6,250,000 bushels in one trip. This leaves out of consideration passenger and other vessels, and it shows what tremendous development is going on in the grain-carrying trade of the lakes. And while the shipbuilding industry is prospering on the United States side of the lakes, and while other industries than the shipbuilding industry are prospering in Canada, why is it that the policy of this government should single out that one industry and say that it shall not exist? There is a shipbuilding industry at Collingwood, there are shipbuilding industries in Toronto, there is one on Lake Erie, and they are quite capable of building fine vessels. Why does not the government patronize them? Something should be done by the government, and done at once, to help this industry in Canada. I cannot draw the Minister of Customs to give his views to-night, but I trust that on another occasion not far distant he will stand up in this House to advocate protection for Canadian shipbuilding, as he has for other industries. Now, the members from Prince Edward Island have demanded an up-to-date and efficient vessel for the service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and the contention is raised that the vessel which the government is about to have constructed will not at all answer the purpose. Is the government going to leave the people of Prince Edward Island to the resort of dog-trains to carry the mails in winter ? Is the government going to send down there a little bit of a vessel of 1,800 tons which, for the greater part of the winter, may be stuck in the ice of the Straits of Northumberland? Did I understand the Minister of Marine to say that he had visited the Baltic and had seen some of the Russian ice-breakers?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. KEMP. The minister must know that the steamer which he purposes building is not to be compared with the ice-breakers on the Baltic.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no ice-breaker in Russia or on the Baltic which will be as strong as this vessel.

Mr. J. D. REID. And as large?

Mr. BRODEUR. The size has nothing to do with it ; it depends on the power of the engine.

Mr. KEMP. I find that the ice-breaker 'Yermak' is 305 feet long, 71 feet beam, 8,000 tons capacity, 25 feet draught, 10,000 horse-power, and that she will break through floating ice 14 feet thick without any difficulty. In view of this, would it not seem that we are spending money uselessly in supplying such a steamer as is proposed for the winter service in Prince Edward Island? If you are going to have continuous traffic between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, why not spend more money and do it properly at once, and not have the members from that province constantly rising to complain in this House of the ineffective service which you give them down there?

Mr. PATERSON. In order that I may not seem discourteous to my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp), I wish to say a word. He will understand that I cannot say what should be done or what may be done by the government, but I can say that this is a very important industry. However, there is in this, as in other things, a conflict of interests. The increased tonnage on the great lakes, to which he has referred, is no doubt accounted for in some degree by British vessels coming in here ; and under the Merchant Shipping Act, as I understand it, we have no power to tax a British ship. The hon. gentleman will remember that in 1902 an Act was passed by this parliament, on the invitation of the government, by which we made foreign built ships pay what is equivalent to 25 per cent duty on their value before they could take out a license and engage in our coasting trade. What I mean by foreign built ships is this : Formerly a ship would be built in the United States, would go to Newfoundland and take out a British register, then come to our waters and do our coasting trade without paying duty. The Act of 1902 put a stop to that practice. British registry is easy to get, but no foreign built ship can now come in under British register without paying 25 per cent. Then there were a number of orders in council passed under a supposed reciprocity arrangement, by which ships from Sweden and Denmark and other countries were granted the right to do coasting trade in Canada. For a long time it was thought that these orders in council had been passed under treaties made by Great Britain which we were not at liberty to disregard. After a long interchange of correspondence, we came to the conclusion that there were no treaties which prevented the cancellation of these orders in council, and a short time ago we decided that these orders in council should be rescinded from the 1st of January next. But conflicting interests again arise, and there are those who say that this is going to inflict great hardship on other lines of industries. I mention this only to show that questions of this kind require a great deal of consideration. Further than that, of course, I cannot be supposed to express even an opinion as to what ought to be done.

Mr. KEMP. Is not the situation in regard to the Merchants' Shipping Act a little different in respect to the great lakes to what it is in respect to the Atlantic sea-

board and the Gulf of the St. Lawrence? We have built artificial waterways and paid for them out of the revenues of this country, to provide a means of getting into those great lakes. I would like the minister to give us his view on that matter.

Mr. PATERSON. The view of my officers who know more than I do on these matters, is that the Act does apply to the lakes. Whether the British government might not be willing for us to pass an enactment with respect to the great lakes, I could not of course say.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The argument of the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) with regard to British ships is a good deal stronger with regard to American ships, which come over and engage in our coasting trade.

Mr. KEMP. I may mention that a fine ship, the 'Midland Prince,' which carries 300,000 bushels of grain, was built on the lakes for the purpose of business on the lakes. She cannot go to the Atlantic, and if she could, she could not do business there, because she is not suited for that trade. I do not see that we are under any obligation to protect British shipping on the great lakes.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have long been in favour of a policy of shipbuilding in this country. I have advocated it from time to time, and I am glad to hear so many members express themselves in favour of that policy to-night. But if you want to establish a great shipbuilding industry in this country, you must do more than talk about it; you must be willing to pay for it, and make the necessary sacrifices to obtain it. I am in favour of encouraging the building of steel vessels not only on our inland waters, but on the Atlantic coast; and probably the best way to secure that is to go at it, not in any small way, but boldly; and as a first step to make an arrangement for the transfer from Great Britain to Canada of one of the great ship building concerns which has its headquarters at Belfast or on the Clyde or at Newcastle. It would cost some money, but it would pay this country well. If one of these great up-to-date shipbuilding concerns which has its architects and its skilled mechanics, would duplicate its yard at one of the ports of our maritime provinces, we could then make provision for the building of our own ocean liners in our own country. If there is one thing that is growing rapidly in this country, it is the ocean steamship business. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has embarked largely in that business, possessing one of the finest fleets on the Atlantic, and there are two or three other Canadian steamship lines, and I understand that it is the intention of the Grand Trunk Pacific to go into the same business. If we go into that business let us go into it wholly; let us not only have the steamships, but build them in our own country, with our own mechanics, our own steel, and all the materials made in this country. Canada is growing at so rapid a pace that she can well afford to bear the cost of establishing such an industry, and once it is established it will soon become one of the most profitable industries we have. If this country is to be an exporting country, sending its products to Europe, its future is largely dependent upon our being able to control not only our inland transportation, whether by rail or water, but our ocean transportation as well. There is only one way to do this, that is by a vigorous national policy, and the readiness to pay the cost, whatever it may be. Again, there is a great ocean trade in prospect on the Pacific coast, and there is no reason why we should not have a great ship building industry on the Pacific coast as well as on the Atlantic.

Mr. PATERSON. There is a yard there now.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is there a policy to encourage it? It is absolutely useless to talk about it unless we are prepared to accomplish it. I am glad to see the Minister of Finance here to-night listening to this. I was surprised one night when I broached this question, to see that in ten minutes I had three ministers of the Crown approving of it—not directly, but by nibbling at it, and among them was the present Minister of Trade and Commerce. These gentlemen have been considering the question for years. I hope they will have the courage to tackle it. If they do, I believe the people of this country will be prepared to vote the necessary money to bring it about. We have found that we can manufacture in this country almost everything we require. A national policy can take twenty forms; but there is a way of finding the national policy for encouraging any kind of industry.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. What would you suggest?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am not prepared to give the details now. For one thing I would give a bounty on the ships as built.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. How much a ton?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Whatever is necessary. This is my idea—to have a policy that will do the trick. That is what our national policy was. Put the responsibility on me, and I will find the policy in a very short time.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will it be on the gross ton or the net ton?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. You can have it any way you like. Will the Minister of Marine and Fisheries say that he is a good

enough national policy man to encourage a policy of that kind in this country? We could not only build our own ships, but we have the men in the maritime provinces who could man them. What better adjunct to the empire could Canada provide than not only transcontinental lines of communication by means of our railroads, but a ship building industry which would be available for the needs of the empire at all times.

Mr. PATERSON. In what way did the Finance Minister nibble at it?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. He came in and went away again, but I am in hopes that he will give us some idea of his position to-night. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) had the same effect on the Minister of Customs and we have had to-night quite an unveiling of the government's policy. Perhaps the Minister of Finance will tell us to-night that he is thinking somewhat along the same lines.

Mr. FIELDING. No doubt the Minister of Customs spoke wisely.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But not too well.

Mr. FIELDING. He always speaks well.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I hope the Minister of Finance will tell us to-night that the capacity of this country is equal to the occasion and that in a very short time we shall have a national policy which will have for its object the creation and development of a great shipbuilding industry in Canada.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. In the year 1907, just closed, orders were placed in Great Britain for 19 ships at a cost of $3,000,000; of which about $2,000,000 would go in paying for labour, and practically all of these vessels were for the upper lakes. Have we no establishments in this country from which our shipping companies can purchase their ships? The government of Canada has built at least three, perhaps four dry docks, at a very large expense—at Kingston, at Lévis and on the Pacific coast—all of which ought to be used for shipbuilding and repairing. Unless the encouragement suggested is given, these docks will not give the value to the country they should give. If you give encouragement in the way of a duty on repairs, we shall soon have a plant capable of repairing the ships that come to these dry docks. What we want are establishments capable of doing this repair work. It seems to be the general opinion of members on both sides that the government should take immediate action.

Mr. J. D. REID. I agree with the hon. gentleman. The shipbuilding industry at Ogdensburg is very prosperous because Canadian vessels go there to be repaired and are not charged any duty on the repairs when they return to Canada.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. When was the change made?

Mr. J. D. REID. It was made by this government and the hon. gentleman supported them.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I am right now.

Mr. J D. REID. But that was the time when the hon. gentleman could have expressed himself to some effect.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. There may have been reasons then which do not exist now.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Minister of Customs was here when that was done. It was about two years ago.

Mr. PATERSON. I really do not remember the change in that matter, but I do not say that there has not been any.

Mr. BENNETT. There was formerly a duty on repairs.

Mr. PATERSON. How far back?

Mr. BENNETT. I can tell of one case, in 1893, because a vessel went over there for repairs and was smuggled back after the repairs were made, but the Controller of Customs of that day, Mr. Clarke Wallace, seized the vessel and made her pay $2,000 or $3,000 duty on repairs.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is not many years since the change was made which enabled Canadian vessels to get their repairs done in the United States free of duty. I would like to ask the minister how long the 'Minto' was on her trip with the Governor General.

Mr. BRODEUR. About six weeks.

Mr. J D. REID. How many were on the cruise?

Mr. BRODEUR. I could not say, it was the Governor General and his party.

Mr. J. D. REID. How long did she run during the year ending 30th March?

Mr. BRODEUR. I gave that information at the last sitting, and the hon. gentleman will find details on page 14 of the report.

Mr. J. D. REID. I see $32 charged against the 'Montcalm' for a marble slab for a sideboard. Is there a sideboard on that boat?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is on all the boats.

Mr. BENNETT. Does she carry passengers?

Mr. BRODEUR. Occasionally. When engaged in carrying lighthouse supplies she has to carry the workmen and officers and the Marconi people.

Mr. TAYLOR. Last year we voted $150,000 for the construction of an ice boat. Was any of that money spent?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, this is a revote, and the tenders have only just been called for.

Mr. FOSTER. If the discussion is over with regard to that item, I have no objection passing it. But the first item was not passed, as the minister will see by reference to 'Hansard' giving the discussion when the matter was debated.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was the night before.

Mr. FOSTER. No. An item is not carried by the minister crying 'carried'. The minister said it was carried and I said it was not; the minister said again it was carried and I said again it was not. And Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) said whether it was passed or not we had better pass; and we did pass out.

Mr. BRODEUR. We spent two days on that. I understand that on the first occasion the item was passed.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, it stood.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister did not get any estimates the first day—that is sure. There is a great deal to be discussed on this item. For instance, there is the whole policy and expenditure of the 'Arctic'. Of course, if the House wants to sit we shall have to sit, but it seems to me we shall make as much progress by adjourning now. It is pretty near midnight.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not understand exactly the proposition made.

Mr. FOSTER. I am agreeable that the item we have been discussing should pass, but the item before that is not passed, and we want it to stand because there is a good deal to be said on it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Could we not take the item 'Examination of Masters and Mates'?

Mr. FIELDING. There are several items there that are not controversial.

Examination of masters and mates, $12,600.

Mr. WHITE. Before that item is passed, I would like to ask, with reference to an item at page P—29 of the Auditor General's Report—Thomas Donnelly, Kingston, $183.-26. Is Captain Donnelly still in the employ of the department?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. He is, of course, when there are examinations.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, he is no longer in the employ of the department.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is there not a school in which lectures are given——

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, but Captain Donnelly is no longer in charge.

Mr. DANIEL. Two years ago, there was always an examination held in the port of St. John, but, I believe, not lately. Why are not the examinations still held in St. John?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am surprised to hear that they are not.

Mr. DANIEL. Captain Douglas used to be here.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, I see by my notes that the position is now vacant.

Mr. DANIEL. And has been for some time.

Mr. BRODEUR. It may be so. The officer who takes this position must pass a very severe examination, and it is not always easy to find the man. I do not know that there is any reason for the vacancy.

Mr. DANIEL. I should think the minister would have no difficulty in making a suitable appointment. I have received complaints that persons to be examined had to go to Halifax or somewhere else for the examination, when, if there were no examiner at St. John, the examiners should have been brought to St. John, instead of compelling those who are to be examined to go to a distant part of the country. I believe that, according to the report of the Marine and Fisheries Department, examinations will be held there for certificates to qualify men for foreign sea voyages. But, as I understand it, every year or two examinations have been held in the port of St. John, and, as it is the great port of the maritime provinces, I do not see why it is omitted.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know the reason this vacancy has not been filled. My impression is that it is the difficulty of finding a person who can pass the examination. But I will inquire and will get the true reason.

Mr. DANIEL. If there is no one there fit to take such a position, why not bring some appointee from another part of the country so that the men could pass their examinations there?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is what we will do.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are masters' certificates granted to American citizens?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not unless they have been three years domiciled in Canada.

Mr. J. D. REID. I know that some American citizens have both Canadian and American certificates. If they can get a position on a Canadian steamer they are able to take it. Of course, the law is that no Canadian can hold the two certificates. It seems to me that it is unfair to our Canadian masters and mates that American citizens should hold these certificates. There are American captains on the St. Lawrence running Canadian steamers, though there

are a good many Canadian masters and mates that would like to get these positions. It is unfair that the law should allow these men to keep these double certificates.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. That will work both ways as there are many Canadians holding American certificates on the great lakes. The question came up two years ago and it was thought better to leave it alone.

Mr. J. D. REID. On the St. Lawrence they compel the Canadians to become naturalized and live on the American side.

Mr. PARDEE. The owners of the vessels compel them to live there, not the law.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would suggest to the minister that some means should be provided to afford instruction for seamen along the coast who are anxious to become masters and mates. In the town of Canso, in my own constituency, I am informed there are 30 to 40 young men who would be glad to take instruction in the evening and qualify themselves to pass the examination if they had an opportunity to do so at home. If the minister could arrange for the captains of the cruisers or other competent persons who are not very busy in the winter to lecture in certain places on the coast where a large number of young men could be got together, they could get the practical part of the instruction without going to the large seaport towns. They can get the theoretical training in the high schools, but they must in addition to the required years of service, have some instruction from competent men in the practical part of it in order to pass their examination.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of this was expended last year?

Mr. BRODEUR. In the nine months, $5,974.16.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the minister explain the increase?

Mr. BRODEUR. The increase was due to the printing of the certificates and a charge for lithographing. This was made necessary by a change in the law by the revised statutes.

Mr. FOSTER. But this is for 1908-9 this $12,600.

Mr. BRODEUR. The expenditure for the six months of this year to 30th September, 1907, was $5,381.22. I suppose the reason for the small expenditure in the year before was that the spring, when most of the expenditure is made, was not included in the last fiscal year.

Mr. FOSTER. How much do you expect to expend in the other six months?

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose all of the vote except perhaps a couple of thousand dollars.

Rewards for saving life, including life-saving stations, $31,600.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of that was expended? I see by the Auditor General's Report you spent $9,000, and how is it you take $31,600 when only $9,000 was expended in six months.

Mr. BRODEUR. For the six months ending 30th September we have spent $8,-759.40. You have here the same factor that a period of the year when large expenditure was made was not included in the last fiscal year.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no possibility of requiring a vote of $31,600.

Mr. BRODEUR. We want to establish more life-saving stations. We will establish new stations and equipment on the coast of Vancouver island to cost $7,500; a new station and equipment at Southampton; a new boat house at St. Paul's island, and some other stations on Prince Edward Island and the north coast of New Brunswick.

Mr. J. D. REID. If we are going to do that, I think we had better go ahead and discuss the whole matter. I think it is most unfair for the minister to press this thing the way he is doing.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not pressing anything. We have been discussing these estimates for three nights now.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) took up three hours discussing that shipbuilding business, and we could not get a chance to discuss the item.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let us rise; it is twelve o'clock.

Mr. FIELDING. Patience; we will adjourn shortly.

Mr. BOYCE. I would like to ask if the minister proposes establishing any life-saving stations on the north shore of Lake Superior, where there have been so many wrecks, and where life-saving stations are so urgently needed?

Mr. BRODEUR. The matter is under consideration. Perhaps with the amount which will be at the disposal of the department we will be able to establish one, but it is not formally contemplated by the estimate.

Mr. KEMP. Does the minister intend to improve the life-saving station at Toronto island?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. KEMP. Does he intend to spend more money on it and make it more efficient? We have had some pretty bad accidents there.

Mr. BRODEUR. I know there was an accident that happened a year or two ago,

but it was not due to the fact that the station was not properly equipped. If I remember well the circumstances of the accident which the hon. gentleman is referring to——

Mr. KEMP. The 'Resolute.'

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Resolute'—the crew of the life-saving station were endeavouring to save another vessel, and in fact this vessel did not show any distress signals. The boat sank in a few minutes, and it was absolutely impossible for the crew, being engaged in other work and the boat showing no distress signals, to go to their assistance.

Mr. KEMP. There are two entrances to the harbour, and the life-saving station is situated nearer the eastern entrance than the western entrance. In case of a storm vessels seek the harbour by either one of the entrances, so that accidents are liable to occur near one entrance or the other. It seems to be necessary to have a crew stationed on the island, where they can go to the assistance of ships in case of emergency.

Mr. BRODEUR. If we established two life-saving stations on the island, it would be quite a serious undertaking for the Canadian government. We have not established many stations throughout the country, but if we established two stations on the island it would cost millions and millions.

Mr. FOSTER. Cost what?

Mr. BRODEUR. Millions. If we were to establish two stations on the island we would have to do the same thing all over Canada. If on the Atlantic coast we had to establish a life-saving station every ten or fifteen acres, it would be expensive.

Mr. KEMP. I do not advocate that at all.

Mr. BRODEUR I think the hon. gentleman suggested we should have two stations on Toronto island.

Mr. KEMP. I think it is necessary.

Mr. DANIEL. Has the minister any information to give us in regard to the rewards granted for life-saving during the past year? What form do these awards take?

Mr. BRODEUR. In some cases we distribute medals, in some cases watches and in some cases money.

Mr. DANIEL. On whose recommendation are these rewards granted?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are granted on the recommendation of Captain McElhinney, the nautical adviser of the department, who investigates each case as reported by our agents, wharfingers, harbour masters and others, and presents a report, which report is acted upon.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the Finance Minister let us know to-night what he will probably take up on Thursday?

Mr. FIELDING. French treaty.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.05 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 12, 1908

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received, from the secretary of the Governor General, the following communication :—

Office of the Governor General's Secretary,
Ottawa, February 12, 1908.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, acting as deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber this afternoon, at 3.30 o'clock for the purpose of giving assent to certain Bills which have passed the Senate and House of Commons during the present session of parliament.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
J. HANBURY WILLIAMS,
Colonel,
Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved that government orders be called, and that leave be granted to withdraw Bill (No. 10) to amend the Irrigation Act. He said : The reason for asking this withdrawal is that, upon consulting with persons largely interested in irrigation matters in the west, it has been decided to remodel the Bill and to include provisions not covered by the present amendment, and which it is found that it will be in the public interest to have inserted. On the withdrawal of this Bill, I propose to introduce an amended Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This, I understand, is done because it is the convenient form of going on with the other Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill withdrawn.

WINDING-UP ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 95)

to amend the Winding-up Act. He said: This Bill is intended to shorten and simplify the winding up of companies under the Winding-up Act in cases of insolvency. The present machinery is rather inadequate in the opinion of many experienced liquidators in Ontario, the corporations and large firms into whose hands is committed the liquidation of companies in insolvency. The amendment is intended to provide that the liquidator—who has given security for the performance of his duties—may have the same powers as the administrator of an insolvent estate, that is, power to proceed with the liquidation of the estate and winding it up to a final conclusion, without being obliged to apply to the court from time to time. Under the provisions of the Winding-up Act, the liquidator is compelled to apply to the court in practically every step of the proceedings. If he desires to compromise a debt, even of so small a sum as $25, he has to apply to the court for authority to do so. In many cases the costs involved in taking such a step exceed the amount collected—very often two or three times over.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Cannot that power be given under the law?

Mr. MACDONELL. There is a provision under the Winding-up Act that authority may be given to the liquidator in the order appointing him to do this. But this is practically a dead letter, because the court, in making the winding-up order, it may be said, invariably, makes it in general terms, and in such a way as not to give the liquidator these powers. Whether the reason for that is the desire of the court to retain jurisdiction over every step of the proceedings or for the interests that may be concerned in the liquidation, I do not know; but the fact is that, a winding-up order has, in no case in the province of Ontario, contained the provision to which the hon. member (Mr. R. L. Borden) has alluded. The present Bill is designed to reverse the existing conditions—that is to give power to the liquidator to take the steps in winding up without applying to the court. He has not the powers now unless they are expressly given in the order; this amendment would give him these powers unless the order expressly declares that he shall not have them. The court will still have power, in proper cases, to put the clause in the liquidation order that the liquidator shall not have these powers. It will leave it in the discretion of the court to retain power to control the proceedings from time to time. This Bill, if passed, will immensely shorten the liquidation of large companies, and will cheapen the cost of liquidation by at least one-half. My hon. friend points out that the whole matter comes before the court at the conclusion, that the liquidator, when passing his accounts, has to account for every farthing of the estate and every step he has taken, and, as he has given security, it is safe to say that the interests of all parties will be amply protected.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. HONORE GERVAIS (St. James, Montreal) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 96) to amend the Criminal Code with regard to conspiracy in restraint of trade. He said: The section of the Criminal Code which it is proposed to amend by this Bill is section 498, which defines conspiracies which are declared to be criminal offences. But this article has a saving clause which reads as follows:—

> Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to combinations of workmen or employees for their own reasonable protection as such workmen or employees.

The rigid, stringent and rigorous application of this article 498 has proved, in some cases, quite detrimental to some industries and to some associations of traders. The purpose of this Bill is quite simple: it is to put the wholesale merchant, the retail merchant, the trader, on the very same footing as the workmen or employee. That is, if this article 498, is not to be applied to workmen and employees, there is no reason why it should be made to apply to employers and traders.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. To whom will it apply?

Mr. GERVAIS. I may say that there is quite a difference between what is styled a trust and what is styled a commercial entente, for that kind of commercial entente or agreement has built the trade of Germany, Trusts may have been found detrimental to trade in some other parts of the world; but, later on, I think we shall be able to show the difference between a trust and the ordinary commercial entente. For, it must be granted that wholesale and retail traders, merchants and manufacturers should be allowed to come together to talk about the future of their industry and the maintenance of their interests in exactly the same way as workmen and employees are allowed to discuss their interests and the future of their trades.

Mr. SPROULE. You never find working men combining to interfere with or restrain trade. He cannot do it as the commercial man can.

Mr. GERVAIS. The government has always available weapons to destroy any undue, unfair or illegal combination in restraint of trade. I think it should not be made a criminal offence for three commercial men or any number of them to come together and discuss what should be done for their reasonable protection. That has been

allowed in Germany and should be allowed in Canada. If these commercial combines are found to be detrimental to the interest of the country then this government or this parliament has all the necessary power to crush them or bring them to terms.

Mr. SPROULE. They are doing it under this very law that you wish to repeal.

Mr. GERVAIS. Not at all. I join issue about it with the hon. member for East Grey. For example some criminal prosecutions which have been started in Ontario have been looked upon as persecutions rather than prosecution.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

REPORT ON LUMBER COMBINE.

Mr. SCHAFFNER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

What action does the government propose to take upon the finding or report of the committee appointed last session to investigate the question of lumber combine in the west?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

There is no action required by this government at present. There is provision in the criminal code for dealing with unlawful combinations in trade. The administration of justice comes under the direction of the Attorney General in each province. One of the provincial governments has already taken action.

EMPLOYMENT OF H. ST. LOUIS.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

In what capacity has Mr. Horace St. Louis been employed since July 1, 1901, by the House of Commons, for what periods, and at what pay?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

1. As temporary translator.
2. Payments to him have been made as follows :—

1902—313 pages of translation at $1 per page	$313 00
1903—424 pages of translation at $1 per page	424 00
1904—474 pages of translation at $1 per page	474 00
216 pages of translation at $2 per page	432 00
1905—120 pages of translation at $1 per page	120 00
191 days of translation at $4 per day	764 00
1906—70 pages of translation at $1 per page	70 00
128 days of translation at $4 per day	512 00
1907—5 pages of translation at $1 per page	5 00
130 days of translation at $4 per day	520 00
1908—Engaged as temporary translator at $4 per day	

THE FRENCH 'HANSARD.'

Mr. A. LAVERGNE asked :

1. Is the government aware that, to expedite the printing of documents in the French language and of the French version of 'Hansard,' a French Canadian superintendent is required at the Printing Bureau?
2. If so, does the government intend to appoint one?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

The government is not responsible in this matter ; it concerns the Debates Committee.

DELAYS IN FRENCH 'HANSARD.'

Mr. A. LAVERGNE asked :

1. Is the government aware of the delays in connection with the French version of 'Hansard'?
2. If so, what steps does the government purpose taking to have that version follow within twenty-four hours after the appearance of the original text, unrevised?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

The government is not responsible in this matter, it concerns the Debates Committee.

JUSTICE CIMON'S POSITION.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE asked :

1. Is the government aware that Mr. Justice Cimon, judge for the district of Kamouraska, has requested to be appointed judge for the district of Quebec?
2. If so, does the government intend to so appoint him for that judicial district?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. No.
2. The subject has not been considered.

PAYMENTS TO JUSTICE CIMON.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE asked :

What amounts has the government paid to Hon. Judge Cimon, Superior Court Judge for the district of Kamouraska, since his appointment, either for travelling expenses or as extras over and above his salary as judge ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

Travelling and circuit allowances.

In 1886-7	$ 360 00
" 1887-8	530 00
" 1888-9	72 00
" 1889-90	822 00
" 1890-1	426 00
" 1891-2	18 00
" 1892-3	18 00

" 1893-4	$ 18 00
" 1894-5	108 00
" 1895-6	180 00
" 1896-7	552 00
" 1897-8	276 00
" 1898-9	72 00
" 1899-1900	528 00
" 1900-1	604 00
" 1901-2	1,258 00
" 1902-3	264 00
" 1903-4	438 00
" 1904-5	666 00
" 1905-6	923 51
" 1906-7	362 47
" 1907-8	853 67

MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST BONDS.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Bergeron—asked :

1. What was the amount of interest paid on the bonds of the Montreal Turnpike Trust to the government on December 31, 1906?
2. Was the said amount of interest so paid by the Turnpike trustees?
3. By whom was paid the amount of $5,000 on account of the principal of the said bonds on February 3, 1897 ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. The amount of interest paid by the Montreal Turnpike trust, to the Dominion government, on the trust bonds, from 1st July, 1867, to the 31st December, 1906 was $30,144.30.
2. Yes.
3. By the Turnpike trustees.

TRANSMISSION OF MONEY TO YUKON.

Mr. THOMPSON asked :

1. What rate does the government pay for transmiting moneys from the Yukon Territory?
2. Through what channel is the money transmitted?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. and 2. The Canadian Bank of Commerce has acted as the bankers for the government in the Yukon since 1898. The rates of commission for the service have varied from time to time. The rate at the time of the last settlement was on the basis of one-quarter of one per cent.

PAYMENTS TO A. W. FRASER BY JUSTICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

How much has A. W. Fraser, K.C., of Ottawa, received since 1896 from the Department of Justice?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

According to the reports of the Auditor General, Mr. Fraser has been paid, since 1896, from all departments of the government, $10,911.66.

Accounts for legal services are examined and certified by the Department of Justice, but are paid by the department to which the services are rendered.

HOLLAND RIVER DREDGING.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Has the Lake Simcoe Dredging Company a contract for dredging in Holland river, Trent Valley canal system?
2. If so, what rate is paid per mile?
3. How long does the contract last?
4. Who compose the said company?
5. By whom are cheques paid to the said company endorsed to secure payment thereof, and what is the capacity in the company of the endorser or endorsers?
6. How much has been paid to said company for services performed as aforesaid?
7. What disposition is made of the material dredged, and is the same carried away in scows?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Yes.
2. Schedule prices.
3. Contract expires March 31, 1908.
4. J. E. Cane, A. H. Spohn, C. G. Gendron and G. Kesner, all of the province of Ontario.
5. Cheques were endorsed by the Lake Simcoe Dredging Company per J. E. Cane.
6. $1,680.
7. Material dredged is deposited at the place or places and in the manner directed by the canal engineer.

CARRYING MAILS IN COLCHESTER.

Mr. STANFIELD asked :

1. Who carries the mail from Londonderry station to Bass River via Port au Pique Mountain, Colchester county?
2. What is the amount paid for that service?
3. Were tenders advertised for, and how?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Levi Davidson.
2. $449 per annum.
3. (a) Tenders were invited in May, 1900. (b) By posting notices inviting tenders in all the post offices and principal business places in the district and by advertisement in the Truro 'Times-Guardian.'

RAILWAY SURVEYS NEAR TRURO.

Mr. STANFIELD asked :

1. Were government surveys ever made of proposed railways between (a) Truro and Parrsborough via Five Islands; (b) between Truro and Brule; (c) between Truro and Upper Stewiacke, the first two named in Colchester and Cumberland counties, the last two in Colchester?
2. If so, at what date were the surveys made?
3. Were subsidies voted in connection with the same, and when?
4. Are all subsidies still valid or have they lapsed?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. No surveys have been made by the government between the places named in the above question.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—WAGES OF FREIGHT CLERKS, PORTERS AND OTHER EMPLOYEES.

Mr. STANFIELD asked:

1. Are the Intercolonial Railway freight clerks and freight porters between Halifax and St. John paid the same rate of wages as those employed by the Intercolonial Railway in the places named, viz.: Halifax and St. John?

2. If not, why not, and what is the difference in the rate of wages paid?

3. Has the government under consideration an increase of wages for the minimum paid employees of the Intercolonial Railway? If not, why not?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Generally speaking, yes.

2. In regard to the clerks the wages paid are about the same at all stations. The reason a less rate is paid at some of the smaller places is that living is not so expensive at these places.

3. I do not know of any proposition at present to increase the rate of wages.

PAYMENTS TO MR. W. D. HOGG, K.C., SINCE 1896.

Mr. P. D. McLEAN asked:

1. What amount did W. D. Hogg, K.C., and the firms of which he was a member, viz., O'Connor & Hogg, O'Connor, Hogg & Magee, and Hogg & Magee, receive from the government of Canada, or any department thereof, during the period from July 1, 1896, to the present time?

2. Is the said W. D. Hogg at present retained or engaged by the government or any department thereof?

3. Was Mr. Hogg president of the Conservative Association of Ottawa for several years since 1896?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice)

1. $20,903.55. These figures are simply a compilation from the reports of the Auditor General.

2. Yes; in the matter of the disputed accounts between the Dominion and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec in which matter Mr. Hogg has been retained by the Dominion government from the institution of the proceedings prior to 1896.

3. The government is not possessed of any information on this subject.

INSPECTION OF FRUIT.

Mr. E. D. SMITH—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

How many days were spent last season by inspectors under the Fruit Marks Act, examining fruit not in closed packages in the tender fruit belt?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (for Minister of Agriculture). One Dominion fruit inspector was detailed for work, under the Fruit Marks Act, examining fruit not in closed packages in the tender fruit belt, and including the district east to Colborne, from June 28, when the first local strawberries were examined, until the middle of August, about forty-five days in all.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

On notices of motion being called:

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to intimate to the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that I will take advantage of his offer on Monday next to have public Bills called if it is agreeable to him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Monday next is not a government day.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Then does the right hon. gentleman wish to give a government day to it? What day does he name?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Next Tuesday.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. All right.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all petitions and correspondence relating to the establishment of a post office at Mill Settlement, West, and also at north side of Newcastle creek, in the electoral division of Sunbury and Queens.—Mr. Wilmot.

For a copy of all correspondence between the collector of customs at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, and the Minister of Customs, or the Commissioner of Customs, including declarations or statements in writing made by Messrs. Donald Nicholson and Evelyn B. Harnett, of the Hickey and Nicholson Tobacco Company, Limited, respecting alleged infraction of the provisions of the Inland Revenue Act, and of the regulations in respect of tobacco and cigars and tobacco and cigar manufactories, by Messrs. T. B. and D. J. Riley, of Charlottetown, or one of them. Also a copy of the reports of William Caven and other officials and collectors of Inland Revenue; and of all correspondence, letters and telegrams, between the said T. B. and D. J. Riley, or either of them, and the government, or of any department, or officer thereof; and of all correspondence between the officers of Inland Revenue in Charlottetown and the government or any department or official thereof, respecting said alleged infraction of said Act or regulations; and all other correspondence, statements and information in possesion of the government relating to the matter aforesaid; together with a statement of the moneys paid voluntarily or otherwise in settlement or otherwise of penalties for such infraction of the law, to whom paid, and the date of payment.—Mr. A. A. McLean.

For a copy of all accounts, vouchers, &c., for travelling expenses paid to A. T. LeBlanc,

A. E. Killam, W. B. McKenzie, E. H. Allen, F. L. Swartz and J. A. Chabot, officials of the Intercolonial Railway, since the 31st day of March last.—Mr. Boyce.

For a copy of the report made by John Fraser, of the Auditor General's Department, on the 7th January, 1898, of a special examination held by him of the financial affairs of the Montreal Turnpike Trust.—Mr. Monk.

For return showing: 1. The total revenue of Belleville, Ontario, harbour, for the years 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906 and 1907.

2. The expenditure for the years abovementioned in that harbour, (a) for salaries, and to whom, (b) dredging in each year, (c) for building retaining walls along the river at entrance of harbour, and (d) to whom or what persons such last-named sums were paid.

3. What money, if any, the government has advanced to the harbour commissioners of Belleville for improvements, how much and when.

4. If any money has been advanced, what security the government holds for repayment of the same.

5. The tenders received for building the retaining walls for improvement of Belleville harbour, the tenderers, the amount of each tender, and to whom the contract was awarded.—Mr. Porter.

6. For a copy of all petitions, letters, correspondence, reports, documents, papers and other information in relation to the granting of a license in the year 1905, to E. H. McLennan and G. A. Redmond, both of River John, Nova Scotia, for the erection of a factory and to fish lobsters, with the date of such license.—Mr. A. A. McLean.

APPLICATIONS FOR TIMBER BERTHS.

Mr. WHITE moved :

For the production before this House of all the original applications and tenders filed in the Department of the Interior in respect of timber berths Nos. 1031, 1118, 1119, 1097 and 1098, and that the same be laid upon the table of the House.

He said : In moving this resolution I desire to state that I want the originals because I feel that I cannot do justice to my case without them. I have not the information in the copies that the originals will give me. I am quite willing to add these words to the motion :

Said papers not to be part of the archives of this House but to be returned to the Department of the Interior after inspection.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. BOYCE moved :

For the production before this House of all the original applications and tenders filed in the Department of the Interior in respect of timber berths Nos. 1048, 1049, 1122 and 1168, and that the same be laid upon the table of the House.

He said: I beg to suggest a similar amendment as that proposed by my hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. White).

Motion as amended agreed to.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN

Mr. BOYCE moved :

For the production before this House of all the original applications and tenders filed in the Department of the Interior in respect of timber berths Nos. 1050, 1265, 1267, 1274 and 1275, and that the same be laid upon the table of the House.

He said : I beg to move this motion on the same conditions.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House that this motion be adopted with this addition ? I think it would be better that the amendment should be handed in so that the clerk would be in possession of it properly.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RULES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenburg) moved:

That rule 38 of the House of Commons be amended by inserting after the word 'question' in the fifth line thereof, the words 'or of the intention of any member to discuss any definite or substantive matter on a motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair for the purpose of going into Committee of Supply or Ways and Means.'

He said : Mr. Speaker, I have just a word to say concerning the resolution which stands in my name. The present rule 39 reads :

Two days' notice shall be given of a motion for leave to present a Bill, resolution or address for the appointment of any committee, or for the putting of a question.

My resolution suggests the insertion of the following words :

Or of the intention of any member to discuss any definite or substitute matter on a motion that the Speaker do leave the chair for the purpose of going into committee of Supply or Ways and Means.

The sole purpose of the amendment is to prevent the taking of the House by surprise. It constantly happens on the motion that Mr. Speaker do leave the chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply or of Ways and Means, that very important questions are presented to the House with regard to which the majority of members are taken by surprise. It is of course an ancient right of the House to ventilate grievances upon a motion that Mr. Speaker leave the chair, but it is a very ancient one, and while I would not like to see it destroyed altogether, I think it is only fair and reasonable that two days' notice of such an amendment should be given to the House. This notice will appear in the Votes and Proceedings and the whole House shall have ample knowledge of it beforehand. I suppose an intimation is given to the Prime Minister or to some minister of the Crown interested in a proposed amendment, but as a matter of fact such notice does not reach the majority of members. I do not think it would be a hardship upon any member to

have to give these two days' notice ; it will not prevent discussion of any matter of urgent public importance under another rule of the House. Under the English rule no such amendment to Supply can be made without such notice. I find in Standing Orders No. 17, the following English rule:

Whenever the committee of Supply stands as an order of the day, Mr. Speaker shall leave the chair without putting any question unless on first going into the supplies on army, navy, or civil service estimates respectively, or of any vote of credit, an amendment be moved or question raised relating to the estimate proposed to be taken in supply.

From the manual of procedure which accompanies these Standing Orders, I think it is clear that on going into Supply in the British House of Commons the only amendment that can be moved is one relating directly to the supply which is to be asked for from the House. The justification I allege for this motion is that it would prevent the House being taken by surprise. I say it happens almost every day that the House is taken by surprise in a discussion of matters which are really important and of interest to every member, but as it works out the great majority of the members have no notice whatever. On that ground, and on that ground alone, I beg leave to move the resolution.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). It rather takes the House by surprise to have a proposal of this kind made. The rules of the House are not lightly dealt with in this way ; the universal practice is that so important a matter as an important amendment to a rule of the House should be submitted in the first place to a committee, considered by that committee and reported on to the House, when the House would take it into consideration. We revised the rules of this House two years ago, and in the opinion of the House there was no occasion at that time for any such far-reaching amendment as is now proposed. It would prevent the discussion of any grievance on motion to go into Committee of Supply unless two days' notice were previously put upon the order paper. That would be an abnegation of the practice that has prevailed for five hundred years in the British House of Commons and that has prevailed in this House of Commons ever since we have had parliamentary institutions in this country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McLean) speaks of members of the House being taken by surprise, but they need not be taken very much by surprise if they perform their duty and attend here. Surely matters of public interest can be discussed in this House without two days' notice on the order paper. The proposal would cut down to a very serious extent the privileges of this House, and I venture to say that in the end it would not be found to shorten the length of the session. I understood the hon. gentleman to refer to some English rule, but so far as the English practice is concerned, they go infinitely further than I hope we shall ever be obliged to go in this country. If we carried out the English practice to the full we would adopt the English system of closure, under which the passage of the estimates would be reduced to very little more than a farce. Often a sum of £10,000,000 is voted by the Commons of Great Britain after a discussion of not more than two hours' duration. We do not require any restriction of that kind in Canada, and it would be a most unfortunate thing to attempt to restrict discussion as the hon. member for Lunenburg proposes. There has been no very great evil attendant upon the practice of this House since confederation. Hon. gentlemen who desire to bring a matter of public importance to the House usually give notice in advance. That is certainly done when there is intention to move an amendment to the motion that the House go into Committee of Supply. I have always pressed upon hon. gentlemen on this side of the House the extreme importance of giving the government notice in advance of any amendment to Supply ; and apart from that, hon. gentlemen have, from time to time, given notice in advance of their intention to discuss important public questions. I decidedly object to the passing of this motion ; first, because according to the usual order of procedure such a proposal should be referred to a committee ; and, in the second place, because it does not seem to me that there is any abuse of the present practice which would justify us in making such a very important amendment to the rules.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE (South Perth). I cannot say that I have given the question much consideration, and I would not address the House at all but for the fact that you, Mr. Speaker, announced me as the seconder of the motion. But so far as I have considered it, I have not found myself favourable to it. So that I must decline to take the position of seconding the motion. I have not felt that our experience has warranted us in calling for any such change. If our experience had shown it to be necessary, we might probably fairly do it. But I would hesitate very much, in the condition of parties in this country, to take away any of the privileges which now belong to an opposition. I think it very necessary indeed that all the parliamentary privileges they have should be ensured to them. The opposition of to-day may be the government of to-morrow; and the Liberals, who are in power to-day, may find the necessity of all these privileges in the future. So that for once at least I can agree strongly with the leader of the opposition, and I will ask my hon. friend to accept some other seconder for his motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, it is only two years since the rules of the

House were consolidated after revision. The committee which was entrusted with the work gave it considerable attention, and, so far as I am concerned, I cannot say that this matter escaped my attention. But on the whole I think we ought to follow the practice which has prevailed, as the hon. leader of the opposition has just said, for more than five hundred years—the well-known constitutional practice that whenever the House is moved to go into Supply it is the privilege of any member to offer any remarks which he has to offer, whether they are good, bad or indifferent. Perhaps no very serious inconvenience would arise if a member were required to give notice of his intention beforehand, but there is this consideration not to be forgotten, that on the motion for Supply, not only important questions, but very often matters of public indifference, but yet of importance to the member himself, may be brought to the attention of the House, and on the whole I think it is well that every member of this House should have the privilege, whenever the Crown asks for a Supply, of standing up and presenting what observations he has to make. If the motion of my hon. friend had referred only to the moving of an amendment to the motion to go into Supply, there might be more force in his contention, but it proposes that notice shall be given of the intention of any member to discuss any definite or substantive matter. Even if the motion of my hon. friend proposed that no amendment should be moved to the motion for Supply without notice being given, I would not for my part be disposed to accept it at once. On the whole, as has been stated by the hon. member for South Perth, this is one of the valued privileges of an opposition. It may be, as he has suggested, that at some time there may be a change, and what is now the party of the government may become the party of the opposition, though I do not for my part anticipate any immediate change.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. You may be taken by surprise.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have been told that before several times. On the whole, so far as the privileges of members are concerned, I think we had better stick to our rules. I may observe to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition that in former years it was the habit of the opposition to give us at least one day's notice of their intention to move any substantial amendment. This year this practice has not been observed, not I suppose by intention, but owing to the pressure of business or otherwise. But if we are to observe the rules of the House, I think it is proper that ample notice should be given by one side of the House to the other of any intention to discuss any important question. On the whole, I do not object to my hon. friend bringing up his motion. It is perhaps as well that he has brought it up, so as to give hon. members an opportunity of thinking over it. But I would suggest that he withdraw it, and leave the matter for further consideration by hon. members on both sides of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I be allowed to say, with regard to the lack of notice by the opposition this session, that I think on two or three occasions there has not been the length of notice that I would have desired and that we have been in the habit of giving in the past. The difficulty has been that the terms of the motion have not been settled until immediately before the debate in one or two of these cases. That may be not a very good answer, as perhaps the proper course would be to postpone the debate until another day in order that notice could be given. I think the Prime Minister's suggestion in that respect is only fair, and for my part I will endeavour to see that it is carried out.

Mr. SPROULE. It is one of the valuable rights of this House, and one which should not be given up, that any member may bring before the House any grievance before Supplies are voted. This is one of the rights which no free parliament would ever desire to give up. But suppose it was contemplated to do it, that is to amend the rule as proposed, and suppose there were a hundred notices of matters to be brought up before the House went into Supply, in what order would they be taken up and how many would be disposed of at one sitting? There are many questions of this sort that might arise. I do not anticipate that there is any likelihood of the Canadian parliament or any other parliament of the British empire abandoning the right which every member possesses of ventilating grievances before the Supplies are voted.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. While I do not quite concur in the reasons given by those who are opposed to the resolution, yet it is quite evident that I could not succeed in having it passed to-day, and therefore, in accordance with the suggestion of the Prime Minister, I beg leave to withdraw it.

Motion withdrawn.

OBSTRUCTION OF TRAFFIC IN HALIBURTON COUNTY.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton) moved:

For a copy of correspondence, plans, and other data in connection with the flooding of roads above the dam at Wilberforce, in Haliburton county, and the proposals, if any, for improving said roads and the bridge so as to prevent obstruction of traffic.

He said: In presenting a motion which on its face refers merely to a local matter, but which nevertheless concerns the Minister of Railways and Canals in connection

with the agreement that was made with the province of Ontario in regard to taking over the head waters of the River Trent tributary to the Trent canal, I may be permitted to say a word or two. The village of Wilberforce is situated on the line of the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway on the Burnt river in Haliburton. At that point there is a little lake, and the government officers in the interest of the lumbermen are in the habit, for the purpose of running the logs, of holding the water back by placing eighteen-inch boards on the dam. The trouble is that the roadway follows the banks of the stream, and for two or three miles above the village passes along the banks of the lake. When this board is placed on to raise the water, the roadway is flooded and travellers have to drive through the water. Foot passengers can pass through the fields, but when they come to the bridge there is a hundred feet or more at the end which is always flooded. In other words, the passage is obstructed along the roadway. There is a splendid place a mile or two above where a storage dam could be readily built. When this board is placed on the dam, the water rises and the logs cannot be brought under the bridge. Consequently the lumbermen take the railing off the bridge and passengers are liable to drop into twenty feet of water. Then when the water is lowered, the health of the locality is injured and there are always numerous cases of typhoid fever resulting.

Mr. GRAHAM. Did these things exist before or are they the result of the work the government is carrying on ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The government is not carrying on any work, and that is what we complain of. A government officer comes along and puts on the board, we claim he has no right to. In fact I do not think it will go on again because the people have been instructed, if it does go on, to take it off. That is the only way to bring this government to a sense of its duty. The Ontario government formerly controlled this work, but subsequently this government took it over and gave a guarantee that it would keep the work in proper repair and the roadway controlled by it. I am not sure whether it is the Ontario government which does the work at the expense of this government or whether this government does it directly, but the board on this dam causes great injury to the health of the neighbourhood, and there is ample opportunity to avoid this by building a storage dam in the valley further up. There is therefore no need whatever for this obstruction.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not quite catch whether this was something recent or which has been going on for years, though apparently this government has taken over that particular locality on account of the proposed work to be done in constructing the Trent Valley canal. I do not quite understand why an official of this government should put on this board.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the hon. minister not know that the waters are now under the control of his officials and that these government officials are looking after it ?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have government officials in more places than that, but I am not at the moment aware of all the places where they are occupied. The hon. gentleman made the statement that an official of this government put on that board, but I am not aware that that is the duty of any official of this government. In connection with many of these dams, we have had complaints from the farmers that their lands are flooded, and that matter is being investigated. But I understand the complaint to be that it is the mill owners who put on the boards, contrary to the terms of their leases. In one case, in the town where my hon. friend lives, there is a dam, and it is complained that the company, under a lease half a century old, has certain rights. The difficulty is that the company put logs on the dam in order to raise the water, and this it is complained is in excess of their rights under the lease. This is a matter that will have to be cleared up if we go on with the Trent Valley route. It is under consideration by the department, as we have a lot of correspondence relating to damages which are said to have arisen all along, and I presume the damages to a municipality come under the same class as damages to private individuals. I have no objection to bringing down the return and giving my hon. friend every information possible.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is an official of this government who put the board on, and there is no need for his doing this if this government would carry out the terms of their contract with the Ontario government and make the rapids below the dam floatable. There would then be no need for storing water in this little lake. As it is, since this government is not carrying out the terms of its agreement with the Ontario government, they resort to this expedient of storing the water for the benefit of the lumbermen. There should be no board whatever on this dam, and no one but a government official can put it there, and I do not think he will put it there again.

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot say what are the terms of the arrangement between the Ontario government and this government, and I would not like to let the remark pass that we are not carrying out our agreement, because that would be a very serious matter.

Motion agreed to.

TRENT CANAL—EXTENSIONS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria) moved :

For a copy of reports, plans, surveys and other data, in connection with the proposal to construct a branch canal from Balsam lake, on the Trent canal, to the head of Gull River waters, in Haliburton county.

He said : I wish to take up for a few moments the attention of the House with regard to the building of branch canals, which the right hon. the First Minister was pleased to endorse last session. In a word, I refer to the Trent canal and the branch running to Haliburton. Last year the First Minister frankly admitted, after we had passed a vote for his little ditch to Newmarket, the principle of building branch canals. That is a canal which has no water supply. The supply at Newmarket is a little bit of a creek. Through the entire summer there is not sufficient water to work any canal properly. In the summer season I have drawn the attention of passengers from the train, as it passed along, to this little stream trickling down, and that thing is supposed to supply the great canal with water. It is said that the government are going to establish rain barrels in the locality of Newmarket to fill this stream and then divert the stream into the canal. The right hon. gentleman endorsed the principle of branch canals, and said he had the assurance of certain people that Haliburton county was not suited for farming but should be set apart for reforestation.

In other words, take the thousands of people living happily in those valleys and remove them to some other part of the world. I wish to point out that as compared with Arthabaskaville, which, I believe, is the county in which the first minister was born, this is a district of great fertility and splendid resources, as he could see by the smiling farms along the banks of the Gull river. I hope the right hon. gentleman will come and visit that country. I will take him for a trip and show him the happy homes of which I have spoken, and I am satisfied that he will come back much in favour of this canal. There are only a few works to be done—a lock and dam at Coboconk, a lock and dam at Norland, a trestle at Minden and a dam at Horseshoe lake, and sixty or seventy miles of splendid navigation would be open to the people of that country. At present, to reach the railway, from twelve to fourteen miles distant, they have to climb these hills—mountains you might call them—so that they are practically prevented from getting out the rich hardwood timber of that locality. Now, with regard to the reforestation. Notwithstanding the remarks made concerning the scarcity of forest products in Canada, I do not believe that the country is in such need of reforesting, in Ontario at any rate, as some people believe.

Mr. GRAHAM.

But if we are to reforest any lands, I could show the Prime Minister some areas in the older-settled parts of the country where one acre of reforesting would produce more than a square mile in the region tributary to this branch canal. All I ask is that the minister should bring down the papers, and if he will come to that country I shall be glad to escort him, either at election times or on other occasions— —

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not at election times.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, at election times—I shall be glad to escort him if he will come. Then he will see the beauties of the canals.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is it that my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) asks for?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I had the pledge of the Prime Minister last year that he would build the canal——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Where is the water?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The whole river is navigable, so far as supply of water is concerned, and there are many lakes. Why, there is water enough there to supply the Georgian bay canal. I do not think it necessary to go into that aspect of the case, because on other occasions I had the endorsement of the Prime Minister in this matter. The only question in his mind was whether it would not be better to reforest this country. He has been advised by some one to reforest the country, and now I want the correspondence in the case.

Motion agreed to.

EMILY LAKE—FLOODED LANDS—THE GOVERNMENT AND THE ROADS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria) moved:

That in the opinion of this House, owing to the waters of Emily lake and creek, in Victoria county, having been raised and so maintained by a dam at Bobcaygeon, now under the jurisdiction of this government, and the lands adjoining having thereby been flooded so as to render the roads impassable and expensive in construction, it is the duty of the government to assist the localities concerned at least to the extent of the extra cost involved in opening up and maintaining the said roads.

He said : This is another matter that may be counted trifling by the House, but it is one of the greatest importance to the people of the locality. For the information of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) I may point out that this is near the line of Peterborough county. There is a dam at Bobcaygeon, which dams back the waters of Sturgeon lake and also of tributary lakes on the same level. Emily

lake is a small lake and a tributary to Sturgeon lake on the south side.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals.) Was that dam for the purposes of the lumbermen or for the purposes of power?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We will educate the minister if he will come up to that country——

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) does not need to wait for that. The minister is ready to be educated now.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Bobcaygeon is one of the great points on the Trent canal. The river there divides between Sturgeon lake and Pigeon lake, and the Department of Railways and Canals is building a splendid dam on one of these rivers and is going to repair the other this summer. The dam is under the minister's control and he is responsible for it. The waters of Emily lake are raised, and the lands to the south of it are flooded. For seven miles there is no way for the people on the eastern side of the lake to cross to the western side. Now, the custom of this government, not only in the province of Quebec, but in Ontario and every other province, has been, where injury is done to a highway through the action of this government, to put that highway in good shape again. There is a roadway running along the fourteenth concession of Emily township, but it is not available now owing to this flooding, and the people have to go around seven or eight miles to cover a distance which, had their road not been spoiled, would be only three-quarters of a mile. All they ask is that the roadway be left in the condition in which it was before the dam was built. They are willing to do the rest of the work themselves. This they are entitled to, and I am sure the government will grant it.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). In the case of other works undertaken by the Department of Railways and Canals, where roads made by a municipality are interfered with, it has been the custom for the government to make new roads, thus leaving the municipality in as good a condition as before. There is a case of that kind in my own constituency, one that is known to the Minister of Railways and Canals. The road through the village of Cardinal was changed by the new works on the St. Lawrence canal and the government built a new road on the other side of the canal, thus putting the people of the municipality in as good a position as before. Of course, personally I know nothing about the situation referred to by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes), but I understand that a work of the Dominion government has interfered with a road in the municipality referred to. If so, there is no reason why the government should not make that road or another as good. This seems to me a very small matter, and I cannot understand why it has not been done already. I therefore have much pleasure in seconding this motion and I hope that immediate action will be taken by the minister. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) who has brought this matter to the attention of the House deserves credit for doing so in the interest of the people of that locality.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I heartily agree with the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) that a member who brings up the grievance of his constituents or any one else is performing a good service. I know the circumstances which my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) has mentioned in connection with the building of the canal and of roads. But this is not the only case, there are several cases arising in connection with the construction of that work just as there were in the construction of the Williamsburg canal. It is a matter for investigation and I assure my hon. friend that the department will of course look into these matters ; we must investigate them and where a municipality has been deprived of anything by the action of the government we must see that no injustice is done to a municipality by the government.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Or to an individual.

Mr. GRAHAM. Or to an individual. The government has no right to work injustice on an individual or a municipality or anyone else. I would suggest that as I have given him my assurance that this whole matter will and must of necessity be looked into as we construct the work, he should be satisfied to withdraw his motion.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I wish to bring up a matter that I do not believe has received due consideration by the federal authorities. Not only the land but the streams are vested in the province unless the streams are navigable. On many of these streams there are valuable water powers which constitute part of the assets of the province. From these water powers when developed the province would derive a certain revenue but when they are diverted or used for canal purposes by the federal government the province is deprived of that revenue and in some cases revenue is derived by this government. Has the government considered the right of the provinces in this water power and the justice of compensating the provinces for what they have been deprived of? I have always thought this was unfair to the provinces and that some compensation should be allowed the provinces for what has been taken from them.

Mr. GRAHAM. This raises a large question and it must be borne in mind that the construction of the canal in most cases greatly improves the water power or creates one where none existed.

Mr. SPROULE. The federal government gets the income afterwards, whereas before the construction of the canal the provincial government would get it.

Mr. GRAHAM. The federal government gets it because it spends a large amount in developing the power that was there before. If they took it from some one who had developed it and was utilizing it——

ROYAL ASSENT.

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows :

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to inform you that His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General desires and awaits the attendance of your honourable House in the chamber of the honourable Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

And being returned :

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to report that when the House did attend His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General in the Senate Chamber, His Honour was pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills :—

An Act respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.
An Act respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.
An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending March 31, 1908.

EMILY LAKE—FLOODED LANDS—THE GOVERNMENT AND THE ROADS.

House resumed consideration of proposed motion of the hon. member (Mr. Sam. Hughes) with reference to the flooding of lands adjacent to Emily lake and creek.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, in obedience to the request of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) I beg to withdraw the motion, knowing as I do, that when he undertakes to have this matter investigated he will carry out his promise. I might suggest to the minister that before he sends his engineer to look into this matter I will be very pleased to give him the names of some of the prominent residents in the locality who could possibly save the engineer a great deal of time by showing him exactly what the requirements of the locality may be. If the minister will be good enough to let me know beforehand I will send him a list of these names.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will my hon. friend drop me a note to-morrow putting in shape the matters to which he desires attention to be directed ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes.

Motion withdrawn.

PROPOSED DAMMING OF THE ST. LAWRENCE OPPOSITE CORNWALL.

Mr. H. GERVAIS (Montreal, St. James) moved :

For a copy of all correspondence, papers, writings, plans and letters between the government and the International Waterways Commission, on one part, and the St. Lawrence Power Company and the Long Sault Development Company of the other part, with regard to the entire damming of the St. Lawrence river, in the vicinity of Cornwall, together with a copy of all memorials, letters and resolutions of protest sent to the government by the Board of Trade of Montreal, the Chambre de Commerce, District de Montreal, the Shipping Federation of Montreal, the Dominion Marine Association, and others.

He said : Mr. Speaker, before this motion is passed I would like to say a few words. For the last two or three years there have been rumours in Montreal that some people either from Pittsburg, Montreal or Buffalo, were desirous of damming entirely the St. Lawrence river opposite Cornwall. I may say that the shipping people of Montreal were quite surprised to hear of such a proposal. The damming of the St. Lawrence just opposite the Long Sault rapids would mean the destruction of passenger traffic between Kingston and Montreal. For such a damming of the river would have as a direct result a delay of one hour a day to boats going down the river to Montreal and there would no longer be a daily service between Kingston and Montreal. I might remind the House that the number of passengers going down the rapids, during the months of June, July and August, exceeds 100,000. The damming of the river opposite that point would have, as I said a few minutes ago for its direct effect, the wiping out of our trade between Kingston and Montreal. No more rafts could go down the river except by way of some canal construction, but in such case with any length of delay for passenger and freight boats. Another result of such damming of the river would be to change the deepest channel from the Canadian to the American shore, and as a consequence the boundary line between the American side and the British side would be altered. Trade would also be taken from our shore to the American shore. I may say that I am moving this resolution at the special request of all those who take an interest in things maritime in Montreal and outside of Montreal. I know quite well, Mr. Speaker, that to per-

mit the entire damming of a river channel the parliament of Canada, about twelve years ago, authorized the government to allow any company or any private individual to build up in any stream of Canada any kind of an obstruction. This was done for the veiled purpose of authorizing the Chambly Manufacturing Company to dam the Richelieu river. Well, that has been a very unsatisfactory experiment because the result of the damming of the Richelieu river has been that one individual has pocketed thousands of dollars to the utter detriment of the residents of Chambly, of Richelieu and of the public in general.

Mr. HAGGART. What Act of parliament is that ?

Mr. GERVAIS. It is an Act of parliament passed about ten or eleven years ago. I am not sure of the date.

Mr. HAGGART. I never heard of it.

Mr. GERVAIS. I will quote to you before a few minutes. It has been enacted that the Governor in Council may authorize a private individual or company to block or obstruct any stream within the limits of Canada without a special mandate from parliament. In this particular case, I consider that it would be an outrage to allow anybody either from the United States or Canada to obstruct the St. Lawrence river or to alter its course. I am not alone in taking this view. If this House will allow me I will now read several memorials, copies of which have been sent to me :

Montreal, as a man, is against the proposed damming of the St. Lawrence river near Cornwall. Anybody in Canada taking any interest in things maritime is also bound to condemn absolutely such a preposterous proposition.

The Shipping Federation of Canada presented the following memorial :

To, the International Waterways Commission (Canadian section) :

The humble petition of the Shipping Federation of Canada, a body duly incorporated by Act of the Dominion parliament, and owning or representing 443,274 tons of shipping, trading to the port of Montreal.

Showeth—

(a) That certain proposals have been submitted to you by the St. Lawrence Power Company, and the Long Sault Repids Development Company for permission to construct a number of dams across the river St. Lawrence at, and adjacent to, the Long Sault rapids.

(b) That the said proposal was discussed at a meeting of the Canadian section of the International Waterways Commission, and the respective interests in the City of Montreal, on November 6, 1907, and it was gratifying to this interest to learn that International Waterways Commission held the navigation interest to be paramount, and the commission would not approve of any scheme that would interfere with navigation.

(c) The said dams would completely block the river so far as navigation is concerned, and necessitate the vessels and rafts that use the river being diverted to the already congested canal, thereby seriously interfering with the present conditions of navigation.

(d) That any scheme that would place the control of the waters of the St. Lawrence river in the hands of private corporations would, in the opinion of this federation, be a giving away a national heritage. At present there is at times congestion in our canals, and to transfer the passenger boats and rafts, would further increase the present delays, that take place in getting the freight to the ports of Montreal, Quebec, Three Rivers, and other ports in the lower St. Lawrence.

(e) That the canal and river system we hold should not be interfered with, even to the slightest degree. We have 72¼ miles of canals extending from (but not taking in Sault Ste. Marie) by the Welland to the St. Lawrence, on which the government have expended eighty million dollars, and the total tonnage passing through those canals in 1903 amounted to over 1,600,000 tons, showing the magnitude of the commerce which is now using the canals, and seeking Montreal as an export point.

(f) That while 57,966,713 tons of freight were carried by Canadian railways in 1906, as compared with 16,356,337 tons in 1887, the betterment was but 254 per cent as against 287 per cent on the canals during the same period, which shows that the increased railway facilities, and the development of the country are tending to increase the traffic on the canals, and it is to the waterways that we have to look for the cheap transit of freight.

It is a well known fact that the water in the river lowers during August, September, October and November, at which time freights are getting heavier, and anything that would tend to hold back water at those periods would interfere with navigation, and seriously affect the heavy shipments during the fall.

That our exports mainly come from Ontario, Manitoba and the Northwest, even out to British Columbia, nor are we localized to our own country, but the United States also seeks this route, as one of the main arteries for their exports from the point of production to the point of consumption on the other side of the Atlantic.

The eventual growth of these exports we are almost afraid to quote in figures, when the immense area in Manitoba and the Northwest (estimated at 240 million acres) yet to be developed, requires a market for its produce. The mode of conveyance for the bulk of those products will be by our natural highway.

That in view of the foregoing your petitioners protest against any interference with the natural flow of the St. Lawrence river.

Lastly, in regard to the appointment of an engineer to report on the proposed scheme, the federation are of the opinion that while such report might be beneficial from an engineering point of view, no engineers' report can be conclusive and contain what the interference with nature may result in, therefore, the federation desire to be placed on record

as declining to be bound by any engineer's report, either wholly, or in part.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

(Signed) HUGH A. ALLAN,
President.

(Signed) THOS. ROBB,
Manager and Secretary.

Given under the common seal of the Shipping Federation of Canada, this 5th day of December, nineteen hundred and seven.

The following is an extract from the address of greeting by the mayor of Montreal to the International Waterways Commission when sitting in Montreal, September, 1905, to consider proposed construction of a dam at the outlet of Lake Erie :

Your visit of Saturday last to our harbour, and your journey on the river between here and Quebec, will have given you some idea of the vast works undertaken by the Montreal Harbour Commission, at its own expense; and by the Dominion government, out of the national funds, in the interests of trade and navigation, and I am sure that you will have perceived how vital it is to the country in general, and the port of Montreal in particular, that nothing should be done that in the slightest degree would impair the usefulness of those harbour and channel works, or of the canal system above this port.

Large as is the trade of the port of Montreal, it is but small compared to what it must be when this great Dominion is more generally settled, and the development and improvement of our great river trade route is a duty that has always been foremost in the hearts and minds of the citizens of Montreal, and in later years of the people of the country in general.

Mr. Gear, president of the board of trade, in addressing the commission, referred to the value of the exports that passed through this port, to the many millions expended on our waterways and to the tonnage passing through them, with Montreal as the central point, and he said that if the level of the water was decreased by the smallest amount it would mean that the canals and waterways from here to the upper end of the Welland canal, to say nothing of the waterway down to Quebec, would have to be reconstructed. Last year (1904) American shippers supplied about half the grain exported from the port of Montreal, which showed the importance of this route, not only to Canadians, but to every resident in the northern states. When it came to a question of export, they had to consider the St. Lawrence route, which regulated rates, and almost every resident of the United States north of St. Louis and Louisville derived a benefit from our waterways.

Mr. Gear also said :

I have now only to protest as strongly as I can, on behalf of the board of trade and the commercial interests of the city of Montreal against the construction of any works whatever at the foot of Lake Erie which would in the slightest degree, even a fractional part of an inch, interfere with our waterways from the foot of Lake Erie to the ocean.

On the same occasion Mr. Hugh A. Allan observed that in the estimation of the Shipping Federation the proposal was full of serious danger to the enormous interests the federation represented. He referred to the vast amount which had been spent on the ship canal, to the number and tonnage of vessels entering and clearing last year from Montreal, Sorel and Three Rivers, and to the number of vessels trading on the lakes and rivers between Canada and the United States, and said :

During the last eight years the Dominion government had done so much towards improving the St. Lawrence route that the Shipping Federation looked forward to the time when there would be steamers in the Canadian trade equal in tonnage to those now running to New York. By increasing the size of the vessels, a greater proportion of the trade from the Canadian Northwest could be carried. With us, it was a question of inches with regard to the water level, not of feet.

Colonel Anderson, who represented the Marine Department of the government, concluded his representations as follows :

The importance of the St. Lawrence route to the future of the Dominion was paramount, and must be protected, so far as the Dominion government could do so.

Colonel O. H. Ernst, chairman of the United States section of the commission, speaking at the conclusion of the sessions, said :

I voice the opinion of my colleagues, American as well as Canadian, that to do anything in Lake Erie to injure the River St. Lawrence would be a crime against mankind, and to which I would never make myself an accessory. If I should aid and abet it in any way, it would be an act after which I should never draw an easy breath the rest of my life; it would be a nightmare from which I should never recover.

At the session of the Canadian section of the International Waterways Commission in Montreal, November, 1907, to consider the proposal to dam the Long Sault rapids, Mr. Robertson Macauley, speaking on behalf of the Cornwall Electric Railway Company, argued that the height of the water above the dams in the winter would seriously affect the power development of the town of Cornwall. The Board of Trade, Harbour Commissioners, the Shipping Federation and the Dominion Marine Association were all represented, and were unanimous in opposition to the scheme. Mr. Cuttle, speaking for the board of trade, said :

If this goes through, we may find the water down three or four inches. When these dams are put in it often happens that the same quantity of water does not flow over a dam as in the natural manner. We are given a fourteen foot channel by the government and it will be a serious matter to reduce it to thirteen feet and eight or nine inches.

Mr. C. J. Smith, on behalf of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, said :

The rapids of the rivers form one of the principal assets of the company, and the

Long Sault Rapids are one of the chief of these. Their loss is not to be offset by any hydraulic works. Then, too, this would establish a precedent. The Long Sault rapids now, the Lachine rapids next. You would grant the right to exploit the Long Sault rapids, and the Lachine rapids would be obliterated. Then we would leave this country, and the loss would be greater than the St. Lawrence Power Company can recompense you. Further the St. Lawrence is now a navigable river, and once these dams were built it would not be.

Subsequently the Dominion Marine Association adopted a resolution protesting against the proposed works, which was in part as follows :

And whereas it has been declared to be the policy of the said commission to recognize navigation interests as paramount and to refuse assent to power development schemes which will prejudicially affect such interests;

And whereas the said proposals include the construction of dams across the St. Lawrence river from the south shore to the foot of Long Sault island, from the said island to Barnharts' island, and from that island to the Canadian shore, which dams will completely blockade the river so far as navigation is concerned and will necessitate passage up and down stream in all cases by way of locks;

And whereas vessels now enjoy the right of free navigation down stream in the channels north and south of Long Sault island and the south channel is also used for transportation down stream of rafts of timber of great value;

And whereas the enforced lockage of these vessels and rafts and the enforced construction of the rafts in sections of suitable size for lockage, as well as the delays to be suffered during the period of construction of the proposed works, would very prejudicially affect not only the immediate interests involved, but also all other vessels which have to share the facilities for lockage;

And whereas if the proposed works are built, the breaking of a dam or disabling of one or more locks, might completely bar all navigation for a considerable time, cut off the passage of rafts, and prevent even light draft vessels and barges from carrying the produce of the west down stream in the free channels as has been done in the past;

And whereas the St. Lawrence channels in question are part of the great natural highway from the great lakes to the sea, and it appears contrary to reason to oppose any obstacles or barriers whatever in the way of their free navigation, and utterly preposterous to subject these navigable waters, the heritage of the people to the direct or indirect control of private or foreign corporations;

And whereas it is particularly desirable to preserve intact and unimpaired and unimperilled all available water routes to the sea passing through Canadian territory, particularly in view of the other outlets from the great lakes by way of the Mississippi to the Gulf of Mexico and the New Erie canal to New York;

And whereas it is impossible to foresee what other conditions may prevail in the future in the light of which the allowance of the present proposals might be seriously regretted.

Now therefore be it resolved :

That the said proposals apart altogether from any engineering problems involved or any question of water levels or depths, are prejudicial to navigation interests;

That no additional or improved locks at this point of the character so far suggested can compensate for the disadvantages temporary as well as permanent, entailed in the scheme, or justify in the slightest the proposed interference with the free chanels;

That the Dominion Marine Association be placed on record as protesting absolutely against the proposed works.

The council of the Montreal Board of Trade memorialized the Canadian section of the International Waterways Commission, copy as follows :

The Montreal Board of Trade.

To the Canadian Section of the
International Waterways Commission.

The Memorial of the Council of the Montreal Board of Trade.

Humbly showeth,—That your memorialists are greatly concerned with regard to the proposed works of the St. Lawrence Power Company and of the Long Sault Development Company, which works would involve the entire damming of the St. Lawrence river in the vicinity of Cornwall ;

That no matter what advantages in the shape of power and light may accrue, as the result of those works, to towns, corporations or individuals on either side of the river, your memorialists contend that the interests of navigation are paramount and that they should not be sacrificed for any cause whatever ;

That the navigable channel of the river is at the present time in Canadian waters and that the only canal (the Cornwall canal) is in Canadian territory, the United States having neither canal, nor navigable channel;

That under the proposed scheme Canada would lose entirely her navigable channel while the United States would gain the great advantage of a canal in its own territory, and your memorialists submit that this fact alone should prevent any and all Canadians from in any way favouring the scheme ;

That whatever minor benefits may accrue to Canadian interests by the construction of the proposed works your memorialists fear that the scheme is really in the interests of the Pittsburg Reduction Company whose power plant at Massona would be enormously advantaged by the increased head of water the proposed dams would give it;

That in the case of a mighty river like the St. Lawrence it is difficult, if not impossible, for engineers to forecast the actual effect of entirely damming its swift flowing waters, and that there is a general conviction among the riverside population above Cornwall that the proposed works would cause such an overflow into the surrounding country, as would involve damage to the extent of many millions of dollars and your memorialists believe that they would also render useless some existing water-powers in that vicinity;

That the proposed damming of the river channels would of course prevent all boats from shooting the Long Sault rapids, the finest rapids in the river, and that the delay which the passage through the canal would cause, would render it impossible for boats to travel through the Thousand Islands by daylight and reach Montreal the same evening, and thus

two of the chief attractions for passenger travel on the St. Lawrence trip would not be available, with the result that the country would lose the large tourist traffic which is a source of profit to the river steamers and to the places visited ;

That while the promoters of the scheme claim that the interests of commercial navigation would not suffer were it adopted, as cargo boats do not run the rapids, the rafting business seems to have been ignored in this connection;

That it is estimated that the rafts which pass down the river each season contain over three hundred cribs of timber, and that were these cribs forced to pass through a canal instead of shooting the rapids much time would be lost, and they would moreover by blocking the canal, seriously interfere with other traffic;

That Canada has in the St. Lawrence waterway a wonderful avenue of transportation from the interior of the continent to the sea which serves not only to carry at a very low rate the commerce of our own country, but also that of a large section of the United States, and that your memorialists respectfully express their conviction that it is the duty of the Canadian section of the International Waterways Commission and indeed of all Canadians to see that nothing be done which might in any way interfere with the navigation thereof.

Signed on behalf of the council of the Montreal Board of Trade,

GEORGE CAVERHILL,
President.

GEORGE HADRILL,
Secretary.

Montreal, November 28, 1907.

I have received the following memorandum from the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company :

If this company's passenger steamers were forced to go through Cornwall canal instead of running Long Sault Rapids, by the building of the proposed dam, it would add from two to three and a half hours in time between Prescott and Montreal.

In order to run Lachine rapids the spare time at present during the month of August, when the heaviest passenger travel is on, does not exceed thirty minutes. It is plain from this that should the dam be built, the tourist route of One Thousand Islands and St. Lawrence Rapids would be a thing of the past, and the 80,000 to 100,000 passengers who take this trip annually to Montreal would find some other holiday trip, and give Montreal the go-by.

The time above-mentioned estimated as lost time by going through the canal, is a conservative one, as the timber rafts which are at present run down the rapids, would be forced to use the canal, to the disadvantage of all steamers and barges.

There would be a question as to what would be the result from running ice during winter, which would block at the proposed dam, and very probably drown out the low land above Dickensons's Landing, as well as seriously delay navigation in the opening of the season.

I have received the following letter from Mr. George Caverhill, of Montreal:

Mr. GERVAIS.

December 18, 1907.

Honoré Gervais, Esq.. M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—Inclosed please find different reasons given by the Board of Trade, Shipping Federation and Dominion Marine Association, and several individuals, as to why the privileges should not be given to the St. Lawrence Power Company, and the Long Sault Development Company to dam the River St. Lawrence.

The whole matter of fact is that the Pittsburg Reduction Company want to get control of the St. Lawrence river at the expense of the inhabitants of the province of Quebec. We, as a province, cannot express ourselves too strongly against this scheme, as once the dam is built the damage will be done for ever.

Should you wish any further memos in connection with this, I shall be glad to get them for you, if possible.

As mentioned yesterday, my idea in getting you to intervene at the present moment is, that I do not want this to be delayed, as it might force the government to play into the hands of the Americans, and besides from the feelings of a great many people that I have spoken to about this matter, I know of no question within years that has come before the public that would lose our friend, Sir Wilfrid, so many votes as this would.

I remain, yours truly,
GEORGE CAVERHILL.

I have received the following communication from the Montreal Board of Trade :

The Montreal Board of Trade.
Montreal, December 18, 1907.

Honoré Gervais, Esq.. M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—By instruction of the president, Mr. George Caverhill, I beg to communicate copy of the finding of the report of La Chambre de Commerce du District de Montreal with regard to the proposed damming of the Long Sault rapids, which report has been sent to the council of this board by that chamber.

I am, dear sir,
Yours truly,
GEORGE HADRILL,
Secretary.

(Translation.) After having taken communication of the letter from Mr. Thomas Côté, secretary of the Canadian section of the International Waterways Commission, requesting our board to submit the name of some engineer who might be appointed to report on the subject, your committee beg to call attention to the fact that the question has already been considered by this board; that a special committee consisting of engineers who are members of this board was appointed at the time, and that a report of that committee was adopted on July 10, 1905, opposing the scheme, and that the information obtained by the board since that report was adopted is corroborative of the views and findings expresed in that report.

Your committee recommend in consequence that the board do state its formal opposition to the carrying out of any scheme having for its object the damming of the St. Lawrence in any part of its course, and that entertaining those views, the board cannot, in accordance with the request of the Canadian section of

the International Waterways Commision, suggest the name of any engineer to be appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the feasibility of such a work.

Your committee recommend, moreover, that the board do state that, being satisfied as to the harm which the carying out of such a scheme would inflict on the shipping interests, it protests energetically, in advance, against the granting of any such privileges to private companies.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are these memorials of recent date ?

Mr. GERVAIS. Yes. I understand also that an indignation meeting has been held in the county of Dundas to protest against such a proposal.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When ?

Mr. GERVAIS. A few weeks ago. I think I may say that the united voice of Ontario and Quebec is raised in protest against any proposal to dam the St. Lawrence river on its course between the Detroit river and the Gulf of St. Lawrence. For these various reasons I would ask that the motion be adopted.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The question raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Gervais) is one of national and international importance, and, having resided on the banks of the St. Lawrence practically all my life it has a personal interest for me. The bald proposition to dam what is perhaps the greatest river in the world is calculated to give us somewhat of a shock. To imagine the St. Lawrence river without the Long Sault rapids is to imagine what seems to me an impossibility. For many years tourists from the American continent and from Europe have regarded the trip from Kingston, through the Thousand Islands, and thence down the rapids to Montreal and on to the old city of Quebec, as one of the most delightful in the world. Not the least of the delights of that trip is the shooting of the Long Sault rapids, with its long swells and sharp curves around the islands. When the proposition was first made to me as a member of the government to consider the damming of the river which would practically do away with the Long Sault rapids, I recoiled from it, and without committing myself very strongly I may say that my natural inclination is to recoil from it yet. Those who know the location well will know that the proposition is to dam the river and to make the Little River on the south side the navigable channel from the west. There would be no Long Sault rapids ; there would be no shooting the rapids in the future for the new proposition would mean navigating through a prosaic canal lock. The promoters of the project say it would improve navigation in that it would make a lake where the rapids now exist and bring about easier navigation for the boats which ply there. I am not quite so sure about that, but I am not going to contradict it in the light of the present information I have.

Mr. GERVAIS. Is it not true that the damming of the river and the substitution of a canal for navigation purposes would result in the flooding of the lands for miles and miles along the river.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will speak of that in a moment. It is said by the promoters of the scheme that it would improve navigation, and while I will not argue that, I do hint that I have my doubts. There are other things which may make the damming of the river a serious consideration. During the past few years there have been two ice jams on the St. Lawrence in that vicinity or a little west of it.

Mr. J. D. REID. You have one there now.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am referring to the country west of Cornwall and the present ice jam is east of Cornwall. The ice jam to which I have referred was caused by the swinging of a large bay out across the current to form a means of communication between the island and the mainland, and it formed an ice jam causing the water to rise for many miles to the west, flooding the streets and property at Morrisburg, and resulting in a great deal of damage. If anything like that should follow from the damming of the St. Lawrence it would be out of the question to consent to it. In addition to that, as my hon. friend (Mr. Broder) knows, those who have to travel in the county of Dundas could not travel on the first concession at all but had to go up and down the second concession, and sometimes they had to go through the third concession to escape the flooding of the roads. I believe the same thing has occurred on the American side. I am told that at the present time below Cornwall there is an ice jam which has caused a great deal of damage to the town. All these things have to be considered by the government from the standpoint of the best interests of the people. It may be possible to overcome difficulties of this sort, but they have to be seriously considered by the government of Canada. It has not been demonstrated to me that the results which would follow the construction of this dam would not be injurious to person and property, not to speak at all of the facilities for navigation. It is a matter of international concern as the government of the United States is interested, but I have been told..... and as to this I do not speak with authority.....that the United States government is favourable to this project and that part of the work has already been undertaken on the American side. As I understand it, the work can be done on either

side of the river and it then can be united into one work ; the proposal being to take over the property of the Davis Company and to amalgamate it with this new power company.

Mr. GERVAIS. Is it within the power of the United States government to construct any work in a stream or river which is common to both countries ? Has the American government any right to build anything interfering with the navigation of the St. Lawrence river, which under the treaty of 1818 and under the prior treaty of 1783 and under the later treaties of 1854 and 1871, has been declared to most extent the exclusive property of Great Britain and to some extent the common property of both Great Britain and the United States. I submit that we should prevent anybody, even though they act in the name of the American government, from tampering in any way with the St. Lawrence river unless it is done under agreement between the governments of the two countries, in any case Canada being represented by England.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. In considering the question of the hon. member (Mr. Gervais) the minister might also take into consideration the fact that on the Canadian side the St. Lawrence Power Company has already constructed works which supply power to the town of Cornwall and to the canal.

Mr. GRAHAM. On the south side of the river is what is known as the Little river which is practically all in American territory.

Mr. J. D. REID. Do you mean the South Sault ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is designated to me as the Little river but it is probably what we know as the South Sault.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has there not been a large water-power developed at Massena on that Little river ?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is not what I was coming at, that they have developed what is called the Little river, which is on the American side. I am sure that nothing has been done that would interfere with the international relations between the two countries.

Mr. GERVAIS. Does the hon. minister admit the thalweg European doctirne that the natural boundary line between two countries separated by a common river is the middle of the deepest channel ? If so, what we call the Little river would be on Canadian soil, and the boundary line would be in the middle of the Long Sault rapids.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman's argument proves my contention. The main channel is north of the island, and this Little river is south. It was not the main channel at all that I was discussing. As I said before, this question of granting power to dam the St. Lawrence river may have a far-reaching effect. We have constructed the Sheik's Island dam, and a large amount of power has been developed from the canal by the St. Lawrence Power Company; but that Canadian proposition, carried out on the Canadian side, does not effect injuriously the navigation as it exists. I may say that the International Waterways Commission has been considering this proposition very seriously, and has discussed it with the representatives of the American government. I am led to believe that the members of the commission from the United States are somewhat favourable to the proposition. In fact, what the company communicated to the department over which I have the honour to preside caused me to think a good deal about the possible consequences. In order that the matter might be discussed intelligently between the departments, I asked the Public Works Department and the Marine and Fisheries Department to each name a prominent official of the department, and I named one of mine, to confer together as to what the effect would be on the interests of Canada as represented by these three departments. I am glad that my hon. friend brought this matter to the attention of the House, and I shall be glad to bring down all the correspondence.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the government parted with any of its rights or powers in regard to the Long Sault rapids ? Has it given the right to any individual or corporation to erect works ?

Mr. GRAHAM. None whatever.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask my hon. friend whether or not the government would have the right to do this without coming to parliament ? Is there at present any statute which confers on the government that power ?

Mr. GRAHAM. My opinion is that this company would have to get a charter from this parliament before it could start to do business by way of development.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Apart from that, the question is whether or not the government have power to confer upon any corporation —assuming that it already existed—by order in council the right to construct any such work.

Mr. HAGGART. They have.

Mr. GERVAIS. It has been done in the case of the Chambly river and it was not a popular move.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not being a legal man, I would not like to attempt to answer that. My own opinion is that it being an international waterway, a good deal more autho-

rity would be required than in the case of an interior water.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the minister be kind enough to have some inquiry made as to that in the Department of Justice? I would be inclined to agree with the view the minister has just expressed; at the same time, I think it would be well for the government to inform the House of the position in that respect.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will ask the opinion of the Department of Justice as to that. I was saying that I am glad that my hon. friend has brought this matter before the House. It is a matter that interests not only those who live along the St. Lawrence river, but every person connected with navigation or the carrying trade in Canada. It might possibly effect the work we have done on our canal, and what we are attempting to accomplish in the way of bringing the trade of the west down our own waterways to the port of Montreal and from there to the ocean. It is a large question, worthy of the consideration of this House, and of course, before anything could be done about it, it would have to receive the amplest consideration. I have received from many people protests on all these lines that I have mentioned—from those engaged in the carrying trade, those engaged in the shipping business, those living along the river whose property might be affected. I not only will have no objection, but will take pleasure in bringing down the papers asked for by my hon. friend.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the minister bring down also, without any formal motion, a plan of the river at that particular point, so that one could get a clearer idea of what might be proposed than could be gathered by merely reading a description of it?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will have that done.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. May I ask the minister if the final report of the International Waterways Commission is in yet?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the report has not yet been presented.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). In view of the question asked by the hon. leader of the opposition, whether the government would have the right to do this work without coming to parliament, even if a proposition were made, and the government decided to grant any water power in that way, by building a dam at the Long Sault rapids, it should be submitted to the House. I know that locality, and I think it would be a monstrous proposition to attempt to dam the St. Lawrence river in the vicinity of Cornwall. In the first place, it would practically stop navigation. The Richelieu steamers going to Montreal all run the Long Sault rapids, and if a dam were built there, they would have to go by canal, so that they could not make the trip from Prescott to Montreal in one day. Then, there is a great deal of trouble in the St. Lawrence river every year on account of the ice jam, which is caused by a great body of ice coming out of the bay at Morrisburg and swinging across the river opposite Farran's point. This causes the river to rise at Morrisburg at least twenty feet, flooding almost the whole town. The government have to send men down every year from the Williamsburg canal to cut that ice jam out; they have been doing this for years. If the river were dammed at the Long Sault rapids, all the ice coming from Prescott and places east would be blocked at this dam. If this river is dammed, all the river from Prescott and places east would be blocked. I do not believe that the government, if they looked into it at all, would allow such a proposition to go through. So far as the dam at Dickenson's landing is concerned, that had nothing to do with the navigation of the river at all. It is just a few hundred feet across from the island to the canal, through which scarcely any water passes at all. The main channel is entirely separate and in addition this dam, made for the St. Lawrence Power Company, was to enlarge the canal. I therefore hope we shall have good opportunity of discussing the matter in parliament and let the people see what is being done. Let all those interested, such as the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company and others, have an opportunity to go into the matter, and I am satisfied the government will not listen for one minute to the proposition to dam that part of the river.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds). As representing one of the constituencies bordering on the St. Lawrence, I agree fully with every word which has fallen from the Minister of Railways regarding what people would say should this or any other government undertake to put a dam across the river at the Long Sault. That government would be damned for all time by the Canadian people. But I have often felt that we have a water-power, both at Fiddler's Elbow in the St. Lawrence and in the rapids of the St. Lawrence further down, particularly at the Long Sault, equal to the Niagara Falls, and I do not think the day is far distant when some inventive genius will devise a water-wheel undershot that will be able in these strong currents, without interfering with navigation in any way, to develop as much power at these points as can be developed at Niagara. By erecting an immense water wheel which the currents would catch, we would develop any amount of power, and I think that the day is not far distant when that will be done without interfering with navigation or the natural beauties of the river. I should oppose strongly any damming of the river at the Long Sault or at any other point where natural rapids are in existence to-day.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). I know the locality in question, and I think it is the most beautiful spot in Canada. I am glad, therefore, that the government have not alienated any portion of it because I think they have full power to do so without coming to parliament. That is a power which, I believe, is vested in the government. I am glad to have the assurance of the Minister of Railways that he does not intend using that power without consulting parliament. This portion of the river might be utilized for power purposes without interfering at all with the navigation of the rapids. There might be a wing dam run out a little distance from the shore and an immense power generated from it. That would interfere seriously with the beauty of the place, and I do not think we ought to do anything with reference to these rapids on the St. Lawrence until the joint commission, appointed by this and the American governments, has reported. I have heard that the commissioners differ as to what are the respective rights on each side of the St. Lawrence, and that the British minister is coming to this city for the purpose of trying to make an arrangement in accord with some principle or plan proposed to him by the United States government for the settlement of our rights with reference to these waterways. Whether the division line is in the centre of the stream, whether we are entitled to all the flow of water on our side or only one-half, is a question which has yet to be decided. All these points of difference have to be considered by the joint commission and some agreement come to, but what I would like to say is that nothing for the present anyway should be done for the utilizing of these rapids. The locality is one of the most beautiful spots in America, and nothing should be erected on the shore in the shape of a dam or anything else which would mar its attractiveness. It is one of those places that should be left to nature. It is true we live in a utilitarian age and perhaps the generation of one hundred thousand or one hundred and fifty thousand horsepower would be productive of benefit which would compensate for the marring of the beauty of this place, but, in our time of life any way, we are not likely to benefit by these utilities, and I would like that this beauty spot should remain one of the places in Canada which we may be proud of.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I am rather surprised at the opinion expressed by my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) that the power is vested in this government to deal with this subject without coming to parliament. My hon. friend did not state under what authority the government possessed that power, but that is a matter as to which we should have further information from the Minister of Railways and Canals. But apart from all the considerations that have been submitted regarding the importance of preserving the spot as one of great natural beauty, there is a further consideration that any water-power which can be generated there belongs to the people and should not be parted with except with the sanction and approval of the people's representatives in parliament. Therefore, I cannot too strongly state my own opinion that before any steps be taken, even should the government possess the power, the government should submit the proposal to parliament and invite the opinion of parliament regarding it. The Minister of Railways used language which, I understood to be an assurance that this course would be followed, and I trust there will be no departure from that policy, because the exploitation of great natural resources should be conducted in such a way as to be of the greatest possible advantage to the people as a whole.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). While this matter has been some time before the government, we have not up to this moment thought it advisable to do anything except refer the petition which was presented to us to the Waterways Commission. In September last—at all events before the Minister of Railways joined the government—we had an application from the promoters of this enterprise, but the matter seemed to me and my colleagues of such importance that we thought it best to take the views of the Waterways Commission. I am not aware that we have received a report from that commission, but I am informed that Mr. Gibbons, chairman of the Canadian section, went to Montreal to consult the various interests concerned in that city. The report I have, which is not an official report, is to the effect that all parties in Montreal were absolutely adverse to the granting of the application of the promoters of this enterprise. And, so far as I can see, on this side of the international line, all those who have had an opportunity of looking into the matter, whether from the point of view of utility or otherwise, have expressed themselves against it. I understand, on the other hand, that the project is favoured on the American side. But the government certainly will not take it upon themselves to deal with such a matter without giving the most ample opportunity for all parties concerned to express their opinion.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). I was present at the hearing in Montreal before the International Deep Waterways Commission. The statement made by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), that all Canadian parties were opposed, is not quite correct, inasmuch as the town of Cornwall, both by its municipal corpora-

tion and its board of trade, sent delegations supporting the scheme and producing resolutions of the bodies they severally represented in support of it. The Marine Association were dubious as to what the effect would be, and the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation people were absolutely opposed to it, on the ground that it would obliterate the scenery of which the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has spoken in such fitting terms. And it was left in that way. The engineers of the International Deep Waterways Commission on both sides are investigating the matter, and, as stated by the Prime Minister, so far as I am aware, the report has not been made.

Mr. GERVAIS. I wish to quote the authority under which the Governor in Council may grant authorization to build dams and other works on any river within Canada. I refer to chapter 115 of the Revised Statutes, 'An Act respecting the protection of navigable waters.' Section 4 of this Act says :

No bridge, boom, dam or aboiteau shall be constructed so as to interfere with navigation, unless the site thereof has been approved by the Governor in Council, or unless such bridge, boom, dam or aboiteau is built and maintained in accordance with plans approved by the Governor in Council.

Let me also read section 8 of the same chapter :

Any local authority, company or person may proceed in like manner to obtain the approval by the Governor in Council of the site and plans of any work constructed prior to the first day of March, 1899.

It was first enacted by the 62-63 Victoria, chapter 32—that is, in 1899. For this enactment was necessary to give effect to the following clause of the Chambly Manufacturing Company's charter, Quebec, 61 Victoria, chapter 61, section 18 :

The company shall not erect any dams across the River Richelieu, nor do anything affecting the navigation of the canal, without the authority or consent of the government or of the parliament of Canada first obtained.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. To what does that apply?

Mr. GERVAIS. To navigable waters.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does that apply to international waters?

Mr. GERVAIS. Not to my mind, but according to the construction of some hon. members——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I do not think it would.

Mr. GERVAIS. I think the international character of the waters would make a difference. England, I think, would have to intervene in this case.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). In the case of the Richelieu river, they had to go before the local government in order to get power to do certain works.

Mr. GERVAIS. Yes, but the Chambly river—the Richelieu river, as it is often called—is a navigable water. And it is all very well known, too, that the legislature of Quebec have granted certain rights on that river, provided they were confirmed by the federal parliament. But I contend that the provincial parliament was powerless to authorize the damming of that river. The company was therefore referred to Ottawa, and, in this parliament, the Act then existing was amended so as to empower the Governor in Council to grant the permission or confirmation desired. And that permission was in fact so granted. And that is the reason why the beautiful villages of Chambly and Richelieu have been deprived of the wealth with which they were endowed by nature—and all this for the benefit of a few men, under the fallacious pretense that it was for the benefit of the general public.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 28) to amend the Copyright Act —Mr. Macdonell.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 2) to amend the Canada Shipping Act. He said : This Bill has been before the House certainly for three sessions, and, I think, for four. It has been discussed at length on these previous occasions, both in the House and in special committees to which it was referred. Hon. members are so well acquainted with its provisions that, unless specially required to do so, I shall not take up any great length of time in discussing it. The purpose of the Bill is to require that masters and mates of vessels trading upon the inland waters of Canada, or minor waters of Canada, on coasting voyages, shall be British subjects. The section of the Canada Shipping Act which I propose to amend is section 75, and I propose to amend it by striking out the words 'or other persons domiciled in Canada for at least three years.' I propose also to strike out subsection 2 of said section, as it will stand as mere surplusage if the first amendment is adopted. This would leave the section to read :

Examinations may be instituted in Canada for British subjects who intend to become masters or mates of ships——

And so on. The effect, it will be seen, would be that none but British subjects could become masters or mates. This Bill has been three times before special committees. The committee of last year gave great attention to the matter, heard a great deal of evidence and made a report. It is only fair to the committee to say that they

made a report which they declared was without prejudice to the principle of the Bill, in case they thought afterward that the principle was not a good one. That is, they guarded themselves—so far as the committee can guard themselves, though the report looked to me like a contradiction in terms—by saying that their report was without prejudice to the principle of the Bill. The Act is not only one of retaliation against the United States, as has sometimes been suggested by gentlemen who came to the committee and asked to be heard as representing the vessel owners' association; the principle itself is good. The principle of the United States legislation, which requires masters and mates of vessels to be United States citizens, is a good principle. It is a good principle for any nation to have its merchant marine vessels officered by its own subjects. If I was a citizen of the United States I would support that principle, and because it is a good principle I advocate its adoption in Canada. It is true we are getting the worst of it to-day, and that it is to some extent a matter of retaliation, of putting up your own fence against your neighbour, because he has put up his fence against you; but, as I have said, the principle is a sound principle, and one which we should adopt.

Many memorials in favour of this legislation have been presented and will be found upon 'Hansard' of previous years. Resolutions have been presented from the Canadian Masters and Mates Association passed at different meetings of that association and in different years, favouring this legislation, and petitions have also been received from the masters and mates of different ports of Canada, from Toronto, Collingwood, Midland and, last but not least, St. Catharines. All of these memorials urge the government to do what is here asked in order to protect Canadian citizens who wish to remain British subjects, but who at the same time desire to follow the calling of mariners in Canada.

I have before placed on the records the American law on this subject which is to be found in the Act of Congress, approved on May 28, 1896, providing that after the first of January, 1897, eleven years ago, no person should be qualified to hold a license as a master or watch officer on a merchant vessel of the United States who is not a native born citizen of that country or whose naturalization as a citizen has not been fully completed. That of course necessitates his forswearing his allegiance to King Edward and to this country.

I understand that the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) is this year of the opinion that the Bill should pass and therefore I shall not detain the House, in order that it may be considered in the committee when any improvements that can be suggested may be made. In order to make clear to some gentlemen who had doubt about it last session and who said that the law was not always enforced in the United States against us, I have obtained the actual form to be filled out by any one seeking a master's certificate in the United States. The first form is the collector's certificate that the applicant has complied with the condition. The form to be filled in and sworn to by the applicant is as follows:—

District of.. .. ..
Port of.. .. ..
I.. .. .., master of the vessel called the.. .. ..of.. .. ..tons, do*.. .. ..that I am a citizen of the United States, having been† .. .. so help me God.

*Insert 'swear' or 'affirm.'

†Insert 'born within the limits thereof' or 'naturalized in the state of.. .. .., on the.. .. ..day of.. .. . .., 18.. .., by.. .. ..,' stating the Act or order of naturalization, and by what court or board.

By this form it will be seen that the applicant has to swear that he is a native born citizen of the United States or else to give the place and state in which his naturalization took place so that he can be identified. Thus it is plain that he must be a citizen of the United States. It works out in this way that a man who will forswear King Edward can get a job on either side. He can have his Canadian certificate because he does not have to be a citizen of Canada to hold it, and he can have an American certificate because he has become a citizen of the United States. Thus if he can swear that at any time he has lived in any part of Canada for three years, under the existing law he can get a Canadian certificate, while he can get his American certificate as an American citizen. As a matter of fact to-day the very best boats are officered almost entirely by citizens of the United States who are living——

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. To what places does my hon. friend now refer?

Mr. LANCASTER. To the boats going up and down the great lakes and the Welland canal.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. He is not speaking of the upper lakes?

Mr. LANCASTER. Not as limited to the upper lakes, but of the boats going through the Welland canal. I am told it applies there pretty generally.

Mr. J. D. REID. And to the St. Lawrence as well.

Mr. LANCASTER. Probably so. In any event I do not base my argument on the question of numbers; if the principle is good it should be applied if there are only one or two or half a dozen cases, the principle involved is that our merchant marine should be officered by men who owe allegiance to this country, to King Edward and his successors. It is natural to expect that

if you protect Canadians in that profession more of our bright young men will undertake to learn it and will be able to obtain positions which in many cases are now held by aliens.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I desire to say, as I have said in the past three or four years that I am absolutely and entirely in sympathy with the Bill that the hon. gentleman has introduced. I asked a question in regard to one statement made by him because I thought he rather injured the case in making the statement so sweeping. I do not agree with him that so far as the upper lakes are concerned, a large majority of the best boats there are officered by American citizens. I do not think that any of the Canadian Pacific Railway boats are officered by American citizens. I am almost certain that there is not an American citizen in any of the Northern Navigation Company's boats sailing either from Collingwood or Sarnia. Nor do I know—I speak subject to correction by my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) that any of the freighters owned by the Midland Transportation Company are officered by American citizens. I think they are not. But, nevertheless, a grievance does exist and a grievance has existed by reason of quite a large number of vessels on the upper lakes being officered by masters and mates who are Americans. The grievance is well founded. Our neighbours to the south absolutely forbid any Canadians obtaining masters' or mates' papers in the United States. We have been speaking about this in regard to masters and mates, we were speaking about it last night in regard to shipbuilding and it is time that we did maintain Canada for the Canadians as against the restrictions which are put upon our Canadian fellow citizens in the United States. They will not permit any kind of an officer on their ships to be other than an American citizen. Their federal statutes lay it down constantly that you must be an American citizen before you will get a certificate either as master, mate or marine engineer, first, second, or third class and it even goes farther. If that is so and if it is wise legislation from their standpoint why should we not protect our Canadian mariners to the same extent? It is time we should say, I submit, that in Canada a man must be a British subject before he obtains a certificate either as master, mate or marine engineer. I am told that it is not workable, that it might prevent the Dominion Marine Association, which bobs up on all these occasions to protest against it—from getting the necessary men for their vessels, I do not believe it for a minute. It is not so. They will get all the men they want and there are just as good men in Canada for these positions as can be got from the United States. Unless you begin now to make good masters and mates of Canadian citizens you will never succeed. I do hope that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) is going to announce to us that he will adopt this Bill and that he will embody it in the law. I know there are some difficulties. The Canada Shipping Act, as it came from the commission which revised the statutes last year, is now a very complicated document, something that is very hard to understand and if you start to tinker with one clause you are very liable to get into difficulty in respect to another clause, but I do hope that his officers have by this time mastered it and that he will be in a position to announce to us that some protection will be given to our own Canadian citizens. We have been more lenient. We are told that legislation in this direction has been to enable a man living in the United States to come over here, work on our vessels and his work during the summer has been credited to him as domicile. Ordinarily of course, a man's domicile is where his family resides. He might leave his family in the United States, come over here and work on a ship during the summer and the place where he has worked during that brief period has been called his domicile. If he continues in that way for three years then he is permitted to obtain his certificate as a British subject. I do not think that is right. A British subject is a man who lives in this country and takes the oath of allegiance and I hope that the minister will extend the Act in that respect.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). Mr. Speaker, I fully agree with what the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) have said. Last year I supported this Bill and I wish to support it again. I know for a fact that there are American citizens holding Canadian masters' papers who never resided in this country and who have no domicile here. They have simply claimed that the fact of working on a Canadian steamer was a fulfilment of the requirements of the law and thus they have obtained their certificates. I know men who are mastering some of our Canadian steamers when there are good Canadians who could fill these positions but who have to take positions as first and second mates on account of these other men having obtained the positions of master through the influence of friends connected with these steamers. I believe the time has come when we should look after our own Canadian people and I hope there will be no hesitation on the part of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) in at once agreeing to this and seeing that the Bill is put through the necessary stages in order to make it law in time to take effect during the present season of navigation.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Vancouver). The amendment as suggested in the Bill

brought forward by the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) has, I presume, a good deal of merit in it and I am not quarrelling with the Bill, or have I ever done so, although I have spoken several times upon this subject in the House and was also on a special committee to which it was referred. But I do not subscribe to the sentiment laid down both by the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara and by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) of Canada for the Canadians. I do not subscribe to that sentiment a particle. If you would say Canadians for Canada it will appeal more properly to the correct principle than the phrase Canada for Canadians. I think that a good deal of our smallness in a good many of these matters is due to the fact that we hear so many giving expression to the sentiment Canada for Canadians. It is well known that for many years in Canada trade and commerce did not flourish very greatly and our young men who followed the sea naturally went to the American side. For a long time they were enabled to carry on their business. I know men who for many years were operating on the American side on the Pacific coast as Canadians and who had charge of boats as engineers and captains. However, the law was more stringently enforced with the result that that cannot be done now. I do not believe in the theory that because Americans do these things we should do them. I think the proper principle should be applied and that is to make it as far as possible that young men will find themselves in the position that Americans find themselves in on the other side or in any other country; that is that they will not require to go from their own homes to get employment or to renounce their own citizenship as they have done in the past—and will have to do if they are obliged to take American boats on the American side. At the present time in British Columbia we have a good many men who are nothing else but British subjects but we have quite a number of men who are operating as captains, mates and engineers, and who are living in British Columbia—and I presume will do so—who have never taken the oath of allegiance. This Bill will make them fall into line and become British subjects. I do not believe it is a matter for retaliation at all but I believe it is a proper thing for us to declare that nobody shall be in charge of a boat, either on the high seas or the great lakes, who is not in possession of British papers, or such as will be agreeable to British law.

Of course they are now, if they are operating in our country, but it is much better I submit that we should have as far as possible British subjects upon our boats. Lately in the province of British Columbia a good many of our Asiatic friends have had no difficulty in getting masters and mates certificates, and I suppose when a thing touches one so closely as that he takes more notice of it. I want to say further, speaking of the examiners, that in my opinion many of them are very careless. Men who have been operating in British Columbia waters have no difficulty whatever in getting a certificate, and I think the examination should be made stiffer than it seems to be at present. A man goes in to be examined and a bunch of yarn is held up and he is asked : Is that blue or yellow or green in colour, and the whole thing is over in twenty minutes and the certificate is issued. I do not say that this has been going on with the cognizance of the Marine Department, but it has been going on just the same, and I think that more rigid discipline of some of our masters and mates would result beneficially for the merchant shipping of the Dominion of Canada. On these grounds I support the principle embodied in the Bill proposed by the hon. member.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). This is not a question with which I am personally familiar, and I would not speak on it were it not for the fact that some of my own constituents have requested me more than once to support this Bill. I am heartily in accord with the principle incorporated in it; I believe in keeping as much of Canada and things Canadian for our own Canadian people as we possibly can; I believe that Canadians should be given an opportunity of engaging in profitable pursuits and callings in this country, and therefore I am heartily in favour of the Bill.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton). I am in accord with the principle of this Bill, but I wish to take exception to a remark made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) when he advocated legislation providing that the holder of a Canadian certificate should not only be a British subject, but that he should be domiciled within the Dominion of Canada. Such legislation would in my opinion be very injurious and would not attain the object we are striving for. We must remember that all along the border (and not only along the border, but back in the country) there reside men who hold certificates as masters and mates, and first and second and third engineers of American boats. Although they are American citizens and have been naturalized for a very considerable time, yet during all the years outside of the sailing season they live in Canada, their families are here and their wages come to Canada and are spent here. That fact must be considered. Some years ago when the Lake Carriers' Association passed a sort of house resolution that no one should be master or officer or engineer of a boat. American boat, unless he were domiciled in the United States, when the rule went into effect a great many men, some of who lived in my own constituency and whom I knew,

were compelled to take their families to the United States and live there although they had previously been residents of the Dominion. If we should legislate to say that a man who received a certificate from us must be both a British subject and be domiciled in Canada, it would be pretty sure to bring about retaliatory legislation in the United States. That would not be fair to these officers of American boats who are domiciled in Canada and whose families have always lived here. The clauses of the Bill have been thrashed out before special committees for several sessions, and it is the final conclusion of these committees and of the House that this legislation is good. However, it is the kind of legislation which we should be extremely careful not to make too stringent lest it may bring about retaliation from the United States. We must remember that if such a thing should happen our comparatively small marine fleet in Canada would be swamped by the United States with their tremendous tonnage, and that a great many men who desire to live in Canada would be cut off from employment on American steamers without their having an opportunity to obtain employment on Canadian steamers. To pass any legislation which might have such result would be very inadvisable.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenberg). I have a great deal of sympathy with the proposal of the hon. gentleman from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), but there are considerations which apply to the maritime provinces and the Atlantic coast which prevent me giving the proposal my support. The amendment proposed by my hon. friend relates to inland and coasting trade waters of Canada. The inland waters of Canada mean: 'All the rivers, lakes and other navigable waters within Canada except salt water bays and gulfs on the sea coast, and including the River St. Lawrence between Father Point on the south shore and Point Orient on the north shore.' The resolution also refers to the coasting trade, and at present the coasting trade means a voyage between any port or place on the eastern coast of Canada or to Newfoundland, Labrador, St. Pierre or Miquelon, and along the American coast as far south as Cape Hatteras. A few years ago the coasting trade extended as far as the most southerly point of South America, but it is now restricted to Cape Hatteras. The chief reason which induces me to say that I am not prepared to give my adherence to this Bill is that in the maritime provinces it is almost impossible to obtain officers or men for our ships. Since the opening of parliament I myself have had three requests from my own constituents asking me to obtain from the Customs Department permission for vessels to sail from the port of landing without mates, because they were unable to get them. They made an honest effort to get mates, but they could not succeed. I know of the case of one brigantine which lay at Bridgewater, Lunenburg County, bound for South America, and in all the maritime provinces she could not obtain a qualified mate. I am aware of several other cases of the same kind. It is now impossible, and it has been impossible for years, to secure the requisite number of mates in the maritime provinces. Of course, the passing of this Bill may not make matters any worse in that respect, but still it is in the nature of a restriction. and while in the maritime provinces I have found a great deal of sympathy for the prinicple which my hon. friend has in mind, still the shipping men there are opposed to any idea of that kind. As a matter of fact, Canadian ships on the Atlantic coast are not manned by Canadians. I cannot tell the reason why, but it is a fact that a large majority of our mates and the great majority of our seamen are not Canadians, and consequently we are not troubled with any competition from the United States whatever. Upon the ground that it tends towards restriction and intensifies the present difficulties on the Atlantic seacoast, and particularly as it refers to the coasting trade, including trade on the River St. Lawrence with eastern Atlantic points, I desire to say that I will vote against this measure, notwithstanding that I have some sympathy with the principle of it.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Mr. Speaker, the question which is now before the House is of some importance, for several reasons. I may say at first that I have found in the administration of the Canada Shipping Act that certain changes have been made from time to time which were not according to the general economy of the law, and I am afraid that the legislation now proposed by my hon. friend involves one more of those exceptions which should be considered very fully before they are adopted. We have two sections of the Canada Shipping Act referring to the matter dealt with by the Bill of my hon. friend, one in regard to the inland waters, coasting voyage and minor waters, and the other concerning 75, which are exactly the same. They provide that persons, to pass the examination for masters or mates, must be British subjects, or have been domiciled in Canada for three years. Perhaps it would be as well for me to read the sections :

74. Examinations may be instituted in Canada for British subjects, or for persons domiciled in Canada for at least three years, who intend to become masters or mates or second mates of sea-going ships, or who wish to procure the certificates of competency for sea-going ships.

75. Examinations may be instituted in Canada for British subjects, or for persons domiciled in Canada for at least three years, who intend to become masters or mates of ships trading on the inland waters of Canada, or on the minor waters of Canada, or on coasting voyages, or who wish to procure certificates of competency or service.

I have not been able to ascertain why we have two such exactly similar clauses in our legislation ; but it is probably due to the fact that amendments have occasionally been made in parliament, one amendment dealing with one subject, and another dealing with another subject, without their relation to the general provisions of the Act being fully considered.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. In the revision of the Statutes why was not that rectified?

Mr. BRODEUR. It could not be rectified, because the commissioners who revised the statutes had to follow as much as possible the old statutes. But I may say that I have been giving some consideration to this matter, and some day, when I have time, I will take up the question of having a shipping Act which will hold together. The present Act has in different parts various definitions of the same terms. There is no reason why the word vessel, for instance, should be defined in different ways in five or six different parts. This renders the administration and interpretation of the law somewhat difficult. As we see by these two sections, in order to become a master or mate, a man has to be a British subject or to be domiciled in Canada for three years. My hon. friend is proposing that in the case of inland or minor waters, on coasting voyages, the domiciliation clause should not apply. The question should then be put, why does my hon. friend confine his provision to the inland waters or minor waters ? If the principle is good in one case, why should it not be good in the other ? If it is advisable—I do not say that it is—that the domiciliation clause should be struck out with regard to the minor waters or inland waters, why should it apply to sea-going ships ?

Mr. LANCASTER. My reason is that I do not know the evil in sea-going ships as I do in others ; and, secondly, if the evil does exist, there can be no harm in applying the principle to that part of the country in regard to which it can legislate. The men affected by my amendment would undoubtedly be British subjects because they are Canadians, and would be working in the country that they would be subjects of. There is that distinction between the two classes. The one class of men are roaming all over the world on seagoing vessels ; the other class are living in Canada, and there is much more likelihood of their being British subjects, because they are working at home in a British country.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not agree with my hon. friend. A British subject does not mean necessarily a man living in Canada. He may be a person from India, or a man living in the British isles or in other part of the world which is the British Empire.

Mr. LANCASTER. But this is to apply to the man who earns his livelihood in Canada, no matter where it is.

Mr. BRODEUR. Why should we make a distinction between a man on a coasting voyage and a man on a seagoing ship ?

Mr. LANCASTER. The principle is the same, but the evil is not so bad.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know about that. For what reason do we require our ships to be manned by British subjects ? Because sometimes, in case of war, for instance, they might be requisitioned for, and the class of vessels that will most necessarily be requisitioned for purposes of warfare will be sea-going ships.

Mr. LANCASTER. It would depend on what nation the war was with. It would not be seagoing ships, if we were at war with the United States.

Mr. BRODEUR. In that case would it not be advisable that the vessels should have British captains ?

Mr. LANCASTER. I think so.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then it would be more important that the sea-going vessels should be under the command of officers who are British subjects. That is not what my hon. friend is proposing. He is proposing that the captain of a vessel, on a coasting voyage, should be a British subject, or a man who has lived in Canada three years before passing examination.

Mr. LANCASTER. That he must be a British subject.

Mr. BRODEUR. At the same time he is leaving out of the question the man who, in case of difficulty with some foreign government or in case of war, is in command of a ship which might be most likely requisitioned in such a case. My hon. friend is not logical. We should have a principle applicable to all cases, and not only to a special part of the country. That would be my idea.

Mr. LANCASTER. I agree to that.

Mr. BRODEUR. If we are to change the law, we should make the change of general application and not one which simply affects some part of the country. My hon. friend's proposition would render the application of the law very difficult. I have no desire to question his figures. Perhaps this is not the time to do so, but the evil on the inland waters is not so serious as he imagines. He remembers, no doubt, the evidence taken last year and the year before by the special

committee to which his Bill was referred. There it was shown that in the last twelve years we issued certificates to 3,659 people on coasting, inland and minor waters. Out of that number only 79 were issued to people domiciled in Canada for three years, and out of those 79, only 14 were Americans. So that the situation is not so serious as my hon. friend claims. Another point to which I would draw his attention is this. Is he sure that we have the right to legislate in the way he proposes? The British Merchants' Shipping Acts of 1854 and 1894 deal with this question, and I might quote to my hon. friend from Abbott on 'Merchant Ships and Seamen.' There it is said :

It is also enacted that where the legislature of a British possession provides for the examination of and the grant of certificates to masters, mates and engineers, and the Board of Trade report that such examination as efficient as those in the United Kingdom, and that such certificates are granted on the like conditions as those under the Act, Her Majesty may by order in council, declare that such certificates are of the same force as if granted under the Act, and apply the provisions of the Act thereto.

Last year a Bill, which, I understand, has been amended in the House of Lords, was introduced by Mr. Lloyd George, President of the Board of Trade, in the House of Commons, and that Bill did not go so far as my hon. friend proposes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How far did it go?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not the Bill before me, but the note I have here is this : That on the 20th of March, 1906, the Hon. Lloyd George moved the second reading of a Bill prohibiting the engagement in British vessels of seamen with an insufficient knowledge of English. That is the only restriction. I do not think there is any restriction regarding masters and mates. Of course, the masters and mates have to pass an examination in English, but it was not provided that they should be British subjects.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman say that we cannot provide that they shall be British subjects?

Mr. BRODEUR. I question whether we can.

Mr. LANCASTER. Where is our want of jurisdiction?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have just quoted the clause of the British Merchants' Shipping Act of 1894, which provides that the British Board of Trade will examine our certificates, and if they find that our legislation clashes with theirs, they have a right to refuse assent to it. Suppose we pass legislation here which will be in contravention of that passed by the British parliament, and suppose an American goes before the British Board of Trade and passes his examination, he will be entitled to come here.

Mr. LANCASTER. Not on the inland waters of Canada.

Mr. BERGERON. On all British ships.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if we have not just as much jurisdiction to require that a person seeking examination shall be a British subject as that he shall be domiciled for three years in Canada?

Mr. BRODEUR. That Bill was submitted to the British parliament after it was passed and was assented to by the British authorities. But since then the British parliament has passed the new Act of 1894, which differs from the one we passed, and the British parliament has declared that its legislation shall apply to all British possessions. Can we repeal legislation with regard to Canada which has been passed by the British parliament? If the British authorities issue certificates, would not the holders of those certificates be entitled to take command of a British vessel here? Suppose an American passes his examination before the British Board of Trade, would he not be entitled to command any British ship? He passes his examination. Would he not be entitled to command any British ship?—because our ships are British ships. That is the situation that presents itself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The logical conclusion of that would be that our present enactment with regard to domicile may have been repealed by the parliament under the legislation in 1894.

Mr. BRODEUR. That may be.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should think it desirable for us to ascertain our situation with regard to that.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is precisely the position. The Deputy Minister of Justice, with whom I have discussed this matter, has great doubt whether many of the sections of our Shipping Act are in force. The British Merchant Shipping Act of 1854 was being applied to all British possessions. In 1867, by the British North America Act we were given the power to legislate with regard to navigation and shipping. We passed legislation from year to year, but all of that legislation, I think, was reserved for the assent of the British authorities. In England, also, they changed the law of 1854 from year to year. Consequently, the law did not at all agree, in some respects, with our revised statutes. The British parliament, in 1894, passed new legislation, repealing the Act of 1854. This Act of 1894 is different in many respects from our legislation. But this Act of 1894 also has been declared in some parts to apply to the British possessions. What about these clauses involving differences ? It is a most difficult and serious question, and one which, so far as I have been able to ascer-

tain, has never been decided by the courts here. My intention is to deal with this matter. I had intended to deal with the particular case to which the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) refers in a Bill to be presented this session. I will not say that I will adopt absolutely the principle laid down by the hon. member in this Bill. I think I will proceed in a different way, but, perhaps it will reach the end he has in view. But, before legislation is adopted, it will probably be necessary to refer it to the British authorities in order to have their assent. I am afraid that, owing to the conflict of certain provisions of the law, we have not the power to deal with the matter in the way proposed by my hon. friend. I have no objection to the Bill going before a committee under the circumstances. But I do not accept absolutely the principle of the Bill. I intend to introduce this session a Bill dealing with the clauses to which I have just referred.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough). If I understand the Bill, a foreigner would be practically shut out from becoming master of a Canadian ship. The present law provides that examinations may be instituted in Canada for British subjects or persons domiciled in Canada for at least three years who intend to become masters or mates of ships on the inland waters of Canada or on the minor waters of Canada, or on coasting voyages, or who wish to secure certificates of competency of service. That is, a foreigner domiciled for three years in Canada, if he can pass the examination, can obtain a Canadian certificate. But it is proposed by the present Bill to repeal the second subsection, which reads :

> Foreign subjects serving in ships registered in Canada, and trading on the inland waters of Canada, or on the minor waters of Canada, or on coasting waters of Canada shall be deemed to be domiciled in Canada while so serving.

Under the existing law a foreigner serving on a Canadian ship for three years is entitled, at the end of that time, to go up for his papers and become a British subject if he wishes. But, if you repeal this clause, a foreigner who wishes to become a master of a Canadian ship, must abandon his business as a sailor and come to Canada and live for three years to become naturalized as a British subject. That seems to be absurd.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not quite understand the difficulty.

Mr. SINCLAIR. At present, service in a British ship counts for residence in Canada. At the end of three years, the foreigner who has served on a British ship can become naturalized, because, as we all know, three years' residence is required for naturalization. But, the repealing of this clause would deprive him of the opportunity of putting in his term of residence by serving on a Canadian ship. Therefore, there would be no way for him, if he wished to become a master of one of our ships, except to give up his business as a sailor, and live on land in Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If he is domiciled in Canada for three years, why should not he be naturalized ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. But how is he to obtain his domicile if he is obliged to give up his business ? A sailor may serve all his life on Canadian ships, but can never become domiciled.

Mr. LANCASTER. We do not require service from a man to qualify. He has to become a British subject.

Mr. SNCLAIR. And that requires three years' residence in Canada.

Mr. LANCASTER. Well, why should he have a special privilege ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. But, under the present law, he is counted as residing in Canada while serving on a British ship, and we are striking that out. But, apart from this, I think the Bill is undesirable. Of course, we all accept the principle of a preference for Canadians ; but, as the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) says, this is imposing another restriction that will prevent our obtaining men to man our ships. I fear also it will be a cause of some irritation with our friends across the border. Many of the men of the province from which I come are employed in the service of ships in the United States. I believe that the majority of the captains of the fleet that sails out of Gloucester are Canadians. I am told also that many of them manage to get their certificates without actually becoming American citizens. There seems to be some method in the United States by which a man when he declares his intention to become an American citizen can after passing the required examinations obtain a certificate to serve on board an American ship. If that is true it is an evasion of the law; but time after time I have met men who are serving as masters of American vessels and who are still Canadian subjects, I have seen them come up at election times and take the oath, that they are Canadian subjects while they were acting as captains on board of American vessels. The statement they always made was that by declaring their intention to become American citizens they were allowed to go up for examination and obtain the American certificate. In the maritime provinces there is a very large number of men who are masters of American vessels and I do not think I have ever heard of a single American who has come over and taken charge of a Canadian vessel. Consequently the question is of no importance to

the people of the maritime provinces so far as any invasion from the Americans is concerned ; the difficulty seems to be altogether in the uper lakes. If it is necessary to have some regulation on the uper lakes, I would ask the House to confine the legislation in such a way that it would not apply to the maritime provinces.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On the constitutional aspect of the question referred to by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) it is undoubtedly true that the British North America Act gives to the parliament of Canada power exclusively to make laws with regard to certain subjects which would include the subject now engaging our attention, so far as the inland waters of Canada are concerned. There has been a great deal of debate as to the effect of that word 'exclusively' having regard to the Colonial Laws Validity Act of 1865, and I can well understand that as the imperial parliament has since 1867 amended the laws with regard to merchant shipping and expressly declared that those laws so amended shall apply to all possessions throughout the empire, the doubt suggested by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries does certainly exist. It will be impossible for any one at short notice, or indeed perhaps after very considerable study, to attempt to solve that doubt. Perhaps it can only be solved by a reference to the courts and a determination by the courts, but it does seem of very great importance that we should know, in respect of enactments of this parliament concerning merchant shipping, whether or not they have been, in whole or in part, repealed by any recent enactments of the imperial parliament, and I would think it might very well be the duty of the government to take that matter into immediate consideration, and, if necessary, state a case, as they have power to do, for the opinion of the Supreme Court, in order that we may have that matter determined. Of course, another and possibly a better alternative is to examine the amendments effected by imperial legislation in regard to merchant shipping in Canada, to ascertain in what respects, if any, those amendments differ from our own legislation on the subject, and to determine, in the first place, whether there would be any practical difficulty or danger in bringing our own enactments into exact harmony with those of the imperial parliament. I suppose that would be the first consideration of all ; but if that harmony should not come to pass after the necessary examination and consideration by parliament, then it seems to me it would be undoubtedly in the public interest that we should know as soon as possible whether or not the imperial enactment does, pro tanto, repeal the British North America Act and take away our power to deal with these matters by our own legislation.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the reference of which my hon. friend speaks would be with regard to some statutes which might affect the provinces. I do not know that we would have the right to refer to the Supreme Court the interpretation of a statute which might affect the legislation of Great Britain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The point is whether or not we would have the right to submit to the Supreme Court the determination of a question which involves the construction of a statute of the imperial parliament.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think there would be doubt about that ; we would not have the right to refer an imperial statute to the Supreme Court ; we would have to refer some clause of our own Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I asked whether or not the hon. gentleman's doubt related to our right to refer to the Supreme Court of Canada the question whether or not our own statutes respecting merchant shipping had been repealed by an imperial Act. The doubt would arise, of course, for the reason that in doing so our courts would necessarily be obliged to construct an Act of the imperial parliament. It might be that a reference involving the construction of such an Act would not be within the meaning of the Act authorizing such references. Was there some further question with regard to provincial laws?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no doubt that under the statute which has been passed concerning these references to the Supreme Court we have the right to obtain determination by the Supreme Court of the question of the validity of these provincial Acts or of Dominion statutes in their relation to provincial legislation ; but I would doubt very seriously whether it would be advisable that the Supreme Court should be called upon to decide as to the validity of a statute which would involve the consideration of the validity of a statute passed by the British parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is exactly what I meant ; because the validity of our own statute depends on the construction of an imperial statute, therefore we may not have the right to refer the question to the Supreme Court. I quite understand a doubt as to that. It might prevent the adoption of the course to which I have referred, in which case some other remedy would have to be found.

Mr. BRODEUR. It could perhaps be referred to the Privy Council.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It could be referred to the Privy Council. But it seems to me the first consideration would be to determine whether or not we could bring our own enactments into harmony with the amendments passed by the imperial parliament. If we could do that, there is no need of referring any question ; if we cannot,

that question must be met in some other way.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Then you would have to be constantly comparing your Acts with those of the imperial parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, I would think in matters of this kind it would be the duty of the imperial parliament always to consult the government of Canada with respect to any amendments which concern this country. Constitutional writers, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and every lawyer in the House who has paid attention to constitutional law knows, affirm that there is a vast difference between the legal power to pass a statute or to perform a legislative Act and the constitutional right to do it. The King in Great Britain, as part of the imperial parliament, has the technical right, the legal power to disallow any statute of Great Britain. That power has not been exercised in Great Britain since the reign of Queen Anne, and it may be said to have fallen into desuetude. Other instances could be given but it is not necessary to do so. While the imperial parliament has the absolute technical right to repeal the British North America Act, pro tanto, in respect to legislation affecting this country, I would respectfully submit that it has not the constitutional right to do so, without first consulting the government of this country and ascertaining whether or not the proposed legislation will meet and fulfil the wants and requirements of the people of Canada; so I think it might well be stated to the imperial government that in respect of any proposed future amendments of the Merchant Shipping Act which concern or affect this country the government and parliament of Canada ought to be consulted in the first place before bringing about any such state of confusion as that which apparently does exist at the present moment. I would suggest that a respectful despatch along those lines would possibly prevent instances of this confusion being brought to our attention in future. The parliament of Great Britain gave this parliament, by the terms of the British North America Act, power exclusively to make laws with respect to this particular subject. That word 'exclusively' has been construed by some authorities as relating to the distinction between Dominion jurisdiction and provincial jurisdiction. Other authorities have construed it more widely. Whether that be the case or not, it is certainly only constitutionally right that we should be consulted before any Acts of the imperial parliament are passed which conflict with the opinion of the people of this country as expressed in their parliamentary enactments in regard to legislation of this kind affecting the inland waters of Canada.

Mr. LANCASTER. If no other hon. member wishes to say anything on this motion

I want to refer to a couple of points which were mentioned by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur). In regard to the number of persons who would be affected by this legislation he gave some statistics, and I wish to draw his attention and that of the House to the fact that the information in which these statistics are based has not quite the effect that one might suppose and perhaps the minister did not think of it in making his statement. The statistics stated how many were British subjects and how many were American citizens who had been certified by the officers of the department to the committee as having registered at the time they obtained their certificates, but the department did not say how many of these latter had since foresworn their allegiance to the King had gone from Canada, had become American citizens, had ceased to be British subjects and had obtained certificates in the United States. Nevertheless that applies to a great many of the figures that the hon. gentleman gave.

Mr. BRODEUR. If my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) will permit me to call his attention to this fact I will point out to him that this Bill does not provide for persons who, under the domiciliation clauses, have been permitted to pass the examination, have gone to the United States, taken their certificates, become American citizens and who continue to act as officers of Canadian ships. The Bill of my hon. friend would not interfere with this class of persons.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am not trying to interfere with what has already been done. I am trying to stop an evil. I do not want to take away what a man has obtained under the laws of the land, but I am trying to stop that evil before it becomes worse. Does my hon. friend want me to take away the certificate of a man who has obtained it properly under the law of the land? It was our fault not his. He had the right to get what he could under the law of the land as long as he did not break the law. But when the hon. gentleman acknowledges that this evil exists I do not see any reason why we should distinctly say that we will allow the evil to continue to exist for want of legislation to restrict it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether my hon. friend has caught my point or not. Suppose this Bill were to pass as it is drafted there, it would not prevent a man who is a British subject coming and passing his examination before the department, then going to the United States, becoming an American citizen, passing his examination there, coming back to Canada and becoming a master or mate of a British vessel.

Mr. LANCASTER. Not if the hon. gentleman is going to stick to what he did two years ago when he defeated my Bill in

regard to regulations to stop that. The hon. gentleman said that it was a matter of regulation and I gave in to him. Now, if the hon. gentleman is going to say that he is not going to make regulations to carry out the law what he says will be so. I was told two years ago that I should not meddle with the regulations, and that whatever provision was necessary for seeing that these people should conform to the law was a matter of regulation. I do not think I am asking too much now of my hon. friend if I ask him to make regulations to properly carry out the spirit of the law. One regulation would be that if a man does what he now suggests he shall forfeit the certificate issued to him. I think that is a proper regulation and one which might be made by the hon. gentleman. Of course, if it is to be a matter of statute I would certainly amend the statute so as to make provision to put a stop to that evil. Then I would be doing just what I was told two years ago by the hon. gentleman and others I ought not to do; that is, to do nothing more than to declare what the law should be and to leave it to the department to make regulations to carry out that law. That is all I have to say on that point.

Now, just one word as to the trouble which my hon. friend may see by a conflict of authority with imperial Acts. I wish to say that it seems to me that is altogether removed as far as my Bill relates to the inland and minor waters of Canada. I cannot see that there is any question of our right to deal with the inland or minor waters of Canada. There may possibly be some question of our right to deal with coasting voyages. Possibly my hon. friend's objection would apply to my Bill as far as it deals with coasting voyages. But I cannot see how there can be any conflict of jurisdiction as between Great Britain and ourselves in regard to the inland minor and inland waters of Canada. We surely have the right to legislate with respect to those waters. There is nothing in the British Shipping Act as I understand it, and I have read it several times—not as quoted in Abbot on Shipping—which indicates to me that there is any conflict of authority in so far as we are keeping within our own Canadian territory, and are confining ourselves to our minor and inland waters. I admit that the Bill as at present drawn covers coasting voyages, but in committee if that is stricken out the objection of my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), of my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) and of the minister as to conflict of jurisdiction would be entirely done away with. If the principle is a good one, I think it should apply to everything, but I am not meddling with sea-going vessels or coasting voyages because they are not so much our business as the matter at which this Bill is more particularly aimed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. BRODEUR. I announced on the second reading of the Bill that I intend to bring in a Bill this session dealing with the question. This Bill, as I have already pointed out, will not cover only this particular case, but will be a Bill of a general nature. I might add also that my hon. friend's Bill will have no effect because, in spite of what has been said by my hon. friend, I do not think we have absolute power to deal with this question. It would be perhaps interesting to hon. gentlemen to place on record the opinion sent to the department by the Deputy Minister of Justice on January the 27th last.

Mr. LANCASTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODEUR. It reads as follows:

Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 9th instant respecting the amendment of sections 95, 96, 97 and 98 of the Canadian Shipping Act so as to make it compulsory that all vessels, whether registered in Canada or not, shall carry certificated masters, &c., I have the honour to draw your attention to sections 735 and 736 of the Imperial Merchants Shipping Act of 1894. Upon reference to those sections it will be noted that the legislature of a British possession has no power to repeal wholly or in part any provisions relating to ships other than those registered in the possession, and the legislature has power to legislate with respect to the coasting trade, but in both cases imperial approval must be had.

Under these circumstances I do not think that Canada could pass an Act legislating with respect to British vessels other than those registered in Canada except as regulating the coasting trade, and that in that case imperial approval would have to be obtained before the Act went into force.

E. L. NEWCOMBE,
Deputy Minister.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What kind of imperial approval is required?

Mr. BRODEUR. Approval from the British authorities.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The British board of trade?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the Bill would have to be reserved for the assent of the Crown. Under these circumstances, and in view of the doubt as to our right to pass this Bill, I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) will not press it now. A Bill will be drafted by the Department of Justice which may probably deal with the question my hon. friend has raised, and we can leave his Bill in committee for the present.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then the minister will move that the committtee rise report progress and ask leave to sit again, so as

to leave my Bill in its present position on the Order Paper.

Mr. BRODEUR. That would be satisfactory. I move that the committee rise, report progres and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. LANCASTER. I might point out that the opinion of the Minister of Justice does not seem to deal with the principle propounded in my Bill.

Mr. BRODEUR. The principle is the same.

Mr. LANCASTER. It may be, but the opinion of the deputy Minister of Justice excepts these boats which are registered in Canada, and the vessels we are dealing with this Bill would require to be registered within Canada so that his opinion would not apply here. I do not understand the deputy minister to say we cannot deal with boats on inland waters that are registered in Canada; on the contrary he says we can deal with them. The boats which this Bill would apply to are all Canadian registered bottoms. If they are registered in the United States this Bill would not apply. Is not the opinion of the deputy Minister of Justice applicable only to other matters than those dealt with in my Bill ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Can the Minister of Marine say if the Bill which he proposes introducing refers to other matters than those dealt with in the Bill now before the committee.

Mr. BRODEUR. The Bill will be somewhat lengthy and will deal with many matters.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Can the minister give us a general idea of what subjects will be dealt with in this Bill.

Mr. BRODEUR. I cannot say offhand. I believe it will deal with pilotage, engineers, inspection of boilers, and deck-load line.

Mr. TAYLOR. And gasoline launches.

Mr. BRODEUR. Probably, yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would it not be complicated to deal with all these matters in the one Bill.

Mr. BRODEUR. They are all dealt with in the Canadian Shipping Act now and the Bill will be an amendment to that Act.

Mr. SPROULE. I once heard the late Sir Oliver Mowat say, when speaking on the question of provincial rights that it was always a good policy to pursue, if there was any doubt as to your power to legislate, to go on legislating and then let someone take exception to it if they wanted to. Perhaps the Minister of Marine could adopt that policy in this case.

Progress reported.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose the French treaty will be taken up to-morrow.

Mr. LANCASTER.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And after that supply ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Marine and Fisheries ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

The House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 13, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

KANANASKI FALLS WATER-POWER.

Mr. J. D. REID—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. Has the government granted to any person or corporation, rights in respect of the water-power known as Kananaski falls on the Bow river? If so, when, and to whom?
2. By whom is the land on both sides of the river for a quarter of a mile above and below the falls at present owned, and how was same acquired?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. No. Negotiations are, however, pending with the Calgary Power and Transmission Company, Limited, for the purchase of 1,000 acres of land at Horse Shoe Falls, which has been duly surrendered by the Indians for the purpose of sale, and which sale is to be carried out on the terms and conditions specified by the Indians in the surrender.

2. The land on both sides of the river for a quarter of a mile below the falls is part of the Stony Indian reserve, held in trust for the Indians. The land for about 500 feet above the falls on both sides of the river also is part of the Stony Indian reserve held in trust for the Indians.

VENTILATION AT THE MINT.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM asked :

1. Have any complaints been made as to the lack of ventilation in the annealing department of the Royal Mint?
2. How many men are employed in this particular branch?
3. What changes, if any, have been made in the annealing staff since the Mint commenced business?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. No. I am advised that ample means are provided for ventilation in the annealing department. Occasionally, in stormy weather or after the furnace has been standing cold for some time, fumes from

the furnace have been driven into the room. This is a condition which may arise with any furnace. As soon as the flues become warm the fumes are drawn up.

2. Two.

3. One man has been discharged.

SALE OF INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. J. D. REID—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. Have any Indian lands in which the Canadian government has had ownership or interest been recently sold at or near New Westminster?

2. If so, when were said lands disposed of, to whom were they granted, what quantity, and for what consideration?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. No.

2. No.

DREDGING IN HOLLAND RIVER.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Who has acted as inspector for the Department of Railways and Canals in the dredging operations carried on by the Lake Simcoe Dredging Company on the Holland river on Trent Valley canal system, and what has been his remuneration?

2. If an inspector acted, upon whose recommendation was he appointed?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Dredging operation by the Lake Simcoe Dredging Company on the Holland river, Trent canal was looked after by the divisional engineer and his assistant.

2. Answered by No. 1.

CLOSED LEASES IN ALBERTA.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. How many closed leases have been granted in townships 12 to 19 in ranges 15 to 21, all numbers inclusive, west of the fourth meridian, in the province of Alberta?

2. What is the name of the grantee in each case, and (a) date of grant, (b) area of each grant, (c) the rent received in each case, (d) the date at which notice was given to the government agent not to accept entries, and date of receipt of notice by agent in each case?

3. What land within the general boundaries of these leases have been disposed of in any way before receipt of such notices by the agent, and the names of the parties to whom they were disposed of or allotted?

4. Have any protests or complaints against the granting of these leases, or the action of the department in reference thereto, been received? If so, from whom and on what general grounds?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). If by 'closed leases' is meant leases granted for a period of twenty-one years with no provision for cancellation, none have been granted in the tract in question.

TIMBER LICENSES UNDER MACKENZIE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. How many applications for timber licenses were received by the government of Mr. Mackenzie, what area in square miles did they cover, how many licenses were issued and what area did they cover, and under how many of those licenses were operations actually carried on, and what area did these include?

2. How many applications for timber licenses were received by the government from November 1, 1878, to July 1, 1896, and what area in square miles did they cover, how many licenses were issued and what area did they cover, under how many of these licenses were operations actually carried on, and what area did they cover?

3. How many permits to cut lumber were given to applicants as above in leases where licenses had not issued during each of these periods?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I would ask that this should stand as a notice of motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of moton for return.

INVESTIGATION RE BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What was the amount of money expended for the investigation held by M. Dupuis, K.C., over William Charette, lockmaster on the Beauharnois canal?

2. Charette having been exonerated and reinstated to his position, is it the intention of the government to pay his salary, held over during his suspension?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. $578.60.

2. The decision of the minister was that he might be reinstated, but that under the circumstances he could not be paid his salary during the time of his suspension.

DREDGING INSPECTOR AT OWEN SOUND.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Was one Telford, of Owen Sound, engaged as a dredging inspector at Owen Sound during the summer of 1907? If so, what was his remuneration?

2. If so employed, what dredging work was he superintending, and who was owner of the same?

3. Who recommended the appointment of said Telford?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

The department had no dredging inspector at Owen Sound during the season of 1907 by the name of Mr. Telford.

Mr. Maxwell Telford was appointed inspector of the revetment wall at Owen Sound ; salary $3.50 per day.

Mr. BENNETT. I beg to call the attention of the Prime Minister to part 3 of question 14 which has not been answered.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It would not be in accordance with the practice of the department to give the names of the parties who made the recommendation.

OWEN SOUND PUBLIC BUILDING.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Has the Department of Public Works decided to add a third story to the public building being erected at Owen Sound?
2. If so, were tenders called for same?
3. If not, who has contracted to perform the whole or different parts thereof?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works) :

1, 2 and 3. The matter is under consideration ; plans are now being prepared to ascertain the cost of an additional story.

BUILDING INSPECTOR AT OWEN SOUND.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Was a Mr. Forster appointed clerk of the works or inspector of a public building being erected at Owen Sound at any time?
2. If appointed, how long did he act, and were his services dispensed with? If so, why?
3. If dispensed with, who was appointed his successor, and on whose recommendation?
4. On whose recommendation were Forster's services dispensed with?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works) :

1. Messrs. Forster and Clark were appointed supervising architects for the Owen Sound public building.

2, 3 and 4. Appointment made April 5, 1907 ; still acting.

BUILDING CONTRACT AT OWEN SOUND.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Was one Leslie contractor for the public building being erected at Owen Sound?
2. Did said Leslie sublet the carpenter work thereof to one John L. Clark, to the knowledge of the Department of Public Works?
3. Was there a term in the contract permitting such subletting?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works). No.

THE OFFICE SPECIALTY COMPANY.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

What quantity or quantities of goods or supplies have been furnished by the Office Specialty Company to the Dominion of Canada in every department of the service since 1896, and what was the total amounts for each year?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). This should be a matter for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

DREDGING DURING 1907.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

Was dredging executed during the season of 1907 at the following places:—Bécancour, Blanche Shoals, Dorion, Hay island, Maskinongé, Point Cavaquole, Raquette river, River Jesus, and St. Placide? If so, by whom ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works) :

Dredging was executed during the season of 1907 at the following places :

Bécancour, by Turcotte and Dufresne.
Blanche shoals, by T. F. Moore & Co.
Dorion, by L. Cohen & Son.
Hay Island, by General Construction Co.
Maskinongé, by L. Cohen & Son.
Point Cavagnale, by L. Cohen & Son.
Raquette river, by L. Cohen & Son.
River Jesus, by General Construction Co.
St. Placide, by L. Cohen & Son.

POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

On the orders of the day being called :

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Mr. Speaker, I would like the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) to make some explanation in regard to the re-arrangement of postal rates on newspapers and to give us a statement as to whether weeklies and semi-weeklies will be included in the re-arrangement.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). Mr. Speaker, I intended to give an explanation at the sitting of the House to-morrow in regard to the question. I am waiting for one of the documents which is missing just now in the department but I will be in a position to make a statement to-morrow.

DISTRIBUTION OF SEED GRAIN IN THE NORTHWEST—APPOINTMENT OF MR. R. E. A. LEECH.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) a question and in order to do so I will read a despatch that appears in to-day's 'Montreal Gazette' :

Seed grain loans—R. E. A. Leech, of Thin Red Line fame, to superintend the work—Distribution in March—Mr. Leech expects over 25,000 applications—Railways to assist in the work.

Regina, Sask., February 12.—(Special.)—R. E. A. Leech, the Liberal politician who was involved in the Thin Red Line outrage, has arrived in the city to superintend the work of the seed grain loans, to be made by the Dominion government. Offices have been taken, and a staff of forty will be engaged for the next three months. Included in the staff will be a grain accountant from Winni-

peg and an accountant from Ottawa, and a clerk from each Dominion land office in the two provinces. Leech states that from 25,000 to 50,000 applications for seed grain are looked for. Actual distribution is expected to commence early in March, and the government estimates the following amount of grain will be handled :

Then he goes on to give the amounts for the two provinces. The despatch continues :

The railways will assist in the work by giving special rates for transportation and letting the local agents distribute the grain to the applicants and receive the necessary lien notes. The grain will be purchased under the supervision of Grain Inspector Horn and his assistants, and cleaned and bagged in Winnipeg and at other points where adequate cleaning facilities exist. With regard to the oats, Leech states that it will be necessary to import 500,000 bushels from the States and the Old Country, and steps are already being taken to that end.

I would like to ask the minister if this despatch in the main is correct and if Mr. Leech is the officer who will be in charge of the distribution or will he be connected with it in any way ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). To a very large extent the despatch is correct. If I am in order, Mr. Speaker, I will make a statement in this connection.

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that the practice seems to be growing up of introducing and discussing matters of this sort at some length. A question is permitted at this time but not the introduction of matters that will lead to a discussion.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I read the dispatch in order to get the question in proper form and I am sure that the minister will not object to giving an answer.

Mr. OLIVER. The answer is that the despatch, in the main, as far as I can gather, is correct.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the Minister of the Interior if the despatch is correct in reference to the man Leech ?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Leech is employed in that connection.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the matter with Wagner ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that there is anything the matter with Wagner.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I beg to call the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to the fact that a return was ordered on January 13 and another on January 20 with respect to the appointment of immigration agents and also with respect to the certificates appertaining to West Kent. I will be obliged if the minister will bring down these returns as soon as possible. I see that a return appertaining to the same subject, asked for a few days afterwards by an hon. member on the other side of the House, has been brought down.

Mr. OLIVER. The returns are being prepared with all possible expedition.

Mr. BARKER. I wish to call the attention of the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to a return that was ordered three weeks ago—on the 22nd of January—relating to Mr. Haney and the Hillsborough bridge. This information is urgently wanted and I would like to have the return made.

Mr. GRAHAM. That return is being prepared just now as rapidly as possible. The order must have passed when I was not in the House and it escaped my mind altogether. We have had to get the information from different parts and it has taken some time.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) when the return was ordered about the middle of December in regard to the food supplied to the militia will be brought before the House.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think the return is about ready. It is a voluminous return and required correspondence with every part of the Dominion almost. I think it will be ready in a day or two.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to an order for a return dated the 11th December, appertaining to the Meat Inspection Act. If this is going to be too voluminous I would not object to having that portion brought down which has reference to the riding which I have the honour to represent.

Mr. FISHER. I will look into the matter and if that is necessary I will inform the hon. gentleman.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when the several measures mentioned in the speech from the Throne will be brought down—one relating to telegraph and telephone companies and another relating to the boundaries of Manitoba. I already asked about that on a previous occasion. There is also the Bill respecting government annuities for the aged and the Bill to amend the Election Act. The other two that were mentioned in the speech from the Throne have been brought before the House—the Bills to amend the

Insurance Act and the Dominion Lands Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Bill with regard to telegraphs and telephones is about ready and it is to be introduced, I believe, next week. The Election Bill is about ready and will be introduced at an early date. The Bill on annuities has been on the Order Paper for some time. Perhaps my hon. friend the Minister of Finance can give us some information about that.

Mr. FIELDING. I expect to give notice of it on Monday.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In regard to the boundaries of Manitoba, my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) is aware that the legislature of Manitoba has laid before the House a petition in which the position they had taken previously is considerably altered in regard to that and other matters, and I am not aware when the Bill may be brought down but it may be expected at no distant day.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. FOSTER. What about thte Civil Service Commission report ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not been able to get any later information in regard to it. The chairman of the commission communicated indirectly with me a short time ago and said that it had been delayed. I will stir them up again.

Mr. FOSTER. Is their pay going on ?

Mr. FIELDING. I hope so ; I would not like to see men working and not getting paid.

THE QUEBEC BRIDGE COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any further information as to the report of the Quebec Bridge Commission ?

Mr. GRAHAM. We expect that very soon, but reports of commissions seem to be things that you cannot really push any faster than the natural order of things.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We expected that they would be through a month ago.

Mr. GRAHAM. So did we.

SUPPLY—PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I desire to call attention to the improper and unseemly use which is being made of federal government patronage for the purpose of influencing the provincial elections which are now in progress in the province of New Brunswick. I regret very much that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) is not present in his seat and that he has deemed it to be his duty to abandon his important post at this time, to leave this House while in session, to engage in a provincial electioneering contest and to exercise all the power that he has as a member of this government in order to save from defeat an administration what has long since outlived its usefulness. It is well known, Mr. Speaker, that when the Hon. Wm. Pugsley ceased his exploitation of the government of New Brunswick a few months ago to turn his attention to the larger opportunities which this government affords, that he left in that province a government so throughly discredited that very few who had formerly supported it would give it any countenance, and that men of capacity and reputation could not be induced to join it. Liberals and Conservatives alike I may say, who before the Pugsley domination and resultant demoralization gave that government a hearty support, turned away from it in reproach. The government which the Minister of Public Works handed over to Mr. Robinson, therefore found itself in great difficulty. In the first place the office of Attorney General which the Minister of Public Works vacated was hawked about the province from county to county and declined, so that in the end and after a hunt of 151 days it required the intervention of the Minister of Public Works to fill that cabinet vacancy. The result was that the Hon. Mr. McKeown who I may say, as a member of the legislature, some years previously signed a memorial and carried it to the lieutenant governor of that province containing three specific charges of malfeasance in office against the Minister of Public Works while holding the position of Solicitor General of that province, was induced to accept.

Mr. BENNETT. What were they ?

Mr. CROCKET. Mr. McKeown finally accepted the position of Attorney General, and it was a matter of general comment that the office of Attorney General with the prospect of so short a tenure was not sufficient to procure his acceptance, but that the intervention of the Minister of Public Works was necessary and that there was required in addition to the office an assurance of federal provision for Mr. McKeown in case of the inevitable defeat that the government of New Brunswick is up against at the prsent time. Now, it is not only with respect to Mr. McKeown that the patronage of this government has been used, but in order to provide the attorney general with a constituency it was necessary to procure a vacancy in the representation in the local House. The Hon. Mr. McKeown did not dare to face the elec-

torate in his home and natural constituency but sought election in the county of St. John—a constituency which I may say was carved out some years ago for the express purpose of creating two safe seats for the government of that province. Doctor Ruddick, member of provincial parliament, was therefore appointed to a lucrative position under this government for the particular purpose of creating a vacancy for Mr. McKeown in that province.

Mr. FOSTER. What did he get ?

Mr. CROCKET. I believe he was appointed quarantine officer at the port of St. John at a salary of $1,800. Having completed the government in that way, the administration then found itself up against another difficulty. They had held on to office until the statutory term had practically expired so that a few weeks ago they found it necessary to prepare for the general elections and to issue the writs. Having done that they encountered further difficulties. So discredited was the government, so discredited had the Minister of Public Works left the government of that province, that it was impossible to procure candidates to stand for their unpopular cause in many of the constituencies of the province. Then again, the patronage of this government was called into play. Although in the last House the government held three seats in the city of St. John, it was found necessary, according to the open and public statements made in the press, in order to secure a ticket in that constituency to offer another federal office. It has been stated openly that Mayor Sears of the city of St. John is slated for the position of postmaster of St. John. In that connection I will read the following from the columns of the St. John 'Telegraph,' the leading newspaper in the province of New Brunswick, published in its issue of Friday, January the 31st :

The ticket and the bargain.

The nomination made by the government party in this constituency last evening represents a transaction in politics which all the right thinking people of this city should be quick to resent and to rebuke. Mayor Sears has repeatedly denounced the local government and said that he did not want a nomination, that he did not want to go to the legislature, but that he did want to be postmaster. He has said that he would not become a candidate unless he had satisfactory assurance that he would be made postmaster.

Notwithstanding that those were the declarations which Mayor Sears made openly in the city of St. John, it is a fact that he afterward accepted nomination, and the statement is openly and publicly made that he did so upon the condition of receiving an assurance of appointment by the federal government to the postmastership of that city. It seems to me that this is a most objectionable practice upon the part of this or any other government.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does my hon. friend say that a candidate in New Brunswick has been promised that if he runs as a candidate in the local elections he will get the postmastership ?

Mr. CROCKET. I am saying that the public press in the city of St. John and throughout the province of New Brunswick has openly proclaimed this fact and that it is a matter of general comment throughout that province.

Mr. LEMIEUX. For the information of the hon. gentleman, and the information of the House and the country, I may say that there is no such promise and no hint has been given that any such promise will be made.

Mr. CROCKET. It is not necessary for Mayor Sears to have received his assurance from the Postmaster General.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Or from any one in the government.

Mr. CROCKET. Well, I think the Minister of Public Works is quite capable of looking after the interests of the party in that section of the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, not only in the city of St. John has this thing occurred, but in the county of York which I have the honour to represent in this House there has been a transaction, according to open and public statement, of a similar kind. Although the government held four seats in that constituency in the last legislature they found themselves in such a helpless condition that they could not within the borders of that constituency find four men to stand as their candidates. It was necessary therefore to go outside of the county of York and those who had charge of the provincial government campaign in that province went over to the county of Westmoreland and they brought from the town of Shediac the claims agent of the Intercolonial Railway, Mr. E. H. Allen. It has been known for some time that Mr. Allen had somewhat tired of that job and was anxious for promotion to something easier. He therefore would not accept nomination unless upon certain conditions, one of which was that he should receive a portfolio and become the Hon. Edward H. Allen. Another of these conditions, according to open and public statement—and this is in the mouths not only of the people of the city of Fredericton but throughout the whole length and breadth of the province ; that a supplemental condition was that in case of his defeat, which I may say is considered inevitable, that some provision shall also be made for him by this government and that the collectorship of the port of Fredericton should be held for him upon his

defeat as the government candidate in that constituency.

These are two flagrant instances of the most unseemly use of federal patronage for the purpose of influencing provincial politics. In the county of Kent also a federal government employee, Mr. W. D. Carter, who held the position of Indian agent at Richibucto, has been induced to resign his position to accept a nomination as provincial government candidate. Not only of these officials and of these promises of appointment do I complain but in the district of Queens and Sunbury at the present time we have the federal government candidate, Col. Maclean, going about in company with an engineer of the Public Works Department, looking for sites for wharfs and other public works, and endeavouring to turn this work to the account of the local government candidates in that constituency. It seems to me that this is not only improper, but a highly unseemly use of fedarl patronage. Not only, however, with reference to these matters, has this government offended in an endeavour to control the government of New Brunswick but we find, by reference to the Auditor General's Report, that members of the local legislature are regularly fed by this government in violation of the statutory law of the province. Mr. A. B. Copp, the local Liberal candidate in the county of Westmoreland, and the Liberal organizer for the province, is down in the Auditor General's Report for the year 1906-7 for $1,086 for services performed for a department of this government. Mr. Copp, is a lawyer. It seems that he was appointed a commissioner to investigate certain charges against Captain Pratt, of the steamer 'Curlew,' and that he received payments in two years, one payment of $200 in the year 1905-6, and the balance in the fiscal year which closed on the 31st of March last. These are the items as they appear in the Auditor General's Report:

Copp, A. B.: Expenses in conducting investigation re Capt. Pratt, travelling expenses, May 23 to August 1, 1906, $221.34; attendance at inquiry, 36 days at $25; making a report, $50; stenographer's fees, $35; witness' fees, $71.15; stationery, $3; telegrams and telephone messages, $6.20; less charged in 1905-6, $200; total, $1,086.69.

It is not my purpose at the present time to criticise with due or undue strictness the scale of remuneration which was fixed for Mr. Copp; although, in view of the ringing denunciation in which Mr. Copp and his fellow Liberals in the province of New Brunswick indulged in reference to the payments by a former Conservative government of men of eminence and reputation in this country for investigations into matters of the most vital concern to the people of this country at the rate of $10 a day, I think it is not amiss to say that the scale that has been fixed for my brother Copp has been rather liberal. But it is not in that aspect that I propose particularly to criticise this payment to Mr. Copp. It is, as I have said, because it is an express violation of the statute law of the province of New Brunswick as tending to the destruction of that principle of which our hon. friends on the other side of the House professed when in opposition to be the guardian angels. Section 10 of the Election Act of the province of New Brunswick provides that 'no person shall be eligible to be a candidate or capable of being elected or returned as a member to serve in the legislative assembly of this province, or capable to sit and vote therein,' who holds certain offices specified in this section, and concludes as follows:

And no person holding or accepting any office, commission or appointment in the service of the government of the Dominion of Canada, with a salary or emoluments directly or indirectly attached thereto, by whomsoever to be paid or allowed, or howsoever payable, shall be capable of being elected to, or of sitting or voting in, the legislative assembly, while holding such office, commission, or appointment.

Notwithstanding the explicit provision of that section, we have the printed record in the Auditor General's Report of this government's complicity in the violation of the statute law of New Brunswick. Mr. Copp has been a member of the local legislature of New Brunswick for the last five sessions, and sat in the House after receiving these payments in violation of that statute. He is standing now as a candidate in the county of Westmoreland. Section 20 of the same Act provides:

No person disqualified by this chapter, or by any other law, to be elected a member of the legislative assembly, shall sit or vote in the same while he remains under such disqualification. If any person by this chapter is made ineligible as a member of, or declared incapable of sitting or voting in the legislative assembly, sits or votes therein while he is so incapable or ineligible, he shall thereby forfeit the sum of $200 for every day on whch he so sits or votes.

How significant is it of the faithfulness of the Liberal party to the principles which they so loudly professed when in opposition, that they have appointed as their organizer in the province of New Brunswick, for the purpose of directing a campaign for the triumph of Liberal principles, Mr. A. B. Copp, who stands convicted by the public records of a violation of the statute law of the province with reference to the independence of parliament. Not only has Mr. Copp offended against the law in this regard, but so reckless has the administration of the government of New Brunswick become under the present Minister of Public Works that Mr. Copp's name has appear-

ed year after year openly in the Auditor General's Report as receiving large retainers from the provincial government for professional services performed for that government. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter which not only I and other members from the province of New Brunswick have a right to protest against, but which ought to receive the condemnation of this House. It is bad enough for us in the province of New Brunswick to recall the fact that under the administration of my right hon. friend the cabinet representation which that province enjoyed in the past has been cut in half; that he has refused to move in the direction of securing, not only to New Brunswick but to Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, the constitutional guaranty to which we are undoubtedly entitled against any further diminution of our representation here; that the right hon. gentleman and his government have appointed to the Senate, as representatives in that body from New Brunswick, two gentlemen who are known to be citizens of other provinces and therefore not qualified under the British North America Act to sit for New Brunswick. These things are bad enough but we have now to contemplate the fact that this government is undertaking to control the provincial and local affairs of New Brunswick by means of federal patronage. That is something which I apprehend the people of that province will not stand for at this time. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to take advantage of my position as a member of this House to enter my strongest protest in behalf of those whom I have the honour to represent, against this vicious practice.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend has travelled very far afield indeed to find a grievance against the Dominion government. He alleges that the federal government has promised two offices to two gentlemen in order to induce them to become candidates. The first allegation was with regard to Mr. Sears, who, he says, was promised the office of postmaster of the city of St. John if he would become a candidate. My hon. friend is taking altogether too seriously certain statements made in the press of St. John. I do not know the name of the newspaper, but the statement is altogether devoid of foundation.

Mr. CROCKET. Will the right hon. gentleman say that there is no intention whatever to appoint Mayor Sears to any office under this government?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. So far as I know and am concerned there is none whatever, and I have something to say in these matters. So far as I am aware, no promise or intimation of any kind has been made to Mr. Sears. The hon. gentleman has also told us that another gentleman whose name I could not catch was promised the office of customs officer at Fredericton. To this also I give the most unqualified denial. I never heard of it until this moment and there is not a shadow of truth in the statement.

Mr. CROCKET. It is true, is it not, that Dr. Roddick, of St. John, was appointed to the position of quarantine officer?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Perhaps, I do not know.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, he was appointed on the recommendation of friends in St. John.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). It is singular that although that appointment is made by this government, the Prime Minister has no knowledge of it. I have never been in a cabinet and do not know whether that is the usual practice or not, but I should suppose that the First Minister would have some knowledge of what is going on in the various departments.

Mr. FIELDING. Does the hon. gentleman think that the First Minister should remember the name of every officer appointed throughout Canada?

Mr. DANIEL. Not at all. I think that the matter which has been brought before this House by my colleague from York (Mr. Crocket) is one of extreme importance to the political welfare of our people. We are having now in the province of New Brunswick a general election for the provincial legislature. Every one who has given any study to the subject must have come to the conclusion that we shall never get really good government in this country except when the government of the Dominion and the local governments are on different sides of politics. Possibly the reason may be that when thieves fall out honest men come by their own. Evidently there must be some reason of that kind, although I am not making that reference in any offensive spirit, but we have found that it was not until the province of Ontario changed its government that we had any sort of attempt to look into the bribery and corruption which had taken place before the change of government in that province. I do not believe there is any one in this House who will refuse to acknowledge that there would not have been any attempt made to ferret out the frauds which were carried on unless there had been a change of government. So that it is very important that the Dominion government should keep its hands off local affairs. The Dominion government and this parliament have plenty to do looking after their own business. It is a menace to the welfare of the people to have the Dominion government and parliament interfering in the local affairs of the various provinces. The right hon. gentleman has said that Mr. Sears has no promise of the office of postmaster of the city of St. John.

I do not know what Mr. Sears, when he reads that to-morrow, will think about it. I think he will probably look up the Minister of Public Works, who I understand is down there, and want to know on whose word he can rely. There is no doubt about it. It is on every tongue.

Mr. Sears himself makes no secret about it at all. He says that he did not want to go into local politics but that what he wanted was office. He said openly that office was what he was after. There was a good deal of difficulty in persuading Mr. Sear to go on the local ticket; so that, though technically the First Minister may be absolutely correct in the statement he made, yet, notwithstanding that statement, it is only reasonable to suppose that the Minister of Public Works and Mr. Sears have a very good understanding regarding what will take place after the election. My hon. friend from York mentioned the case of Mr. Copp. Mr. Copp was a member of the local legislature. He was employed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries to undertake an investigation down there into the case of an official of that department. I notice that in the payments read out by my hon. friend, one includes so much for stenographer. It happened that I was near the place one day where the investigation was being held, and I went in and was present for a time during the proceedings. Mr. Copp had no stenographer. He took down—I was going to say he took down the evidence; he took down something, and after the examination of the witness was ended, the witness was asked to sign the paper without having had a single word of what was written thereon read over to him. This is the investigation for which Mr. Copp was paid $25 a day. I am not a lawyer, but I do not think it takes a lawyer to understand that to ask a man to sign a paper the contents of which he does not know, is not the way to conduct such an investigation. I am not saying that Mr. Copp put down anything he ought not to have put down; but to safeguard his own position, I think the least he could have done would be what is done by others in judicial or quasi-judicial position—read over the statement to the witness before asking him to sign.

And then, we have Mr. Hugh McLean. He is a candidate for this House in Sunbury and Queens. According to the press of New Brunswick, Mr. McLean is in a position to cause seven new post offices to be established in Sunbury and Queens within the last week or two. I do not know whether he had any authority from the Postmaster General to offer post offices there. It may be the post offices were needed, and if so I make no complaints at their being opened, and probably some of them should have been established before. But it would appear that it is only necessary for a federal candidate to come along at a time when a local election is on to have these post offices established for no other purpose, apparently, than to influence the voters in that constituency to vote for the parties supporting this government. Such things are certainly a public scandal. They lower our political institutions in the estimation of every right-thinking person. I think that the least that this government could do would be not to allow candidates such liberty of action as they appear to have in this case.

With regard to the appointment of Dr. Ruddick, every body knows that he was appointed quarantine officer in order to give an easy seat to Mr. Keown, now the Attorney General. And this is the way this federal government is bartering these offices in order to exert influence in provincial affairs as it is now doing in the province of New Brunswick.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I shall only attempt to answer the hon. gentlemen who have spoken as regards statements that they have made concerning the Post Office Department. Within the last three or four days—I will not say that three different insinuations have been made—but on three different occasions my attention has been called to certain allegations. The first was that I had allowed the postmaster at Woodstock to take part in the local campaign in New Brunswick. This afternoon I am told that a promise was made by the Postmaster General, or by this government, to Mr. Sears, one of the Liberal candidates in the city of St. John, that, if he would be a candidate, he might get the position of postmaster of that city. And I have just heard the statement of the hon. senior member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) that the Post Office Department had opened, within the last week or two, six or seven new offices. Does he state that these offices had been opened in one constituency? Or did he speak generally of the neighbourhood of St. John?

Mr. DANIEL. Not St. John, but Sunbury county.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Five or six in Sunbury county?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes—Sunbury and Queens.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understand that these statements are based on newspaper reports. Now, as regards Mr. Sears. Surely as head of the Post Office Department, and in view of the importance of St. John, I should know, first, if there is a vacancy, and, second, if any promise has been made regarding that office. I can declare to my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) that this is the first I have heard of any such promise having been made. As a matter of fact, Mr.

Sears has never written to the department, nor has the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) ever mentioned the matter to me. The name of Mr. Sears has never, directly or indirectly, been brought to my notice. And nobody has the promise for that office at present. That is all as regards Mr. Sears and the St. John post office—and I suppose my hon. friend will be satisfied with this candid declaration of mine.

As regards the opening of new post offices in Sunbury: It may be that a number of new post offices have been opened in the province of New Brunswick of late. One must expect that, in a province like New Brunswick, in the course of a month or three weeks, or even of a week, a number of new offices would be opened. I do not think that five or six different offices have been opened of late in one constituency. My hon. friend must know that the department has strictly followed certain rules in these matters. I have followed those rules since I took charge of the office, and the same rules were followed by my immediate predecessors, Mr. Aylesworth and Sir Wm. Mulock. These rules have to do with distance between post offices, the number of families interested, the necessity for the service, and so on. I declare most positively that I have not departed from those rules. And if five or six new post offices have been opened in the county of Sunbury, which I very much doubt unless my hon. friend says that it is so——

Mr. DANIEL. Seven was the number.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And I understand the statement is based on newspaper reports? My hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) has no knowledge about the matter ?

Mr. DANIEL. No.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The report for the opening of a new office must be initialled by me, and I declare that I have not initialled such reports as alleged since my return from Japan, which is two days over a month ago. And, if these offices were opened more than a month ago, it could hardly have been on account of the general elections in the provinces, for, I understand, the local legislature was dissolved only a few days ago.

My hon. friend for York (Mr. Crocket) was very keen the other day about the postmaster of Woodstock. In answer to a letter which he had written to me, I told the hon. gentleman that I had informed the postmaster for Woodstock of the statement which had been sent to me by the hon. member. I warned the postmaster of Woodstock that if that statement was true he should immediately cease taking part in politics, as that was the rule of the department. I have this afternoon received a letter in answer to my warning, and the postmaster, Mr. Smith, declares that it is entirely false; that he has never made a public speech in the town; that he does not intend to make any, and that probably some people were led into error because the Conservative candidate bears the same name as himself.

Mr. CROCKET. I inclosed in my letter to you a statement published in the Woodstock 'Press' that Mr. Smith, the postmaster at Woodstock, had attended a political rally in the Liberal committee rooms and addressed a meeting of party workers.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have the letter here, and if my hon. friend will read it privately he will be satisfied——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not care to read it, because there are harsh words against the other candidate. I will trust my hon. friend's honour. I will send the letter to him, and he will satisfy himself that Mr. Smith has not taken a part in the campaign, but that the Conservative candidate, Mr. Smith, has been making speeches, and probably the public has been led into error.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the Postmaster General think that the Woodstock 'Press' would mistake Frank L. Smith, the Conservative candidate, for Charles L. Smith, the postmaster at Woodstock ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Even the press may be led into error.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any denial in the letter that he has attended and addressed a meeting in the committee rooms?

Mr. LEMIEUX. He says he has not taken part in politics and has not addressed a public meeting. Surely my hon. friend will not object to a postmaster attending a public meeting.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did he attend a committee meeting?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, he does not mention it; but I think the gist of the statement was that Mr. Smith was taking an active part in the contest and making public speeches.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Addressing a committee meeting is pretty good party work.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If he only attended a meeting, I do not think we could object.

Mr. GEORGE W. FOWLER (Kings, N.B.). If the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) is so innocent as to be willing to accept the letter received from Mr. Smith as a denial of the charge made against him by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Crocket), I can quite understand how his colleague, the Minister of Public Works, has been able to impose on him and make him think that no promise has been given to Mayor Seers in connection with the postmastership of St. John. He has not become acquainted with his colleague the Minister of Public Works,

or he would not be willing to stand up and say that no promise by any member of the government has been extended to Mr. Sears. I do not think the Minister of Public Works will be particularly grateful to the Postmaster General for making this public statement, which will no doubt appear in the press of St. John and be read by Mr. Sears; because, knowing the Minister of Public Works as well as I do, I am satisfied he has already assured Mr. Sears that he will get the appointment of postmaster of St. John, that the matter has been already arranged with the government and only awaits the mere formality of an order in council. So far as the denial of Mr. Smith that he took part in the election now in progress——

Mr. CROCKET. The letter does not deny it.

Mr. FOWLER. The letter itself is not a denial of that, so far as the statement of the Postmaster General with respect to the contents of that letter goes. Mr. Smith says he has not addressed public meetings. The assertion quoted by my hon. friend from York, N.B., was simply that he had attended committee meetings of the party and addressed them. Does the Postmaster General say that is not a serious interference on the part of a federal official? Is that not a very active part? Is it not the sort of committee work that wins elections even more than speeches from the platform, even such eloquent speeches as are delivered by my hon. friend, that master of eloquence, the Postmaster General? The work in the committee room is of far more effect, so far as getting votes is concerned, than even his speeches could be. Therefore, if he is so anxious that the officials of his department should keep out of politics, he should certainly reprimand and severely discipline the postmaster of Woodstock. We have also had denials from the Prime Minister in respect to promises to persons engaged in these provincial contests. We would put more confidence in these denials if it were not for history. We have heard similar denials before. At the last provincial election in New Brunswick there was some difficulty in getting a candidate to oppose Mr. Hazen in Sunbury. The late Hon. Mr. Blair, then Minister of Railways, felt it his duty to go down and take a very active part in that election, just as his successor, the present Minister of Public Works, is doing to-day. Mr. Blair, in order to get a candidate in the county of Sunbury, went to an official, the inspector of fisheries for a portion of New Brunswick, a Mr. Henry Harrison, and made an arrangement with him whereby Mr. Harrison resigned his office of inspector of fisheries to accept the nomination for the local legislature in opposition to Mr. Hazen, and it was on the distinct understanding that if he were defeated he would be restored to his office at an increased salary. This charge was made publicly and absolutely denied. What were the facts? Mr. Harrison was badly defeated at the polls, and within a few weeks of his defeat he was restored to his office as inspector of fisheries, the office in the meantime having been kept open, and his salary was increased by $200 a year. If it were not for that, we might place a little more confidence in the statements that are made with respect to these gentlemen, Mr. Allan, the late claims agent of the Intercolonial, and Mr. Sears, the prospective postmaster of St. John and present candidate in that constituency.

The case of Mr. Copp, a member of the local legislature, has been spoken of. I would call attention to what has been done for another member of the local legislature of New Brunswick, a gentleman named Ryan, who represented Albert in the last legislature and is now a candidate in that county. Mr. Ryan is a farmer. He is so described in the 'Parliamentary Companion,' and I know of my own personal knowledge that that is his occupation; but Mr. Ryan figures very largely in the Auditor General's Report, not as selling farm produce to the government or to the Intercolonial Railway, but as selling lumber. I find from the Auditor General's Report that since 1903, the year in which Mr. Ryan was last elected to the local legislature in that province, he sold to the government, according to the Auditor General's Report, the following quantities of lumber and ties:

Year.	Lumber.	Ties.
1903	$ 2,499	397
1904	2,235	4,122
1905	21,048	4,353
1906	69,368	3,375
1907	2,803	2,096

Now, Sir, the Intercolonial Railway has an officer filling the position, created by this government, of purchasing agent. This gentleman was supposed to be appointed for the purpose of purchasing supplies for the Intercolonial Railway. The only justification there could possibly be for his appointment and for the salary and travelling expenses which he received was that the middleman should be entirely done away and that these supplies should be purchased by the purchasing agent. But, the supplies apparently were not purchased by the purchasing agent. Instead of the purchasing agent buying these supplies Mr. Ryan, member for the provincial parliament for Albert county goes to the mill and as a middleman buys this lumber. If this purchasing agent had done so he would have been justified in his position, he would have saved to the country the commission which went to Mr. Ryan and he would have paid for the salary and expenses which he received. But, not so. Mr. Ryan, being a farmer, not owning a mill, having no interest in a mill of any kind, during the past four or five years sells to the government $112,296 worth of lumber

and ties as a middleman. Then we have the case mentioned by my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Crocket) of Mr. Copp receiving $25 per day holding this inquiry into the case of Captain Pratt of the steamer 'Curlew.' one of the fishery protection fleet. I have not the slightest doubt, Sir, but what that investigation was not at all hurried, because never before in the history of Mr. Copp's professional career had he received so large an emolument for a day's service as $25 and therefore I can quite understand that the statement made by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) would be absolutely correct that he dispensed with the services of a stenographer and took the notes in long hand in order that the time might be lengthened as greatly as possible. It seems to me that in view of these facts the members from New Brunswick are justified in thus making a protest against interference on the part of the federal government with local matters in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). Mr. Speaker, I just rise for the purpose of making one comment upon what appears to be the present policy of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) as compared with that which was carried on by his predecessor, Sir William Mulock. In the year 1896, after the election in the county which I have the honour to represent, there was a young man, a very active, intelligent, bright young man who was the postmaster in the village of Beamsville where one of the candidates resided. This young gentleman was naturally a Conservative in politics. He had been appointed, in succession to another gentleman who had resigned, by the Conservative government, and he had given ample and perfect satisfaction to the whole neighbourhood as postmaster. But he expressed the opinion after the votes were all cast in 1896, after the polling was all over and the result was known, that 'Gibson was in the soup.' That was the interference in politics that he was guilty of in that election. He was removed. I do not think for that reason really, but because they wanted to give the office to a man of their own stripe of politics. He was accused of having been a violent partisan and, having denied it, an investigation was granted and for several days—I think I am correct for saying a week—at all events for a great many days, this investigation was held in Beamsville at great expense to this country. Efforts were made to give evidence to prove the violent partisanship of this young man, and all they were able to prove against him—if it was anything against him at all—was that after the election was over he had expressed the opinion that 'Gibson was in the soup.' So he was removed as being a violent partisan and as having been guilty of an interference in politics by the then Postmaster General. The present Postmaster General has asked us to believe that, down in the province of New Brunswick, when a man goes to a committee meeting and does his best to assist in the workings of the party to accomplish a political result—not addressing a public meeting, not allowing Conservatives and Reformers alike in the community to hear manfully from him what his views are about the public issues of the day, but going behind the closed doors of a partisan committee and assisting them in every way he can to further the candidature of one man —he is not guilty of any undue interference in politics, while a poor young fellow, who is appointed by the Conservatives, is condemned and put out of his postmastership notwithstanding that he has given ample satisfaction to everybody in the neighbourhood and notwithstanding that old Liberal after old Liberal came to testify to that effect in that investigation. He was held to be a violent partisan, unfit to hold the position of postmaster, simply because he had expressed the opinion that one of the candidates was in the soup. I am obliged to mention that to the House to draw the attention of the hon. Postmaster General and the right hon. the Prime Minister to the fact that if they expect this country to take any stock whatever in their statements about where they do or do not interfere with their officers they must be more consistent than they have been as has been demonstrated here to-day.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). Mr. Speaker, it was not my privilege to hear the whole speech—the very moderate and mild-mannered speech—of my hon. friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler), but I heard a few words in which he made certain references to gentlemen in the province of New Brunswick to which I certainly must take exception. My hon. friend seems to be very much alarmed as to certain elections which are being carried on in the province of New Brunswick. I had supposed from an interview with the hon. gentleman which I read in one of the Montreal papers that the provincial elections in New Brunswick were entirely settled, that he had disposed of them, that he had been there, that he had fixed the matter and that it was only a question of the detail of recording the votes with the view of having a Conservative government established in the province of New Brunswick. However, he seems to be very much alarmed lest possibly his utterances may prove false. My hon. friend has referred to Mr. Copp. I can only say that Mr. Copp holds a position at the bar of New Brunswick quite up to the standard of my hon. friend, and he has always received fees quite as large as the hon. gentleman. When he suggests that Mr. Copp has not received a per diem allowance of $25 he is certainly speaking without the proof. Mr. Copp was eminently fitted

to fill the position which he was asked to fill and which he very worthily did, and I think he received credit from all interested for doing his duty in a very fair and impartial manner. Mr. Ryan has been referred to. He is a candidate in the county of Albert, a part of the constituency represented by my hon. friend. Mr. Ryan, it is true, is regarded as a farmer, but for many years Mr. Ryan has engaged in general trading business. He has done so for the past fifteen years, and he is still engaged, as a part of his business, in trading. Mr. Ryan has enjoyed some business transactions with the Intercolonial Railway. My hon. friend, I know, is quite familiar with that. I think that my hon. friend, although he appears here in this parliament as a lawyer, has been engaged, as a sort of side show, I suppose, in certain lumbering operations for some time in the west and in New Brunswick, and perhaps he is familiar with a certain lumbering operation in the county of Albert, near the town of Salisbury, in the province of New Brunswick.

My hon. friend himself has perhaps in an indirect way supplied the Intercolonial with certain lumber; he may not have done so directly but indirectly I think he has. I want to say from personal knowledge, that whatever contracts Mr. Ryan has had with the Intercolonial they have always been based upon open tender and contract. My hon. friend knows this full well and, he knows that certain friends of his, a certain gentleman in the city of St. John who was largely interested with him in certain lumbering operations, has enjoyed through Mr. Ryan as a commission man, certain contracts with the Intercolonial. But, I am bound to say, Sir, that these contracts have always been let after public competition. And why is Mr. Ryan assailed ? He is a very honourable man ; he is engaged not merely in farming but in other business. Is it any discredit to a Canadian farmer that he should engage in other occupations ? My hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) is a lawyer but he is also a lumberman and a dealer in land and he has many side issues, and no one will say that because he is a lawyer he has no right to engage in these transactions. Surely Mr. Ryan is not to be reflected upon in any way because of the dealings he has had with the general public, for as I understand it, Mr. Ryan tenders and receives contracts from others than the Intercolonial Railway. He has for a number of years enjoyed the confidence of the people of the county of Albert, and I venture to think that after the polling on the 3rd of March it will be found he has retained that confidence by a very large majority. My hon. friend has referred to Mr. Edward Sears, of the city of St. John, and Mr. Sears is a man who also has enjoyed the confidence of his fellow citizens. It appears that his party requested him to represent them in the coming elections, and because of that fact and because he enjoys the confidence of the citizens, an attempt must be made to belittle him in this House. My hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Daniel) has had something to say on this question, but I fear that his tenure of office as representing St. John in this House will not perhaps be very long. But because Mr. Sears enjoys the confidence of the people and because nothing can be said against his character, my hon. friend rakes up a side issue and he says that Mr. Sears was promised some office if he would accept the candidature of his party. Surely it is an honour for any man to be called upon to represent the city of St. John in any capacity. Mr. Sears has been mayor of St. John and I have no doubt he would be elected again if he sought the office, but his friends think he should be in the legislature and they have invited him to be a candidate. I am sure that Mr. Sears is quite as independent a candidate as ever was my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) in any of his elections. It seems to me that it is carrying things very far indeed if men are to be attacked in this parliament simply because they enjoy the confidence of their fellows and are asked to represent them in office. Then, again, Mr. Harrison has been referred to. I do not know any of the circumstances of that case, but I do know that Mr. Harrison belongs to one of the oldest and best families in the province of New Brunswick. I know that he enjoys the confidence of the people ; I know that he makes a most capable official, and I know that nothing can be said against him officially or personally or in any other respect. I rose simply to protest against this method of party warfare. In very many instances in late years this parliament has been dragged down by the method of warfare pursued, and it seems to me that there should be an end to this dragging into the mire the status of public men without any cause or excuse. Mr. Sears and Mr. Ryan hold equally as honourable a position as does my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) in the province of New Brunswick, and they enjoy at least an equal extent with him, the confidence of the people of that province and the constituencies they represent. I enter my protest against this method of warfare. If my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) is sure (as he has said he is to the Montreal newspapers) that the Conservatives will win in the province of New Brunswick, I think he might have spared the House this—for my hon. friend in comparison with some of his other utterances—very mild and moderate denunciation. But I think my hon. friend is not sure about the Conservatives winning ; I think perhaps he feels that even his own position is not secure and that while he may boast now, later on he will be in sackcloth and ashes.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). One main question in this matter is

as to the policy of the government in interfering in provincial elections.

Mr. EMMERSON. Do you remember a provincial convention at Moncton ?

Mr. FOSTER. I remember most of these conventions; that was a very good one so far as I recollect. The Prime Minister did not have anything to say on that branch of the question. I wonder if he remembers the doctrines he used to preach in this House and outside this House with reference to interference in provincial elections by the federal authorities. I wonder if he has forgotten the preachings he drew in from Edward Blake and Alexander Mackenzie and the stalwart fathers of the Liberal party in the years between 1870 and 1890, and to which he gave willing and public adherence. The doctrine laid down by Edward Blake and Alexander Mackenzie, and by the Prime Minister himself in another period of his political history, was : That there ought to be an absolute division between federal and provincial politics and that the influence of the one should not be used in the other. I think my right hon. friend will not challenge that assertion of the old doctrine of the Liberal party, or rather the doctrine of the old Liberal party. But the doctrine of the new twentieth century Liberal party under the guidance of the right hon. gentleman seems to be absolutely and radically different. When not long ago a contest for life and death was on in the province of Ontario and when according to the doctrine of the old Liberal party, professed by the right hon. gentleman, he should have kept himself and his federal patronage and interference out of the contest, he remembers that in the city of Ottawa at a public meeting at which Mr. Ross, the then premier, laid his case before the electorate, the right hon. gentleman went out of his way to put his hand upon Mr. Ross's shoulder and say to the assembled electors not only of Ottawa but of the province of Ontario : Here is my right hand ; don't let that be shattered in the province of Ontario.

My right hon. friend's memory goes that far. It probably goes as far as the late British Columbia election, in which after colloguing with several others, he called down his High Commissioner of the Yukon, one of his adherents, dragged him off his throne in the lone white country to the north, and sent him as his direct emissary, with directions to slaughter Mr. McBride and the Liberal-Conservative government and party in that province, and stood behind him with federal patronage and federal influence. Maybe he does not forget that in order to strengthen the Liberal party in that fight against Mr. McBride, he went on to the bench, and picked off a gentleman to represent his party, that that gentleman took the nomination whilst he was still conducting cases in his court, that he was defeated, and that, although it was stoutly denied then, he had prospects in view if he was defeated. Then the prospects were realized, and Mr. Henderson to-day sits on the throne in the great white country to the north as Commissioner and Governer of the vast domain of the Yukon. My right hon. friend does not disremember that. Why, Sir, the whole policy to-day of my right hon. friend and the twentieth century Liberals is to interfere in every possible way, by hook or by crook, with offices, patronage, promises or anything at all that will enable their friends in a local contest to hold their own, and thereby add to the federal power in the particular province. That is the policy of my right hon. friend. Which policy does he believe in ? He stood up and preached the other policy with the straightest kind of a face and with the most honest expression of belief in it ; to-day he preaches an absolutely different doctrine, and defends it as right and just. Which principle represents my right hon. friend's convictions ? Has he any convictions on this matter at all, or was he on that side of the fence before because he thought it would be to his party advantage, and is he on this side of the fence now because he thinks it will be equally to his party advantage ? And yet there is no line more definite than the line which separates federal from provincial matters, in our constitution and in our practical politics. The right hon. gentleman has gone so far that he has made it absolutely impossible to carry on a provincial election without lining up his followers and warping provincial issues by introducing federal issues into provincial politics. The best argument in proof of that statement is that vacant chair on the other side of the House. Where is the Minister of Public Works to-day ? Parliament is in the midst of its heaviest and hardest work, and the Minister of Public Works is not here. Questions cannot be answered, business cannot be carried on, and the reason is that the Minister of Public Works is away, not on federal business, but because he has gone down to the province of New Brunswick to set aside local issues and to import into that contest all that federal patronage, federal promises and federal influence can do to strengthen the Liberal government and the Liberal party in that province. My right hon. friend's government saved that party once. At the last local election in the province of New Brunswick that party was as absolutely beaten as a party could be until the Hon. Mr. Blair appeared on the scene with federal patronage, and with plenty of resources for carrying on the election, and so saved the local government. I believe that the opinion of the people of New Brunswick to-day, if it could run current and have its effect, is absolutely opposed to the local government as it is at

present constituted. It has been a long time in power. The Minister of Public Works said something the other day as to how he had left that province. We shall have occasion to see how he left it. But one word expresses it—that the province to-day, by the reckless management of the Minister of Public Works and his friends there, is practically on the verge of a precipice so far as its financial condition is concerned; largely because of the fanciful, not to say unworthy, uses of public money made by the present Minister of Public Works and his friends while they were in the government; and yet the people of New Brunswick cannot be allowed to discuss and settle that question for themselves. Perforce this government must go down into that province, and, by the exercise of federal patronage and influence, try to keep a government in power there which is for other purposes than the purposes for which a federal government and party exists in this Dominion.

Now, in reference to these examples which have been brought out. The right hon. gentleman says that so far as he is concerned, and he will have some say in the matter, no promise has been made to Mayor Sears that he shall have a postmastership in St. John or any other federal office if he be not successful in the local election. While on that point let me say one word in reference to a statement made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. There was no need at all of his coming with such funereal tones to the rescue of Messrs. Ryan and Sears. One would think he was on the outskirts of a graveyard listening to an elegy—not one so high-toned as Grey's, but something presaging political death and decay. No one attacked Mr. Ryan or Mr. Sears as gentlemen. No one attacked them for selling lumber or receiving a postmastership—laudable ambitions, and business, in both cases.

That is their right, if they can get it and are qualified for it. No man is raising a word against either of these gentlemen. But the indictment is against this government, against the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) and against the federal party which leads these gentlemen to suppose that they will be looked after. But, says my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) I will have something to say in that. My right hon. friend is about three months behind the times. Does he not know that the Minister of Public Works has arranged all that? Is he not aware that in the city of St. John the Minister of Public Works has selected himself, or caused to be selected, a patronage committee, made up of the heelers of the party in that city, and has handed over into the hands of that committee all the appointments to federal office from that district. Is he not aware of that? That fact has been publicly advertised and publicly stated by the Minister of Public Works himself. Why, my right hon. friend will not have anything to say in the matter at all. It is the patronage committee down in St. Johns which will settle that question, and when that committee has decided the Minister of Public Works will have only to hand their recommendations to the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), and the latter will have nothing to do but fill the bill and carry out what that committee and his colleague have recommended. How innocent must be the Postmaster General to think that he will have anything to say in the appointment. Let the patronage committee down in St. John act, let the Minister of Public Works sign their recommendation, let the name of Mayor Sears be given in as postmaster of the city of St. John, and if there be a vacancy I venture to say that the Postmaster General will not refuse to give it to him. No promise made—of course not. When Mr. Derbyshire, a member of the House of Commons, philanthropically if not patriotically, resigned his seat in favour of the present Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), and when the charge was made that Dan Derbyshire was to get a senatorship as the price of his resignation, we had that charge indignantly denied. All through the Liberal press we were told that nothing of the kind would happen, but just as Mr. Harrison got back into office with $200 of an increase, so did Mr. Derbyshire get the senatorship after he had made way for the Minister of Railways. Does anybody of common sense not know that that was a bargain made and carried out, signed, sealed and delivered. Why then this assumption of innocence? It is simply a sale of seats; it is a counter by which political results are made to turn to the advantage of my right hon. friend and his party. It is a fact that Mr. Harrison—a very good man; no need to quote the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) of all men as sponser to Harrison's good character—but the fact remains that Mr. Harrison entered the contest; that he did so under the promise that he would be put back into his office at an increase if he failed; that he failed to be elected and that he was reinstated at an increase. These things, my hon. friend must know, are done in a different way from the way they used to be. My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) will soon have another Bill to put his name to. When the patronage committee gets ready in Toronto and selects a proper person to be postmaster of that city, that office, which has been held vacant for months and months, and which is one of the most important in Canada, will be filled. When the patronage committee sends in its recommendation and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) countersigns it, the Postmaster General will have nothing to do but fill the bill. How can he get out of it?

He has the appointment in his hands, but he knows, as well as he knows anything, that provided they name a suitable man he cannot object. The appointment lies in the hands of his colleagues from Ontario, and the very moment the patronage committee decides and the ministers from that province confirm that decision, my hon. friend has no reason for not making the appointment and he will make it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It must be a suitable person.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not stated that Mr. Sears is not a suitable person for the postmastership of St. John. Not at all. That is not the question, but the question is a bargain and sale and the interference of the federal government in local elections. There is the condition of things into which my right hon. friend, who stated on that broad ground that local and Dominion affairs should be kept absolutely apart in political contests, lands to-day. There we find him to-day, an advocate and prime mover in the most inveterate and determined interference of federal patronage in the different provincial elections. Look at the appointment of Leech. It is fortunate for the Finance Minister that we were not told, before we passed the seed grain vote, that Leech was to be the distributor. If we had, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, it would have been a long while before that vote would have passed. The appointment of Leech is sufficient in itself to show that this vote is to be used for partisan purposes. Why, in the Northwest ask any sensible man you meet who is not a dyed in the wool partisan, ask many who are, and they will tell you that nine-tenths of the civil service there are simply partisans working for the party interests of the government. Do you know what a gentleman from the Northwest told me the other day, and he is not an adherent of either political party, so far as I know? He said that he drove out eight miles to send a telegram from the government telegraph office. It was during an election and the operator could not be found. The operator had not been in his office for eight days, and the telegram, therefore, was not sent. Nine-tenths of your land and Indian agents and other officials are partisans who are taught to do in the first place what will be for the benefit of the party and then, after the party has been served, they can make a feint of doing something in the interests of the country. This man Leech, so far as the records show, did a most infamous thing, and did it as a partisan for partisan purposes. I would not trust him, with that record against him, anywhere, and have no doubt he will act in the same way regarding the sale and purchase of seed grain and its distribution to the people of the Northwest.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). When one hears the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) declaim about bargain and sale in connection with local elections in the province of New Brunswick, one would scarcely believe that when, a few years ago, there was a government in New Brunswick which was not a party government, but composed of leading men, men of good standing at the bar and in business, some of whom were Liberals and others Conservatives, that happy condition which was acquiesced in by all parties, was put an end to by the efforts of this hon. gentleman who is now so outspoken in denouncing any federal interference in local affairs. In 1899 this hon. gentleman, who then represented a New Brunswick constituency in this House, but who to-day sits for the division of North Toronto, went down to Moncton and sent out a clarion call to the Conservatives of New Brunswick to gather together, in order to do what? In order to do away with this nefarious coalition system. He went down and called upon them, with the eloquence for which he is so famous, to forsake the provincial government of that day and come forward as one solid phalanx of Conservatives in the province of New Brunswick. That was his call. And who responded to it? That call was responded to by a large portion of the Conservative party of New Brunswick—what was left of it. Up to that time the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) had been a subservient follower of the local government. He had sung the praises of the late lamented Hon. A. G. Blair, and had often sung the praises, in most dulcet tones, of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), who was in the provincial government at that time. He had stumped the country calling upon his Conservative friends to vote for H. R. Emmerson as Minister of Public Works of New Brunswick. But his federal leader comes down from Ottawa and says: This must cease. And from that time, though elected as a supporter of the local government, he became an opponent and has so remained. These are the sins of which the hon. gentleman is guilty. These are the results of his call in the city of Moncton to line up according to party standards. What complaint can he make if party lines are drawn in the province of New Brunswick? But to-day his friends do not even dare to draw party lines; the present leader of the opposition in New Brunswick, though at that time persuaded to adopt the policy of the hon. member for North Toronto and run provincial elections on Dominion party lines, is now going up and down that province preaching from every platform that he is not the leader of the Liberal-Conservative opposition, but the leader of a coalition opposition, and claiming that Liberals as well as Conservatives should support him. And why? Because he knows that he has not a single

chance on earth to win the elections in the province of New Brunswick as leader of a Liberal-Conservative party; that his sole and only chance of winning is to gain the support of some of the Liberals of that province.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the way Ross talked in Ontario, and see what became of him.

Mr. DYMENT. And so did Haultain.

Mr. LOGAN. My hon. friend from North Toronto, I hope, will not worry too much over this matter; for, if these horrible things are being done, if provincial elections are being run on federal lines, it is done under his own advice. I do not think these hon. gentlemen should refer in such strong terms to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). That gentleman is largely interested in the province of New Brunswick as an elector of that province, and he has a perfect right to go to New Brunswick at the present time, just as the hon. member for North Toronto, as a resident of the province of New Brunswick, had in 1899—'What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.' The hon. Minister of Public Works ought to take part in the elections for New Brunswick, because he is interested in that province. Now, I notice these hon. gentlemen opposite are very bold and brave to-day. A lamented politician of New Brunswick, a personal friend of my own, speaking of a member of this House from that province, said: He is the bravest man in the world when he is in No. 6. This hon. gentleman, it appears, was fond of saying what he would do to Hon. Mr. Blair when he came to this House. But Mr. Blair did come to this House, and this man who had been so brave was as dumb as an oyster. Ever since the opening of this session my hon. friends opposite have had the Minister of Public Works in his place, one of the most constant attendants upon his duties in the House of Commons. These hon. gentlemen are very, very brave when the Minister of Public Works is seven or eight hundred miles away. But he has challenged them upon the public platform and in the public press to ask him certain questions and to do certain things, and they have never dared to open their mouths. If they want to attack the Minister of Public Works, if they want to ask him any question, if they wish to call him to account for any charges he has made, why do not they call upon him when he is present? Why do they wait until he is in the province of New Brunswick before they make these statements concerning him?

I am very sorry—speaking seriously, I am very sorry—to hear the statement made by an ex-Minister of Finance that financially the province of New Brunswick is on the verge of bankruptcy. Is my hon. friend, for the sake of a little party capital, for the sake of gaining a few votes, ready to let such a statement go to the bankers and financial men of this and other countries on his authority as an ex-Minister of Finance? I read the other day of a loan made by the young and brilliant premier of that province, Mr. Robinson; and I think I shall be borne out by financial authorities in this country when I say that it was a most excellent loan under the present condition of the financial markets of the world. The credit of the province of New Brunswick is as strong as that of any province in the Dominion of Canada, and very much stronger than that of some cities I could mention, which are represented here by members who sit on the other side of the House?

The Minister of Public Works did not leave the province of New Brunswick in disgrace. He did not leave it having been banished by the electors of that province. He left the province of New Brunswick when the people of the city of St. John, Liberals and Conservatives, followers of the hon. member for North Toronto, put their names to a paper asking him to be the representative in this House of the city of St. John. Then, and then only, did he come to this federal House. How did he leave the province of New Brunswick? I will tell the hon. gentleman; he left the province of New Brunswick through the door of a constituency which had been Conservative by a majority of 700 three years before, and had so completely changed its political attitude that these hon. gentlemen did not dare to put up a candidate against him. My hon. friend should not be jealous of the way the Minister of Public Works left the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. LEFURGEY. He wanted to come in 1896 as a Conservative.

Mr. LOGAN. I deny the charge, and I will give my reason. In 1896, while the Conservative party was in power, they held out all kinds of inducements to this same gentleman (Mr. Pugsley). But, notwithstanding that, he came out as an independent and ran against the government in the city of St. John. He did not wait until the government had changed. He came out upon a principle and won upon it; and stands to-day high in public regard. And the government he supports stands high in public esteem. And, when the time comes for the people of the province of New Brunswick to pronounce on Mr. Pugsley as federal leader of the party in that province, it will be seen that public opinion is as strong behind him in the federal House as it was in the local legislature.

Mr. PIUS MICHAUD (Victoria, N.B.). This seems to be a New Brunswick day. It therefore becomes my duty, as a young member of this House, and as one who has recently entered the House as a representative of New Brunswick, to have a word to say

concerning the politics of that province. I was amused to find the hon. member for North Toronto, who has left the province of New Brunswick, rising here to take an active part in the discussion of this question. I am sure that when the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) left here to go to the province of New Brunswick he left this city to meet his friends. I do not know whether the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), if he were leaving this city to go back to New Brunswick, would meet as many friends as would the Minister of Public Works. I was also much amused at the remark of the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) that there is only one civil engineer in the province looking after the public works. Must we, to please our friends of the opposition, stop the public works in progress in the province of New Brunswick because a local election campaign is being conducted in that province? I can tell the hon. member for St. John and the hon. member for Kings and Albert that they may well be uneasy as to the result of the election in New Brunswick. In my constituency we had the pleasure of a visit from the leader of the local opposition, who at first came as an independent man, but who, on his last trip, was a pretty good Liberal. He tried to find among the ranks of the opposition suitable candidates, but when he found it impossible to place a single candidate in the field, he was satisfied to accept the Liberal candidates.

The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Crocket) stated that the Hon. Mr. Costigan, when he was appointed senator, was not qualified for the position. I must say as a lawyer that he knows when a man has a residence, dwells in a certain place and pays taxes on his property, he has a place of residence and therefore was qualified to be appointed to the Senate.

Several hon. members have taken advantage of the absence of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) to attack him. Every one of these gentlemen has had many opportunities in the past to say to his face whatever they may have to say against him. But to-day when he was called to New Brunswick on political, public or personal business, these attacks are made behind his back. In the good old days when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was Minister of Finance and represented New Brunswick in the cabinet, he was called to New Brunswick on several occasions. Was he not called there for the very purpose he now says the Minister of Public Works has been called? Perhaps it will best please the hon. member (Mr. Foster) if I say he was called on private business. I can assure these hon. gentlemen that for all their statements of affairs in New Brunswick—and they have gone rather far—they do not know half of what is going on to-day. I can tell my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Crocket) that in his own county each of the four opposition candidates in the field has been promised a position in the cabinet of Mr. Hazen, if he ever comes into power. That applies to other counties and apparently if the opposition come into power there will be as many portfolios as there are opposition candidates in the field to-day.

REPORTS FROM PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I wish to direct your attention to a resolution that I propose to move dealing with the treatment the opposition has been receiving at the hands of the government representatives in the Public Accounts Committee of this House. The resolution reads :

That all the words after the word 'that' be left out and the following substituted therefor:

The Committee on Public Accounts is constituted for the purpose of affording full and free examination and inquiry into the receipts and expenditures of public moneys and the circumstances in connection therewith.

That in the public interest the greatest possible freedom of investigation and inquiry should be enjoyed by the committee.

That any action of the majority of that committee in excluding evidence, or restricting inquiry should be subject to appeal to this House and upon request for that purpose the necessary report of proceedings ought immediately to be ordered.

It is a well known fact and need not be debated that the Public Accounts Committee is constituted for the purpose of examining into the public transactions of the government. In my experience the right of the minority of that committee to appeal to the House of Commons was never refused until this government came into power. Speaking subject to correction, I would say it had never been refused ; that is my information and in the short time at my disposal to look into the question that has been the result of my investigation. It is well known that this government has given cause for a very great deal of special work by the Public Accounts Committee. In every department of this government there have been great increases of expenditure and wherever the people's interests are at stake we find the middle man who holds such a prominent place in the heart of this government standing between the rights of the people and the government of the day. For that reason it has been necessary for the Public Accounts Committee, since this government came into power, to make a very thorough examination of some departments of this government. Commencing with the House of Commons itself we find that when the Conservatives were in power the expense of the Speaker's department of this House under the Hon. Mr. Ouimet who

was Speaker for nine months and twenty-eight days, were $1,175.23. When my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in this government occupied the position of Speaker for three years, one month and five days, the expenses of the department had increased to $9,899.80. In every department of the government we find similar increases as compared with the expenditures under the preceding government.

I do not propose to enter fully into the particulars but I will say that we have had wonderful developments from the investigations in the Public Accounts Committee during the last two years. We remember that a gentleman who appeared before that committee last year said that he had been supplying this government with large quantities of goods. In the witness box he admitted that he came from Montreal on learning that Mr. Foster was proposing to examine into his accounts. As soon as he read this in a Montreal newspaper he hastened to Ottawa and to the department to which he was supplying goods, and returned his cheque for some $600 as overcharges. This case and many others might be cited and it is no wonder that the people of the country are expecting great things from the Public Accounts Committee. Therefore I say that full freedom of investigation should be given and whenever the minority have not received their full rights in the committee we have a right as a minority to appeal to the House in order that this House shall have an opportunity to give to us the rights that will enable us to properly investigate these enormous expenditures.

For instance in the Department of Marine and Fisheries we had an investigation last year into the transactions of a gentleman named Merwin who was supplying large quantities of goods to the government. He supplied 15 articles which he purchased at the price of $11,838.70 and he sold them to the government for $18,012.50, making a profit on these fifteen articles of $6,173.70. He purchased a Stuyvesant pumping engine from the manufacturer in the city of Montreal for $335 and, without touching that article at all, without having a dollar invested in any kind of business except that of a middleman, he put in his invoice to the Department of Marine and Fisheries for $960, putting $625 in his pocket and making a profit of 187 per cent. On these fifteen articles to which I have referred the profits they have made range all the way from 26 per cent to 187 per cent. Therefore, I say that when instances of this kind are disclosed by the public accounts, when these facts are presented to parliament and to the people of this country, it is time that the minority had a full and unrestricted opportunity of examining into these transactions that come before us from time to time. We had an examination going on with respect to the Militia Department. It is well known that a few friends of the government formed a company for the purpose of supplying goods to the Department of Militia. The friends of the government from the city of Toronto and elsewhere formed themselves into a company. They supplied to the Department of Militia and Defence——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Excuse me one moment. The hon. gentleman is making a statement; I suppose he wants to be correct. Does the hon. gentleman say that the company to which he refers was composed of friends of the government?

Mr. BLAIN. Yes.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that he is entirely inaccurate.

Mr. J. D. REID. Explain.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Is Sir Adolphe Caron a friend of the government? I was not aware of it.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend, I think is a little hasty. May I suggest to him that Mr. Hartley Dewart, who is a Liberal candidate in the city of Toronto, is a member of that company? I did not wish to mention Mr. Dewart's name but if he has any complaint to make he must charge it to my hon. friend, I did not propose to mention any names. But what I say is this: that this company was formed and I repeat the statement, by friends, although possibly not all friends of the government.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend says 'hear, hear.' I did not make the statement that they were all friends.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, you did.

Mr. BLAIN. If I did I did not so intend it. What I wish to say is that the majority of the members of this company were friends of the government.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not admit that.

Mr. BLAIN. Well I will not stop to debate that point now.

Mr. FOSTER. It is safe not to admit anything.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is your rule.

Mr. BLAIN. This company were not in existence until they had received a contract to supply 250 sub-target guns to this government. They had their company formed and did they put their money into the manufacture of this article as men usually do in a private way? Not a bit of it. They went down to Sherbrooke in the province of Que-

bec and made arrangements with a manufacturer established there to manufacture 250 of these guns at $64 apiece and then they sold them to this government for $250 apiece, putting the difference in their pocket. Does my hon. friend deny that ?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. May I ask my hon. friend a question ? Does he know that his friend Mr. Whitney pays that same amount without question and thinks he has a good bargain ?

Mr. BLAIN. I will not enter into a discussion of the conduct of Mr. Whitney's government but I wish to say that there are no statements or charges of this kind made against Mr. Whitney's government in Ontario. Mr. Whitney's government conducts its business without middlemen standing between the people and the government.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Where was the middleman in this case ?

Mr. BLAIN. Now then, leaving that for a moment, I wish to turn my attention to the Railway Department. What do we find there ? When this government wished to purchase a piece of land in the city of Moncton did they send their officers down there to purchase that land as they should have done ? No, they engaged a middleman and Mr. Lodge stood between the people and the government. Mr. Lodge purchased land in the city of Moncton for $5,075, sold it to the government for $13,880 and put $8,805 in his pocket, or a profit of 167 per cent ? Does my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) not think that there is a sufficient number of officers in each of these departments to make purchases without engaging a middleman ? When this government requires land in the city of Moncton, upon what principle have they the right to engage a middleman to make this purchase and allow that middleman to put these enormous profits in his pockets ? Why do not the government go about it in a business way ? They prided themselves as being a business government some years ago ; I suppose that is not in their platform now. Why do not the government send their own officers to purchase property and pay the money direct from the treasury of the country to the man who sells the land ? That does not answer their policy, because this army of middlemen that is to be found in every branch of this government must be taken care of, and so Mr. Lodge falls in for the enormous profit of 167 per cent upon land that he has supplied to this government.

I wish for a moment to direct the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to a branch of expenditure that I think, should and, I have no doubt, has received the special attention of my hon. friend. The Quebec Bridge Company was formed for the purpose of constructing a bridge across the St. Lawrence river at the city of Quebec. Were the middlemen to be found in that? Oh, yes. The government of Canada, up to the close of last session had supplied $6,678,200 for the construction of that bridge. This government had also given a subsidy to the company of $379,353. The province of Quebec had given a subsidy of $250,000 and the city of Quebec a subsidy of $300,000. Where do we find the company coming in ? They came in at the last with a contribution of $65,000 to carry on this enormous work. The middleman stands here between the people and the government and in the contract that is made between this government and the Quebec Bridge Company we find that the company's interests are protected. If this should be a splendid investment, if it should turn out to be a success in the future then this company will have the right to put the profits to their own account. But, if it should be found to be a failure as it develops and is in operation the company have the right to come to the government and ask for their money back with interest. Is that the kind of a contract that the people of this country would endorse if they understood it fully ? I do not think so. Surely the friends of the government organizing themselves into a company, making application to the government for money to construct the bridge, appealing to the province and city of Quebec and receiving these enormous amounts and then putting their own $65,000 into this company should not have the right to draw upon the future development of Canada for the profits that are likely to accrue from this large investment of money. I do not wish to follow into other departments. I could go on for some time and give to this House examples of where the middleman stands. Therefore I say, with these few matters before us, and with the other investigations and examinations into public documents that we have had in the Public Accounts Committee, when we were told in that committee that there shall be enforced there the doctrine which the Minister of Finance laid down in this House, namely, that the minority have only such rights as the majority are willing to give them ; I say when that doctrine is introduced into the Public Accounts Committee which above all others is the committee constituted to make searching examination into the expenditures of the country, we have a right to appeal to this House and to place before the people of Canada the fact that the policy of this government is secrecy on every hand, and that the policy of the opposition is that there shall be full and thorough investigation into the public expenses so that the people shall know where their money is going, and what kind of a government we have in power at the present time which would deny the people that right.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). If the intention of my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) who has moved this motion were to obtain an amendment to the rules which have prevailed in this House, and so far as I know in all British parliaments, he certainly could not have taken a more unfortunate mode of carrying out his intention than that which he has adopted. If it is the opinion of my hon. friend, and of his friends on the other side that the rules which have hitherto prevailed have become antiquated and no longer answer the purpose for which they were framed, there is a proper method to have them amended, but, I think hon. gentlemen opposite will agree, that to move an amendment on the motion for supply is hardly the correct method to pursue. In the first place, it is not possible to offer any amendment to the amendment to go into supply, and the scope of an inquiry into the rules of the House is therefore necessarily contracted. An amendment to the motion to go into supply is also considered as a want of confidence motion and although I do not press the point, I think it must appeal to the sense of fairness and justice possessed by gentlemen on both sides, that if we are to revise the rules of the House this is not a proper way of doing so. Yesterday the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) proposed an alteration to the rules of the House, and as my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) knows the House did not see fit to accede to that motion as the House believed that the rules which now exist are adequate and ample for all purposes. My hon. friend (Mr. Blain) has laid the foundation for his motion upon the statement that the Public Accounts Committee is the grand investigation committee into the expenditures of the government. That is a truism which nobody will dispute. But if I understood him aright he stated that the Committee on Public Accounts was so constituted now that the minority could not get the information to which they are entitled, and he proceeded to give example after example of what he called reckless expenditure in department after department of the government. So far as I know, and I think I am right, the knowledge he has of what he calls reckless expenditure has been obtained in that very Public Accounts Committee, and therefore his motion destroys at the outset the foundation upon which his argument is based. The hon. gentleman told us of a certain middleman who, as he said, came up to Ottawa and the moment he knew the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was to examine him he went back to the department and withdrew some cheques. Where did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) get this information? So far as I know he got it in the Public Accounts Committee and therefore it seems illogical, that on information he obtained in that committee he should base his charge that the committee restricts investigation. As to whether or not the proposition made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) is reasonable and fair, I ask the impartial consideration of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. The motion concludes in the following words:

That any action of the majority of that committee in excluding evidence or restricting inquiry should be the subject of appeal to this House, and upon request for that purpose the necessary report of the proceedings ought immediately to be ordered.

So far as I know, and I do not think the fact will be disputed even by my hon. friend, the minority has ample means to protect itself in the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. How?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. By following the rules which have invariably been followed in the Public Accounts Committee. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Foster) is an old parliamentarian and he knows as well as I do that under the government of which he was a prominent member the opposition of the day had no difficulty in protecting itself in the Public Accounts Committee. He knows very well also that since there has been a change of government and since he has been sitting in opposition, the minority has ample means of protecting itself in the committee, and of asserting its views and of bringing them before the House. The books are full of examples. We have only to look at our own proceedings and we will find a very notable example some years ago when there was an inquiry ordered specially by this House into the Drummond County Railway; the minority and the majority divided, the majority came to certain conclusions, and the minority to other conclusions, and both views were presented to the House by the report of the committee and were the subject of a long discussion in the House. Again and again it will happen that there would be difference of opinion in the committees, but I am not aware that under any circumstances the minority has put a motion before the committee and that the ruling of the motion did not form part of the record presented to the House. Let me quote Bourinot on this very point.

In 1898 the minority report was regularly moved as an amendment to the draft report which was adopted and appears in the minutes of proceedings; the proper course under such circumstances.

That is to say, that if a minority report is presented to the committee it forms part of the proceedings and is reported to the House and upon it the House can pronounce.

Mr. SPROULE. If the majority of the committee will not allow a report at all, what are you to do?

Sir. WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware that the committee can have any discretion on the point. All motions made in the committee are matters of record.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Then if they are matters of record the will of the majority or the minority have nothing to do with it, but the record comes to this House and when the record comes to this House it comes with the proposition made by the minority and the proposition made by the majority, and the House is seized of it, and the House may adopt or reject.

Mr. SPROULE. Let me ask this question: In a dispute in the committee between the two parties in regard to the asking of questions to bring out information, suppose the government party instructs the witness not to answer, and there is an appeal to the Chair as to whether he is entitled to answer or not, and the Chair rules that he has no right to answer, and the minority appeals from the ruling of the Chair to the committee, and the majority of the committee vote to sustain the ruling of the Chair, what course can the minority take if they are not satisfied except to ask that the matter be reported to the House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It may be that the majority may vote that the matter be not reported to the House now, but a report from the committee must be made to the House when the case is concluded, and the majority cannot prevent the minority then bringing the matter before the House and the House taking cognizance of it.

Mr. SPROULE. How is the minority to get out the evidence?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The evidence will be got out in this way: If when the case has been concluded and the report has been made to the House, the House disagrees with the majority of the committee, the case is sent back for further investigation. My hon. friend knows that this is what has happened on many occasions. Let me again call the attention of my hon. friend to the motion :

That any action of the majority of that committee in excluding evidence or restraining inquiry should be the subject of appeal to this House——

So far there is no objection. In a committee of the House, as in the House itself, men will not always agree, and there is a method of disposing of this question under the rules which now prevail. But what will take place if this motion is adopted ? This is what will take place :

——and upon request for that purpose the necessary report of proceedings ought immediately to be ordered.

Upon request by whom ?

Mr. SPROULE. By the party who desires to appeal.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. One man would have that power, even if all the other members of the committee were against him. The moment a man was not satisfied with the ruling of the Chair or the decision of the majority of the committee, he could say, I want these proceedings to be reported to the House, and forthwith the matter must come before the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Cannot one member do the same in this House? If he is not satisfied with the ruling of the Chair he can appeal to the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is the present rule, and the rule is the same in a committee—there is an appeal from the ruling of the Chair to the committee. But my hon. friend wants to go further than that; he wants to give the power to a single member of the committee, even though every other member should be against him, of immediately stopping the proceedings of the committee, to have the matter appealed to this House. It would be impossible to carry on the business of the committee if such a rule were adopted. Why should not the rule which has always prevailed continue to prevail? The majority gives its opinion, and for the time being the minority has to yield. It is not pleasant always to be in the minority; I know that as well as my hon. friend. It was my misfortune to be in the minority in this House for many years. But a minority has always a means of defending itself by having its view presented to the country; that is its remedy in our parliamentary system, and the majority cannot deprive it of that remedy. But it is proposed now to have all the wisdom of the ages set aside and to have a new rule under which the proceedings of a committee may be interrupted in order that a question may be sent to the House to be determined on. The rule which has always prevailed is that a certain time, when the business before the committee is concluded, the matter may be referred to the House. I do not know what particular matter my hon. friend who moved this resolution has in mind, but I am satisfied that the moment the inquiry by the committee is concluded, it is in the power of the minority to have the matter referred to the House. If the gentleman who has the matter in charge has not availed himself of the opportunity afforded to him in this respect, that is no reason why we should go back on the old rules of this House and introduce a new rule which would work as I have indicated.

Mr. SPROULE. Let me ask my right hon. friend what would happen if that were done. Suppose an inquiry were held by a committee, and towards the end of the session the committee reported to the House. There would be no time then for the matter to be sent back to the committee to be taken up again, and we would not get out the information.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am afraid my hon. friend wants to have a grievance. We have been only six or eight weeks in session, and if we are going to continue until September or perhaps November, there will be ample time for the opposition to get all the information they want. I appeal to my hon. friend as an old parliamentarian who has followed the proceedings of the Public Accounts Committee as closely as any other man, if not more closely. It is always open to the opposition to have brought before the House any matter that has been before the Public Accounts Committee, such as whether certain questions should be put to certain witnesses or not. I think it is sufficient to appeal to the sense of justice and fair play of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House in saying that this motion cannot be allowed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). It is common knowledge to every member of the House that a minority in a committee cannot present a report. There can only be one report of a committee. The hon. gentleman may shake his head, but a moment's reflection will show him that he is absolutely wrong if he says the contrary. In the Drummond County Railway case what was done was this: The minority report did not come to this House as such, but as a part of the proceedings of the committee, the whole of which were reported to this House. Every one familiar with the proceedings of the committee knows that it can only make one report, and the minority report comes before this House simply as part of its proceedings.

We do not want in the Public Accounts Committee any departure whatever from the wisdom of centuries, but a strict adherence to that wisdom and practice. What has been the practice which has prevailed in that committee ever since I have been a member? Up to the present I do not know of one instance in which the minority of the committee had been refused an appeal to this House except upon this occasion. I am not proposing to discuss whether the majority of the committee be right or wrong. That is absolutely beside the question. What I am asking is that we affirm the principle enunciated by this resolution, namely, that the minority of the Committee on Public Accounts should have the right to appeal to this House.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Has it been the practice of parliament in the past to take an appeal on a vote of a committee?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not propose to waste time by going through all those appeals, but I might give one instance. In the case of Merwin, where the majority of the committee refused——

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. That was a case where the witness refused to answer a question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If my hon. friend will be good enough not to take the floor while I am addressing the House, he will be giving better evidence of courtesy. In that Merwin case, when the minority in the committee asserted their right to an appeal and that appeal was granted, the immediate result was that the witness answered and no appeal was necessary. That is a very good illustration of the advantage to the minority in that committee of an appeal. Look for a moment at the essence of things in that committee. On that committee sit a majority of men not disposed to investigate the public expenditures or revenues. We know that. I am not saying that this is more the case now than formerly. It may be or it may not, and I am not affirming the one or the other. But it is the natural condition of that committee to have a number of gentlemen not very much disposed to probe into the expenditures of the government they are supporting. Therefore. the active and effective work must always be done, and always is done, by the minority. But the right hon. gentleman says: It is all well enough to have an appeal to this House, but that appeal can only come at the conclusion of all the proceedings, when the minority report comes up to this House among the other proceedings of the committee. Does my right hon. friend not understand that to take such a position would be destructive of any effective work by the minority? Suppose you have a witness who has to leave Canada next week, and whose testimony is most vital and important. Suppose the fate of the government and public interests as a whole should depend upon the question as to whether the examination of that witness is to be permitted. We say that the minority are at least entitled to the advantage of publicity with regard to the exclusion of that evidence, and therefore should be permitted, as a matter of course, to appeal to this House from the decision of the majority in that committee excluding that evidence. But the right hon. gentleman says: No, you must let the witness leave the country; you must let the critical moment pass, and then six or seven weeks later, when the proceedings are closed, you may bring that matter up in the House, and it may be argued out and discussed purely as an academical question, the opportunity for obtaining the witness having passed away. Does the right hon. gentleman not see the absurdity of such a contention? Does he not see that the public interests require that the minority in the

committee shall have the right of appeal? He says that in that case one man alone might have it. Certainly, whether the minority be composed of one man, or two men, or ten men. The right of appeal has always been recognized until this session—the right to appeal to this House, and then, by the publicity thus given, to appeal from this House to the country. What public detriment can there be from such a course? The right hon. gentleman can easily see that if we observe the contrary rule, public interest will in all probability suffer. But what public interest can suffer by conceding to the minority in that committee the right to appeal to this House against the majority?

I do not know what the hon. gentleman meant by some of his remarks. He said that we were attempting to subvert the rules of this House and of that committee. We are subverting no rules of this House, but are simply asking that, in accordance with immemorial usage, the minority in that committee shall have the right to this House and have the particular question determined. That is all. The right hon. gentleman knows that, so far as the rules governing that committee are concerned, they depend infinitely more on unwritten custom and practice than on any written rule. A question has been raised as to the exclusion of certain evidence. The majority of the committee has taken the view that strict legal rules of evidence shall be applied. In my experience on that committee, I never saw that rule observed, but whether it is right or wrong does not concern the present question. The question is as to the undoubted right of the minority to come to this House and have full and free discussion. The right hon. gentleman must understand that publicity is the chief weapon of the minority when out-voted in the Public Accounts or any other committee. If you deny the minority the right to come to this House and have spread on 'Hansard' the arguments pro and con, you take away from them, not only an undoubted right, but a great safeguard of the public interests. On that committee the critics are always in a minority and that minority must have publicity as its chief weapon with which to guard itself against any tyrannical treatment which may be meted out by parliament. Under the circumstances the right hon. gentleman should accept the resolution. What is the resoultion that the hon. member for Peel has placed before the House?

> The Committee on Public Accounts is constituted for the purpose of affording full and free examination and inquiry into the receipts and expenditures of public moneys and the circumstances connected therewith.

My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) finds no fault with that. We are all agreed on this point:

> That in the public interest the greatest possible freedom of investigation and inquiry should be enjoyed by that committee.

The right hon. gentleman, if I correctly understand, finds no fault with that. But he criticises the concluding clause, which is as follows:—

> That any action of the majority of that committee in excluding evidence or restricting inquiry should be subject to appeal to this House, and upon request for that purpose the necessary report of the proceedings ought immediately to be ordered.

What detriment can be caused to the public interest by adopting that principle? The right hon. gentleman asks: Upon whose request is this appeal to be made? Upon the request of the men who are pursuing the inquiry in that committee and desire opportunity to make known any facts that they deem in the public interest. The debate in this House, after the report is made, depends upon the action of the member who moved for the appeal and who has the right to debate it on this floor. Under the circumstances, the government, in refusing the affirmation of this principle, is departing from a usage of the past, putting aside necessary safeguards and acting against the public interest.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, reading the extended accounts published in the daily press of the proceedings of the Public Accounts Committee, I cannot but feel that no committee is today attracting as much attention as that committee. The reason for this is obvious. In the first place that committee has to deal with the expenditure of millions and millions of dollars, a great portion of which is alleged to be expended not only improperly but dishonestly. There is no use in mincing words, most of the examinations conducted in that committee are not along the lines of improper expenditures but of dishonest expenditures. It is in the interest not only of the public but of the government that these expenditures should be fully and fairly inquired into. The average citizen of Canada would imagine that when gentlemen representing both parties are gathered together in a committee of this kind for the purpose of such investigation their paramount object would be to see that the expenditure of the money of the Dominion is honest and above board. That, Sir, is a delusion and that delusion would be dispelled in the mind of any gentleman, not a member of this House, who visited that committee. Instead of its being an honest attempt on the part of both sides to unearth wrong-doing and bring it

to the light there has always been on the part of some members of the committee a studied effort to suppress the truth. It is all very well to make such an accusation as that but it may be said to be more difficult to prove it; I shall cite one case in order to prove it, that is the case of the Collingwood Dry Dock Company. In a few words the particulars of the case were these. Under an Act of Parliament, persons constructing dry docks in Canada were entitled to a bounty of three per cent on the amount of their investment for 20 years. An official of the Public Works Department, Louis Coste, was assigned by this department to make an estimate of the value of the Collingwood dry dock; on that estimate the company were to receive a subsidy. This engineer who was engaged at a large salaray, I think $3,000 per annum, appeared before the Public Accounts Committee as a witness, and it will surely startle the public to know that he actually confessed under oath, and it was proved up to the hilt, that he occupied the dual position of being an employee of the company and also a servant of the people of Canada. His own evidence proved that Mr. Coste in the course of his duties as an engineer of the department had to go back and forth to the town of Collingwood in connection with certain harbour improvements; that he met a gentleman named Long, connected with the dry dock; that Long interviewed him to get information from him as to his ideas as an engineer upon the dry dock, and it was admitted in the committee that on one occasion Mr. Long offered him $100. That meant that Long did not think he was there in his private capacity as an engineer but he simply considered that he was doing something, to use slang expression, 'on the side' and for that reason he offered him $100. What did Coste do? With a full knowledge of the fact that the day would come in all probability when he would be called on to value this dock for the purpose of granting a bonus to the company, he declined the $100. From time to time while there Mr. Coste inspected this dock, he also prepared certain plans of the dock and when it came to a settlement he was not prepared to accept any $100 as was proffered by Mr. Long, but according to his own sworn testimony, he demanded and received $2,000 in cash and $2,000 in stock of the company. In order to gain, as the company evidently desired to obtain from him, an estimate of $500,000 as the value of the dock which would insure them a bonus of $300,000. Mr. Coste did certain acts that I will have to refer to, which should have been the subject of a full and thorough investigation by this committee, but which were not fully investigated.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. The hon. member is going into the matter of the inquiry into the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company.

Mr. BENNETT.

That inquiry was not completed last session and was never reported to this House by that committee.

Mr. BENNETT. Is this a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I wish before taking the point of order, to say that the matter of the Collingwood dry dock was a matter of inquiry before the Public Accounts Committee last year. During the last sittings of the committee it was agreed that other witnesses might be called at this present session and so far as I remember that evidence was not reported to the House. It is true the evidence was printed from day to day and that it now appears in book form, but I think it was not reported to the House. My point of order is that the hon. gentleman has no right to discuss the matter of the Collingwood dry dock because the investigation has not yet been completed and the result submitted to the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it to be said that the House of Commons will be estopped from doing its duty or referring to what took place in a committee that never reported? We frequently have committees that do not report, committees that have done work sessions before; and I think I am within the judgment of the House and the memory of many members in saying that we have never been denied the right to refer to what took place in these committees because these committees might never report.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the point of order is well taken, because it is a well established rule that it is not permitted to refer in a debate to something that has been before any committee unless there is a report of that committee before the House. Suppose proceedings had been taken last session before a committee but that a report of those proceedings had not been made.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the minister say there is no report?

Mr. BRODEUR. I say if there has been a report; if there has been it is all right.

Mr. BENNETT. There has been.

Mr. BRODEUR: But if there is no report I claim that it is not.

Mr. J. D. REID. There has been a printed report of all the proceedings in so far as this matter is concerned. That report has been distributed to every member of the House.

Mr. BRODEUR. Has there been any report of the proceedings of the committee before the House? I maintain that if there has been no report of the proceedings of this committee no reference must be made to these proceedings.

Mr. J. D. REID. I claim that the report is before every member of the House because the proceedings were ordered to be printed and distributed among the members and therefore every member has these proceedings before him at the present time.

Mr. BRODEUR. But they have to be reported to the House by the committee.

Mr. J. D. REID. That may be a technical point, but I claim the proceedings of the committee are before every member of this House at the present time. They have been distributed and we are entitled to discuss them.

Mr. BENNETT. I think that if the hon. gentleman will hunt up the Votes and Proceedings he will find that they have been reported. I am surprised that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) should come to the rescue. He will have troubles enough of his own to attend to.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule, of course, is perfectly plain, that if a committee has not reported it is irregular to refer to its proceedings in debate in the House. There seems to be a dispute as to whether the committee has reported or not. At the moment I cannot determine that.

Mr. BOYCE. I would remind the House that no hon. gentleman has suggested that the evidence has not been reported.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member who took the point of order raised the point expressly on the ground that the proceedings of the committee had not yet been reported to the House.

Mr. BOYCE. He did not say it.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is a question that I cannot determine offhand.

Mr. BENNETT. There will be Public Accounts to be discussed in this committee during the next several months that this House will be in session and among these will be the accounts of the Public Works Department. It will require a considerable amount of time to deal with the Department of Marine and Fisheries and I will promise the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that due attention will also be given to that department by the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will be very glad.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister will not be so glad perhaps before he is through. As a matter of fact I think that the report of the case was made to the House; I am too much occupied at the present time to hunt it up, but I would suggest to the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) that he look it up and if I am wrong I will desist. But, in the meantime I am pretty certain that the case was reported by the committee to the House. What was the proceeding in that case? Here was an employee of the government paid a large salary admitting under oath.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I do not wish to interrupt the discussion and I would have no very great objection to it myself were it not that it is so unfair, I undertake to say that there was no report made to this House last session. I would be very much surprised if I were shown to be mistaken. It was generally understood last session that the hon. gentleman from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) had abandoned his investigation because every allegation made by him had been disproved.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The position at the present is that the hon. member who has raised the point makes the statement that there was no report. I have not time to verify that at present, but in the meantime in default of something being shown to the contrary, I will have to assume that it is so and unquestionably, until the report has been presented, there can be no discussion of the proceedings of the committee.

Mr. BENNETT. Since I am debarred on the present occasion I will refer to it at greater length when the estimates of the Department of Public Works come up. I think the House and the people of the country will well understand now the tactics that are being indulged in by the supporters of this government and by some of the ministers—I am glad to say not all of the ministers because there are some ministers who are not so shamefaced. They will not look at everything with partisan eyes and they are rather desirous of cleaning out the bad element from the party than retaining it. I was glad that there was no remonstrance from two of the senior members of the government against a full and fair discussion of charges against departments in regard to which we have sworn evidence printed in the reports. I am here to make this statement that the contents of this report will go out before the public——

Mr. FOSTER. Have gone.

Mr. BENNETT. Have gone before the public and they are well known in the riding and the surrounding ridings.

Mr. SPEAKER. I find that there was a report.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER (reading):

Mr. Geoffrion, from the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, presented the nineteenth report of the said committee, which is as follows:

Your committee have had under consideration the accounts, vouchers and other papers relating to a payment of $30,000 to the Col-

lingwood Shipbuilding Company, in connection with subsidy to the Collingwood dry dock, as set out at page V—246 of the Report of the Auditor General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1906, and in connection therewith have examined witnesses under oath, and for the information of the House report herewith the evidence given to date by such witnesses and the exhibits filed during the said examination; and your committee recommend that the same be printed, and rule 72 be suspended in relation thereto.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) owes an apology to the House.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. In view of the report I must certainly admit that I was mistaken, but nevertheless I am very strongly of the opinion that the report was against the common understanding of the committee.

Mr. BENNETT. I will endeavour to resume although I was rather broken off in the line of argument that I intended to pursue for a few minutes. But, it is well that the country should know what the facts are. What are the facts in this case? There never was a case approached in the Public Accounts Committee with more hostility than was this case. Day in and day out these hon. gentlemen were there in number. Why should they not be there ? They were there because they knew that the case was of such a nature that they must endeavour to drive out what was bound to transpire by a perusal of the documents, or such of them as had not been burned, and that was the truth.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman must be careful not to impute motives to members of the committee.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not suggest that members of the committee burned them. They were very closely watched.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member, I think, did make reference to members of the committee. I so understood him.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not mean to suggest that the members of the committee burned them. What happened ? Here was a company with a large capital. Here was a company which was alleged to be spending hundreds of thousands of dollars. Will it be believed that that company came down and tried to buttress up and strengthen their position as to the way in which they had obtained this large subvention that they knew had been a subject of discussion from one end of this country to the other. The startling statement was made to the committee and the House that the books upon which they hoped to base their statement that they had expended half a million dollars had been burnt in an accident. Well, that is all very well, Mr. Speaker. That went for so much. But there was in that statement something which should have attracted the attention of every member of that committee. What else transpired ? Mr. Coste was placed on the stand and he admitted that not only had he received $4,000 of the stock of that company for services performed by him but he had actually been appointed a director of the company. Now nobody ever entertained the belief——

Mr. PARDEE. Did not Mr. Coste say $2,500 ?

Mr. LENNOX. He said $3,500.

Mr. GERMAN. He would have taken $5,500 if he had got it—a tory.

Mr. BENNETT. At page 58 of the report of the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee will be found this :

> Q. Now, how did they pay you that?—A. They paid me $2,000 in cash and they gave me $2,000 in stock, common stock.

That is what I said that he received—$4,000. That is his sworn testimony. Now, what happened after that ? Mr. Coste was next in order promoted to the directorate of this company. But, Sir, here is one of the main points of that whole case. There was standing to the credit of one gentleman on the stock list of that company large blocks of stock in trust, and I believe now that certain members of this House, and I have always been advised that a member of this House if not more than one member of this House, had certain holdings of that stock and that Mr. Coste had too.

Mr. GERMAN. Will the hon. gentleman state who they were ?

Mr. BENNETT. It was not the hon. gentleman ; he was not in it.

Mr. GERMAN. Who were they ?

Mr. BENNETT. Why, Sir, when we endeavoured to bring it out the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) was one of the first men to protest against it.

Mr. GERMAN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I never protested against any investigation in regard to Mr. Coste or Thomas Long, who are both Tory supporters of the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. BENNETT. If I had time to read this report through it would be found that in the forefront of the fight there was no greater blocker than the hon. member for Welland, and I commend him to read that report when he has more leisure than now and is perhaps in a better frame of mind. We endeavoured to direct the whole of our inquiry as to who the holders were of this trust stock but that was objected to, overruled, and out-voted. But we came to a most crucial point in the case after that. We had information from certain gentlemen who are directors in that company ; men who had put their hard cash into the com-

pany, men who stood to lose their cash in that company by reason of manipulation and schemes that had gone on in the company, and these men were supplying us with information and we were directing our inquiries along that course. Now what happened ? We were informed that Mr. Hyman, owing to the fact that representations had been made to him by prominent Liberals, was unwilling to accept the valuation that was being put on by Mr. Coste, and if hon. gentlemen will consult the evidence on that point it may be found in the report that Mr. Coste states himself that Mr. Hyman would not agree to accept the report that he, Coste, had made. Why ? Because he had been informed by certain men that there was fraud and evidence of fraud in connection with it. Nay more, and the evidence bears it out, for two years that subvention was held up ; for two years the Department of Public Works would not pay it over and in the meantime what was the pressure that was brought to bear. I am sorry two gentlemen are not in their places in the House to-night, but I cannot be responsible for their not being here. There was the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and I make this statement and make it on the authority of a stockholder who saw the bills, that in one year the law firm of which he is a member received $8,000 in cash for fees out of this concern. And there was a letter on the file written by that hon. gentleman——

Mr. GERMAN. Did they not earn it ?

Mr. BENNETT. Well, some of the stockholders did not think so ; the ones who gave us the information. And the hon. member for Algoma East ; the firm of which he is connected had a holding of $50,000 of stock in that company and it was life and death to the company that they should get the subvention of $300,000 in cash. Hanging up in the balance was $300,000 in cash, to be given how? Upon the say of Mr. Coste. Now, how did the company expect to get that and what did Mr. Coste expect to get before he gave that certificate ? I will tell you what Mr. Coste expected to get. As I am informed and believe Mr. Coste expected to get $15,000 from that company before he would made his report, and we knew that a letter was written by Mr. Coste demanding from this company the sum of $15,000 before he would make a report that would drive the people of Canada into paying this company $300,000. Now if that was true that Coste had written this letter demanding (blackmailing or whatever you like to call it) of this company the sum of $15,000, was it not in the interest of the people of Canada that it should be known. What happened in the committee ? My hon. friend from Lunenburg and all the gentlemen were on hand on that occasion. And, Sir, that was the strongest part of the whole case and that is when their objections came thicker and faster than at any other time. At page 249 will be found the evidence, and although I have not seen the letter I know men who have seen the letter, and if the letter has not been destroyed very recently it was in existence only a little time ago. And I know more than that, I know where there is a photograph copy of the letter to-day that was written by Mr. Louis Coste. My friend from Welland says Mr. Coste is a Tory, but I notice the hon. member for Welland who has great works going on at Port Colborne has not moved to have that gentleman removed away from these works.

Mr. GERMAN. I certainly have and I tried to do it and I could not do it. I wish I could. He would not be there an hour if I had my way.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, Mr. Speaker, hear the hon. member for Welland, this power behind the Throne ; this gentleman who can with a snap of his fingers step into a cabinet position any day he likes, hear this gentleman standing up and telling us that for upwards of ten years he has been striving to have Coste removed from certain public works on which millions of dollars have been expended in his riding and he is utterly unable to do it. Well, I do not think the hon. member for Welland has been trying his best. Now, Sir, to resume ; we came to a crucial point in that examination. We brought here as a witness a gentleman named Mr. Calderwood who had been manager of this company and had been the trusted confidant of all the shareholders, a man who saw the letter and had had it in his own hands and had had it handed to him by the director in charge when he said: What are we to do with this fellow Coste? This gentleman, Mr. Calderwood, was in the witness box, honest and straightforward, quite willing to testify and he could have told the story. Talk about quills standing up on the fretful porcupine, but we would have seen some quills stand upon the head of some gentlemen had Mr. Calderwood been allowed to tell all he knew. Mr. Calderwood was willing to give his evidence fairly and above board, and nobody could say otherwise, and I assert that Mr. Calderwood had seen that letter and knew the contents of it and that it was shown to him by the directors when this attempt was made to drag $15,000 out of their pockets before the report would be made by Mr. Coste which would entitle this company to the sum of $300,000. Let us go to the evidence of Mr. Colderwood at page 249:

Mr. LENNOX. I want to ask two or three questions. Have you got in your possession a letter from Mr. Coste, making a demand of three per cent on a half million dollars; that would be $15,000?—A. I have not.

Q. Have you a letter making a demand at all?—A. I have not.

Q. Have you ever had a letter of that kind? A. I do not think it is necessary to answer that question.

Q. Well, I think it is?—A. Well, I appeal to the chairman.

And the chairman said :

You are not obliged to say it.

That was the impartial judgment of the hon. member for Verchères who was chairman of that committee. The witness himself, mind you, did not say he would refuse to answer the question and the hon. member for Verchères interposed and said he was not obliged to. And then Mr. Lennox said : Why not ? and the chairman of the committee said : Because it is a personal affair between them. And that shows the limited vision of the hon. member of Verchères. Here was a company trying to get a sum of $300,000 ; here was an engineer of the department upon whose say it was a question whether they would or would not get that money or would get a smaller sum ; here was this same engineer making a demand from the company of $15,000 before he would give his report, and that grave and impartial chairman of the committee says : That is not a question in the interests of the people of this country at all. Then Mr. Lennox renewed his question :

Q. Have you ever had a letter from Mr. Coste making a demand of three per cent on $500,000 on the company?—A. I never have.

That was true ; he never had the letter ; it had been in the possession of the company.

Q. Have you ever had a letter from Mr. Coste making any demand upon the company? —A. I don't think it is a question that should be brought up here. I don't care about answering it unless I am compelled to by the chairman.

Mr. LENNOX. I an instructed you had. I am asking you if you had a letter from Mr. Coste making a demand on the company for money?—A. I have already said that I do not care to answer that question unless I am compelled.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not ready to direct the witness to answer that question. I rule that it is not relevant to this investigation.

By Mr. LENNOX Q. Now I want to go a little further than that, I will come back to that after I have cleared the ground a little. Mr. Calderwood, you probably know that Mr. Coste was settled with for a bill of $3,500?—A. I do not know.

Q. I am not speaking of that $3,500, that is what I want to call your attention to, that $3,500 which he put forward as a legitimate fee. I am speaking of a demand outside of that. Now, I ask you outside of that $3,500—you do not know anything about the $3,500?—A. That is correct—I beg pardon.

Q. About that $3,500 claim for professional services?—A. I do not know anything about that.

Q. I am not speaking about that. I am asking you, outside of that, did he write a letter making a demand upon the company for money?—A. I have already refused to answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the same ruling.

Mr. LENNOX. I will appeal from that ruling.

Now, what were we face to face with? We were face to face with a chairman whose idea of what was the duty of a government official was very different, I think, from that of most hon. gentlemen in this House apart from partisanship. This chairman thought it was perfectly right for the government of Canada to be paying a man $3,000 a year to act on their behalf in giving a fair and honest valuation of property on which they were to pay a subvention of $300,000, while at the same time this official was the recipient of a large grant of money from that company. One would be charitable enough to believe that my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) and certain other hon. gentlemen on that committee would have seen the matter clearly, and would have said : Here is a case for honest investigation ; if we have an engineer to whom we are paying $3,000 a year and who is at the same time making a demand for $15,000 from this company so that the company may take from the pockets of the people of Canada $300,000, we are going to find out what sort of man he is, and let that question be answered. Well, what happened?

Mr. LENNOX. I will appeal from that ruling.

Question put and ruling of the chair sustained: Yeas, 13; nays, 5.

Mr. LENNOX. I move that this evening's proceedings and the evidence and the votes be forthwith reported to the House.

Question put; motion lost: Yeas, 5, nays, 13.

Now, I do not object to the hon. gentlemen voting for the last motion, that the whole affair should not have been reported to the House, because I should have thought that they would have been heartily ashamed of themselves for taking that action, and would not want it to see the light of day.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who were the voters?

Mr. BENNETT. Unfortunately, the names are not given here ; but I suppose they can be found in the records of the committee. Is not this a pretty state of things? Here were gentlemen sitting on that committee so politically blind that they could not see anything wrong in a man occupying the dual position of acting for the company and at the same time acting for the people of Canada. What is the use of appealing to a committee constituted like that? And so, perforce, we wanted to go outside of the committee and have the whole matter brought before the House, so that the discussion would be reported and find its way into 'Hansard,' and the members of this

House would be ranged up and put on record on that question. If that had been done, though the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite are pretty solid most of the time, I believe that some of them would have said: We do not propose to vote to sustain that man in that position and pay $300,000 of the money of the people of Canada, after what the evidence has disclosed. So the thing was chopped down and killed in its infancy in the committee—and, as my hon. friend suggests, in its infamy, too. Now, the first two clauses of this resolution are not opposed, but the last clause is, I understand, opposed by the premier :

That any action of the majority of that committee in excluding evidence or restricting inquiry should be subject to appeal to this House, and upon request for that purpose, the necessary report of the proceedings ought immediately to be ordered.

Now, I appeal to any fair-minded man whether that was not a case in which we ought to have been permitted to appeal to this House, and especially whether that question should not have been answered by Mr. Calderwood. I think it should, and that is all we are asking in this resolution. So far as the Public Accounts Committee is concerned, I can only say that in an experience of seeing witnesses examined in court rooms in the last twenty odd years, I have never seen more perjury or more flagrant perjury committed than I have seen in the Public Accounts Committee, and I make that statement without any reservation. So far as I am concerned, I would just as soon, for the sake of decency, that the witnesses were not called to the Book at all, but were allowed to make their statements not under oath. It has simply got to be a travesty and burlesque, and it would be better simply to rely on the daily accumulating evidences of deceit, fraud and dissimulation practised on the people of this country, by which a crowd, particularly that crowd of hungry hangers-on who have been driven out of the province of Ontario by the indignation of the people, are now festering on the government of the Dominion ; and this government will go down with that festering crowd hanging to them, just as the Ross government went down a few years ago. I had a good deal to say against the Ross government, but I have this to say, that the Ross government was as clear as the driven snow compared with the government of Canada as it is composed to-day.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland). Mr. Speaker, of course, we never take the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) seriously. He always says a lot of things that he does not believe, and he says a great many that he does not know much about. My experience has been that in so far as the Liberal government has ever got into difficulty at all, it has done so by reason of having Tories in its employ. Mr. Coste was an employee of the Conservative government for a great many years as chief engineer of the Public Works Department, and was continued in that position under the Liberal government—whether rightly or wrongly, I am not prepared to say. I know Mr. Coste very well, and I do not think he would do anything dishonest. My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has made a charge against him which I do not think is borne out by the facts, even though Mr. Coste be a Conservative. Mr. Coste made a report on the value of the property which the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company own, and on that valuation the government paid the bonus which, under the law then existing, the company were entitled to receive. Mr. Coste made his valuation, and his evidence was before the committee and is before the House. He may have been wrong. I am not prepared to say whether he was right or wrong. I think myself that he perhaps valued the property to its full extent.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GERMAN. I am quite willing to admit that he probably valued it to the full extent, but will hon. gentlemen opposite object to a valuation put on a public property by a gentleman who had been in their own employ twenty years or more ? Was not the then Minister of Public Works, Mr. Hyman, fairly and honestly entitled to rely on that estimated value? Mr. Hyman sent Mr. Coste to make a valuation of the property, and Mr. Coste, who had been the chief engineer of the Department of Public Works for years under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, went up and made his investigation and reported to Mr. Hyman. Was Mr. Hyman not entitled to accept that report as a fair and honest one? It may not have been honest, and I would not be surprised if it were not, because the Tories do a lot of things which are not honest—not in a financial way, but politically. I say that Mr. Hyman, the Minister of Public Works at that time, was fairly entitled to accept the report of Mr. Coste as a fair valuation on which the bonus should be paid, and I defy any of the hon. gentlemen opposite to controvert that proposition. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is a monomaniac on the question of graft; he thinks that everybody who has dealing with the government in any public contract or matter at all is in it for graft He may have been in for it himself.

Mr. BENNETT. I never was disqualified like the hon. gentleman.

Mr. GERMAN. I was disqualified for carrying out a promise to a man to whom I promised a job, and I am absolutely certain that my hon. friend will never be disqualified for carrying out a promise. I shall not detain the House further. Mr. Coste, having been engineer of the Public

Works Department for years, the ex-Minister of Public Works, Mr. Hyman, was perfectly justified in relying on his report.

Mr. J. D. REID. What has that to do with his refusing to answer the question?

Mr. GERMAN. I have always thought it was foolish for anybody to refuse to answer a question in the Public Accounts Committee or any other committee. I am quite prepared to agree with my hon. friend from Grenville that every question should be answered, and that whenever you try to prevent a question being answered you get into greater difficulty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GERMAN. I am quite prepared to agree to that.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why did the hon. gentleman vote with that 13?

Mr. GERMAN. I did not vote with any 13. I may have voted with 12. The resolution before the House proposes that the minority should report to this House. Well, the minority can report to this House. I venture to say that the leader of the opposition will not deny that it is possible for the minority in any committee to report to this House.

Mr. SPROULE. How?

Mr. GERMAN. By resolution. By putting a notice on the Order Paper and bringing it up when the orders of the day are called. The minority is perfectly protected in the Public Accounts Committee and every other. I would like to hear some suggestion from hon. gentlemen opposite, other than the hon. member from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett)—I would like to hear any one of them give any possible reason why the minority in a committee should not be heard on the floor of parliament if they have any objections to the ruling of the committee. Looking at it from that point of view, I cannot see why this resolution should carry.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny). I shall not delay the House long, but I do not wish to give a silent vote. Two years ago when that—what shall I call him?—national curse, W. T. R. Preston, refused to answer in the Public Accounts Committee and the matter was referred to the House, I voted with the minority that he should be forced to answer. Without going into all the details which the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has given, I think I may fairly say that I am in favour of the greatest freedom being given to hon. members to put questions in any committee. I do not think that in any committee of this House the rules applying in courts of law should be applied. These committees are not courts of justice, but are delegates of the House to investigate and report upon matters referred to them. At the same time the resolution submitted is rather a broad one. With the two first paragraphs nobody can find any fault, and I would be ready to accept the first part of the last paragraph. I should be ready to accept the first part, declaring that any action of the majority of that committee in excluding evidence or restricting inquiry should be subject to appeal to this House. I hope I shall never be found in any committee sustaining the ruling of the Chair, or voting with the majority to prevent any question being put to a witness or to shield the witness from answering. I have not been very long in this House, but many times I have sided with the minority of committees on this very question—voting that the Chair should not be sustained in ruling that a witness shall not be obliged to answer questions put to him for the good of the country. But the last paragraph of the resolution, I find fault with and cannot support. It reads :

> And, upon request for that purpose, the necessary report of the proceedings should immediately be ordered.

It would be very well to adopt such a resolution if we had not already, in our parliamentary procedure a remedy for the case. Every day, after the sitting of a special committee, there is a report brought to the House. The chairman of the committee presents that report to the House, and then it is open to any hon. member to move that the report be not concurred in. For instance, it was moved last year, by myself, I think, that the report of the special Committee on Privileges and Elections be not concurred in in the affair of Mr. Hyman's resignation. So, as we have the remedy under our present parliamentary procedure, I cannot see any reason why we should depart from the old rule. Especially is this true in view of the word 'immediately' contained in this part of the resolution. I think it would delay the progress of the committee to rise the moment a witness refuses to answer in order to report to the House. The committee can very well go on until one o'clock when it would rise naturally. The chairman brings the report of the committee to the House in the afternoon, and then the minority can move that the report be not concurred in. Then, as I have said, so far as I am concerned, if the motion is made that the report be not concurred in on the ground that a witness has refused to answer, or that the chairman has failed to direct the witness to answer, or has told him not to do so, I shall be ready to support the minority. I believe also that, if we look more closely into our parliamentary procedure, we shall find that, though it is very seldom resorted to, it is possible for a minority report as well as a majority report to be presented. I believe that such cases will be found in our records. Therefore, I am sorry I cannot support the resolution—

An hon. MEMBER. Sorry ?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Yes. I say I am sorry I cannot support the resolution because I agree in the principle that in the committees of the House the greatest freedom of investigation should be allowed, and that the rules followed in public courts should not be used in our committees because they are tribunals of an entirely different nature.

Mr. T .S. SPROULE (East Grey). I can scarcely agree with the conclusions reached by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne). I have been in this House a good many years, and have never known or understood that it was possible for the minority of a committee to report. It seems obviously impossible, because if the motion is made to report, and the majority do not carry the motion, the report cannot be made. Therefore, we are taking the only means, so far as I know, available to us to ventilate our opinions before the House and the country.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will allow me, I will make my position clear. If a state of facts were distinctly reported, and the motion were made not to concur in the report, I should be glad to vote in favour of forcing the witness to answer. For instance, in the case of Mr. Preston and the North Atlantic Trading Company. There was a clear state of facts reported. But this resolution covers no special facts. I see no reason for departing from parliamentary usage in a proposal which is not based upon definite facts.

Mr. SPROULE. But let me explain why. When the motion was made in that committee to report the facts to the House, so that we could base a motion on that report, we could not get the report made. Therefore, we are estopped from referring to it in this House, and are obliged to resort to this device to bring the matter to the attention of the House and the country.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. If it were certain that that was the state of the case, I should support the resolution. But I understand that, when the refusal to answer was sustained by the committee, that would be reported and then a motion could be made that the report be not concurred in.

Mr. SPROULE. But the majority of the committee agreed with the ruling of the chair, and voted against reporting to the House, and so we are prevented from going further. This is the only parliamentary device that I know of by which we can bring the matter to the attention of the House and the country, and endeavour to correct what is, to my mind, one of the greatest evils in our parliamentary practice.

I would like to deal with this question briefly, by referring, in the first place, to the duty of a member of parliament. What is parliament for ? Who clothes us with authority to act ? If we are unable to act, why should we be thus unable ? We are here as representatives of the people, each of us elected by, perhaps, 25,000 people to do their work here, to assist in the legislation of the country and to promote good government. We are the representatives here of the people who own the lands, the mines and other assets of this country. They are the shareholders, as it were, who own this property, the government being trustees in the management of public affairs. The people have a right to know how their property is managed, whether a fair return is received for any property alienated, and also whether the money received for it is properly spent. One of our first duties, as the elected representatives of the people, is to inquire into the expenditure of public money. Coming here, we endeavour to discharge that duty, and, to that end, we commence an inquiry into public expenditures. Our first step it may be is to examine the files in the department, this being one of the convenient sources of information which we are entitled to have access to. It is the readiest, the quickest and most convenient way. We are refused that right, we cannot do it, we are told, Oh these are our private papers. Whose private papers ? might I be permitted to ask ? I thought they belonged to the people of Canada, not to the ministers or to the deputy heads of departments, the chief clerks or 2nd class clerks, who tell us in that austere way, Oh these are our private papers and we cannot allow you, who represent only 25,000 people, to read the work done here. Why are they private ? They are the transactions of the public business of this country and it is our duty to look after the interests of the people who sent us here to inquire into these transactions. We are stopped at the very threshold in the performance of our duties. I deny that they are private papers. I deny that any minister of the Crown has the right to refuse us permission to examine papers and files which belong to my constituents as well as to the constituents of any minister or to any civil servant who is doing duty for the country. The servant has become the master and therefore the representatives of the people are denied by a subordinate authority the legitimate right to perform their proper functions.

Then we put questions to the ministers of the Crown. But the ministers give only such answers as they choose, and we cannot go further and combat them and say that they must give different answers, containing more information than they choose to give us. I do not think a minister is doing his full duty if he withholds information ; but we are estopped there and we cannot get the information.

Then we move for an order of this House that a return may be brought down. We ask

for the originals, because it is sometimes found that the copies are not true and complete copies, sometimes these papers are mutilated and sometimes only a partial return is brought down. So that, owing to the withholding of these papers, we cannot get full information in this way. This session we made a fight lasting for days and days upon this point, and we ultimately succeeded in compelling the government to abandon the position they took, that the opposition had no rights in the House except what the majority would grant them. In obedience to the force of public sentiment and opinion the government were obliged to give way; they partially complied with our request and brought down some of these papers. They are entitled to our gratitude for so doing, but they were doing no more than they should have done; we have received no more than we are entitled to of right as the representatives of the people. But we do not receive all the information there, we are not allowed to get all the information which would enable us to judge and to lay before the country a state of affairs that in many instances would immensely discredit this government if it was known by the electorate of this country.

Let us consider for a moment the purpose of the committees. At the commencement of every session of parliament, as soon as the address from the Throne is disposed of, certain committees are appointed. This year the appointment was made on motion of the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on the 3rd December. One branch of this motion was that a Standing Committee on Public Accounts be appointed. It was further resolved, on motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier:

> That the select standing committees of this House shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House; and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

What was referred to that committee? On the 6th of December Sir Wilfrid Luarier moved that the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's Report laid on the table last session be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, and afterwards the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's Report of the succeeding year were referred to that committee. For what purpose? For purposes of inquiry, to enable the representatives of the people to inquire into every item of expenditure in that report to ascertain if the public's money was properly, wisely and honestly spent and a proper return obtained for it.

We have now reached the stage where the committee is ready to commence their work. The committee is a creature of this House, and of course the creator must be greater than the created. The House has clothed the committee with authority to not only have the officers of the government brought before them, but any party who has had business connection with the government, to put them on oath and compel them to disclose information required by the committee to enable them to judge whether or not the money was properly expended. We endeavour to do that. This practice is an ancient one. It has been the common practice of this parliament from its earliest history to the present, and it has been the practice of the mother of parliaments. It is one of the undoubted rights of this House, and the procedure is well understood. It is sacred by virtue of its age if nothing else. It is one practice that must always be resorted to if members are to be enabled to do their duty. What are the functions of that committee? Bourinot says:

> They are empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House; and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, &c.

That is the function of the committee—to make inquiries. We are denied that right, and what are we met with? We start with the Auditor General's Report, which has been referred to us by the House. We move for all the accounts, papers and correspondence in connection with a certain item in that report. They are brought down in answer to a formal motion; we examine the accounts, and if there is anything that seems suspicious, or as to which we cannot get the information from the papers, we ask that officials from the department concerned be brought before that committee to give additional information, and these officers are brought before the committee.

These accounts are brought before the committee. We make such inquiry as we require to enable us to understand them, so that we may be enlightened. When we cannot get the information there we go farther and we have the parties who have been doing business with the government summoned to appear before that committee. They have been supplying the government, they have been purchasing agents for the government, they have been contractors for the government and we bring them before the committee and endeavour to get information from them. The first thing we do is to swear these witnesses. They are sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. We begin to ask such questions as we find it necessary to ask to elicit the information. Are we allowed to do our work as members of a committee charged with the responsibility of doing it should be allowed to do it? Not at all. How are we prevented? The first thing we are met by a number of lawyers on that committee checking us up every minute and saying: What you are doing is not warranted by the rules of evidence in court. I venture to say, as I have said fifty times over, that,

as I understand the Public Accounts Committee, we are not to be circumscribed by the rules of evidence in court. How do the laymen of that committee know what rules of evidence are? Are the parties who are before us giving evidence that would result in hanging a man or sending him to penitentiary for life? Is it the prisoner at the bar who is being examined and who, according to all well understood practice, should not be allowed to convict himself? Not at all. We are inquiring into a business transaction. We ask a question and immediately we have some lawyer on that committee up. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) is up, the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald is up——

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. They do not stay up long if they are up.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, they are up; I object; I object! Then they tell you that before you proceed to ask a question you must make an allegation of fact, that you must make a charge, that this is not an inquisitorial examination. If it is not, what is it? What are we sent there to inquire into? Is it not eminently and pre-eminently an inquisitorial examination? Certainly it is. It is part of the duty of members of that committee. But, we are estopped from doing our duty because, forsooth, we are not lawyers and do not understand what the rules of evidence are. They say: You should not ask this man to produce a letter because you did not say so and so, and for that reason he should not produce that letter. You should not ask this man to answer a question as it might disclose some person's private business, then he refuses to answer the question. We cannot get the information out. We appeal to the chair to compel the witness to answer the question. The chair generally says: I do not think the witness should answer the question. That is the general thing. He seems to be disposed to rule that way. I assume he imagines he is right but he generally rules in that way. What redress have we as members of the opposition? The only thing we can do is to appeal to the committee that the ruling of the chair be not sustained and that the witness be instructed to answer the question. The committee, generally by a partisan majority, votes to sustain the ruling of the chair. Then we cannot go any further unless we appeal to the House. Having followed the regular course of taking an appeal from the chair to the committee, our next and proper and only step is to appeal from the committee to the House either for instructions or to say whether the witness should answer the question or not. We have no power to inflict punishment if he refuses but this House can inflict punishment. He can be brought before the bar of this House and witnesses have been brought before the bar in my presence before this and they have gone back and answered the questions which they had previously refused to answer.

Look at the inquiry with reference to the North Atlantic Trading Company. What were we confronted with there? Three hundred thousand dollars of the people's money was paid out to a company which had no existence in fact at the time that this large amount of money was paid. We desired to find out to whom that money was paid, for what it was paid and whether we got a return for it or not. We brought witnesses before the committee. We had Mr. Smart, who was formerly Deputy Minister of the Interior, and who refused to answer the questions. We appealed to the chairman. I think it was the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McKenzie) who was in the chair and we asked him if the witness was not entitled to answer the question. He said: Do you want my ruling? If you do I will very soon give it to you; he has no right to answer. He did not answer and we did not get the information. Mr. Smart told us that he burned the papers belonging to the department that contained that information when he left that office.

Mr. MILLER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. I asked the same question in the House a few days ago when some other hon. gentleman was making the same kind of statement. I would like to ask the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) if Mr. Smart did make the statement that he had burned any papers that were public documents or anything belonging to the department.

Mr. SPROULE. I said that Mr. Smart said emphatically in my presence, speaking of the correspondence that had been carried on in regard to this North Atlantic Trading Company which was represented to us to be a body corporate and politic and with whom he had made a specific agreement, that when he had left that department he carried away these papers and he also said that he had burned them.

Mr. MILLER. I would like——

Mr. SPROULE. I do not want any more interruptions from the hon. gentleman because I notice that is always a device resorted to for the purpose of checking up a man in his speech or argument that he is making and which he has a perfect right to make.

Mr. MILLER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman——

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman has anything to say let him say it after I have done. I say that Mr. Smart refused to answer the question and I say that the chairman ruled he had no right to answer that question. Then Mr. Preston came be-

fore us we put a question, he refused to answer and the chairman sustained him. Then we desired to refer that to the House to get instructions whether that witness had or had not the right to answer, and we were refused the right to bring it before the House in proper shape so as to get instructions from the House or to get the authority of the House to compel him to disclose the information which he had refused to disclose to the committee. That is one case. Then we tried to inquire into the transactions of the Arundel Printing Company. We tried in regard to the ice breaker 'Montcalm.' We tried in regard to several in succession and in every case we were met by this same kind of obstruction that compelled us to fritter away time and prevented us from getting out as much information in ten days as we ought to get out in four hours. How can we, as representatives of the people do our duty here with this persistent obstruction. How long will the country tolerate this kind of obstruction when we are faithfully trying to discharge our duty to the people. How long will they tolerate it? Let the people of the country know it and I think there will be a remedy and that before very long. Then, we went on in that committee. We asked for tenders and we proceed to make an inquiry with regard to these tenders. We believe that these tenders are fraudulently put in. We find tenders sent from two different parties put in an envelope belonging to one of the parties and these tenders so arranged that no matter which one gets the contract both share in the profit. Will some one say that I am not justified in making that statement? Let me explain. In connection with the sale of binder twine belonging to the penitentiary, when these tenders were put in, one from the Hobbs Hardware Company, of London; one from H. N. Bate, of Ottawa, and one from Mr. Connolly, of Ottawa, what did the Minister of Justice find? The Hon. David Mills told me:—I felt perfectly satisfied that these tenders were fraudulent. I wired to Hobbs, of London: Send on your forfeit for the due fulfilment of this contract and come down and sign the contract and he said: So and so in Ottawa—I think it was Connolly—will sign it; it is all right; it is all the same.

Mr. Mills told me that Connolly put in one tender, Bates put in another, and Hobbs put in another, and that he felt perfectly satisfied that the whole three were collusive tenders. And yet if we desire to make an inquiry about that we are stopped from doing so in the Public Accounts Committee, and we are not allowed to tell the people of the country how much money they have lost on such transactions. In the case of the Collingwood dry dock, in the inquiry into the Public Works in all parts of the country, we are blocked from getting the information we desire. The departmental officers are brought before us but we are not allowed to get the information from them. These are the tactics which retard us in our business in this House almost every day of our lives. Every avenue which ought to be opened to us for inquiry as representing the people is closed against us. The last avenue, the Public Accounts Committee, is closed, and the friends of the government tell us there that we must be confined to the rules of evidence, that the witnesses need not answer questions, that we are asking about their private business, and that we have no right to know anything about it. At last we have been compelled to appeal from the committee to the House. We ask that the rights of the representatives of the people to examine witnesses into public expenditure be upheld. In the committee we are prevented from getting the information which it is absolutely necessary we should have. The House is the creator of that committee and we now ask the House to instruct its creature to give us our rights. Surely the House will not be so neglectful of its parental duty as to refuse to correct its child when it is doing wrong. The functions of parliament are paralyzed because we cannot do our duty in the committee and we are not allowed to carry on the work which our constituents send us here to perform. Will this House vindicate the rights of its members. The rights of the people in parliament have been won through centuries of struggle and are we to lightly abandon them now. Will we maintain these hard won rights or will we let them fall into desuetude? Whether we are laymen or lawyers in that committee should not we be allowed to get the evidence bearing on the public expenditure according to the best judgment we have. Are these obstructions to be continued in that committee? If so one of the most important functions of parliament is swept away and our constituents must come to the conclusion that the government shall be called to account for it. In the Public Accounts Committee, in the Agriculture Committee, in the Immigration Committee, in other committees we are denied our just rights. If we inquire how the public money has been expended we are told in the first place that the rules of evidence have to be complied with and in the second place that the witness need not answer questions for this reason or that. Another subterfuge resorted to is that witnesses are kept out of the country. I remember that once we did our level best to get Mr. Charlton before us to make inquiries into a very heavy expenditure of public moneys on a telegraph line which he was building in the Northwest. I saw Mr. Charlton day after day walking around the streets of Ottawa, and when we first tried to have him brought before the committee a letter was

sent to him, but there was no information given to the committee as to whether he received it or not. Then a summons was issued and the summons was supposed to be served on him at once and I saw Mr. Charlton in the Russell house on the very day that summons was issued, but I was told that the summons was held, and Mr. Charlton suddenly decamped and at the next sitting of the committee we were told that he was on his way to the Northwest. From that day to this we never have had an opportunity of examining Mr. Charlton. The witnesses we desired to examine before the committees are spirited out of the city and out of the country and every device known to human ingenuity is resorted to to block us from getting information. If we try to find out how timber limits are handled or how grazing leases are granted, or how purchases are being made by the government we are stopped by every means possible. The government now employ agents to make purchases. They have a device known to themselves lately of doing business through some kind of bogus companies the personnel of which is not known. Friends of the government hide their identity behind the name of a company. At one time it is the North Atlantic Trading Company, the names of the members of which are kept a secret; at another time it is the Arundel Printing Company which got $60,000 of our money and we would not be told who composed that company. It was said to be a respectable company of printers, but later we found that the son of James Somerville who used to represent Brant, who had a little office in London selling Butterick patterns was the president of the company and his wife was one of the members and another member of his family was another of them and the three composed the company. But they got $60,000 of the people's money under the high sounding name of the Arundel Printing Company. We tried to find out something about the Robins irrigation deal and we were stopped there. We tried to find something about the Eastern Supply Company which is organized to buy supplies for the Intercolonial Railway and there we were stopped again. In some cases we have found that the parties who bought these supplies for the government have had 150 or 200 per cent commission on their purchases, when any officer of the department could have purchased them at wholesale price without getting any commission at all. But, instead of that we have been paying 150 per cent commission to one company alone on over half a million dollars worth of supplies purchased in two years. We tried to find out who composed that company, but we could not do it, because we were not allowed; we were obstructed and prevented in every instance. It is impossible for us to do our duty under these circumstances, and we want to ventilate this thing before this House and before the country. We want to find out whether this House will vindicate its own authority and compel these witnesses to give the representatives of the people the information they require. If this House will not do that, the country should know it. It is for that purpose that we bring the question here—to see whether this House will vindicate its authority and its own rights. If it will not, our last resort will be to appeal to the people. But until we do that we have to appeal to this House, as members of the Public Accounts Committee, and as representatives of the people, elected by this House for the purpose of inquiring into these matters to sustain us in discharging our duty to the people of this country, which we are endeavouring to do, however imperfectly, according to our best lights.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a few words with reference to this resolution, and particularly with reference to what I thought was a very fair admission by the Prime Minister:

> That the Committee on Public Accounts is constituted for the purpose of affording full and free examination and inquiry into the receipt and expenditure of the public moneys and the circumstances in connection therewith.

As I understand it, there is no disagreement as to the enunciation of that as a fact. If the Committee of Public Works has not that duty, it has none.

> That in the public interest the greatest possible freedom of investigation and inquiry should be enjoyed by that committee.

That follows naturally on the first statement. If the Public Accounts Committee is constituted for the purpose of affording full and free examination and inquiry, then it follows that the greatest possible freedom of investigation and inquiry should be enjoyed by that committee. Then, to carry out that object, is this a proper conclusion, or can a better one be found? Is this conclusion adequate or more than adequate? Does it go further than it ought to go? What it says is this:

> That any action of the majority of that committee in excluding evidence or restricting inquiry——

If the committee is to obtain evidence for the purpose of examination and inquiry, then any action of the majority of that committee in excluding evidence or restricting inquiry—what do we say?—should not be allowed? We do not say that. We do not set a hard and fast line; but we say:

> —should be subject to appeal to this House—

—the House that constituted us, that created us, that gave us our duties; the House

that referred the Public Accounts to us for examination. We say that in carrying out the purposes for which we were formed, if the majority of the committee, by the fact that it is a majority, excludes evidence or restricts inquiry, we ought to have the right to come back to the House that constituted us and adjudicate the matter and get its instructions, if the House has any to give. What more reasonable thing could be asked ? If we wanted to lay down a hard and fast line that the majority of the committee should not exclude inquiry or restrict evidence, we might say so, and we might be called arbitrators if we said so. But we do not. What we say is that if this bar is thrown across the track of the duties of the Public Accounts Committee, then we ask the liberty to lay the matter before the House that it be subject to appeal to this House. My right hon. friend believes that is allowed, and he admitted it to-night ; but he does not understand the workings of the Public Accounts Committee as well as some of us who have been on that committee for years. He says : We agree that if a majority of that committee, either with or without the ruling of the chair, exclude evidence or restricts or refuses a question to a witness, you have the right of appeal to this House to have the matter reviewed here ; but, he says, you are not to do that until the whole inquiry is concluded and the whole matter is brought back to the House. Now, is that at all a remedy ? That is what I want to ask my right hon. friend to consider. For instance, suppose I am prosecuting an inquiry on a certain contract. I summon my witnesses according to the best of my knowledge. I get them there ; I put a witness on the stand ; he is sworn, and I put my first question to him : Do you know anything about this contract ? He answers that he does or does not. My next question is one which goes into some circumstances connected with the contract which I think it necessary to ask about in order to elucidate the contract. He says, I do not care to answer that. I appeal to the chairman to instruct the witness to answer. The chairman says, you need not answer. I appeal from the decision of the chair. The appeal is taken to the committee, and the committee by a majority says the chair is right. Then I ask the committee, and my friends join with me in asking it : If that is your decision, you have blocked my inquiry ; grant me an appeal to the House, who sent us all here. What I want to show the right hon. gentleman is that if I were to wait until the inquiry is concluded, and I am stopped from prosecuting the inquiry at the initial stage of it, how can the inquiry be concluded ? It is impossible. The moment I ask my first or my second question, the committee stops me. I cannot go any further until I get that information from that witness. There is exactly the question which is before the committee to-day, and which I am not allowed to discuss here to-night. I am prosecuting an investigation. There are several persons and a great many circumstances connected with. I have subpœnaed a witness. That witness is ordered to bring papers and corespondence, and when I get him there I ask him if he has brought the correspondence. He says, No. Didn't you get some? I did, but I did not bring it with me. You were subpœnaed to bring it ? Well, I did not bring it. Did you receive a letter from so-and-so at a certain time ? I have no recollection ; I might or might not. If I read you the letter or telegram——

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. I am taking a case that might occur.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend did not say that.

Mr. FOSTER. I will not pursue that any further.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Will my hon. friend pardon me ? I do not think there would be much objection on this side of the House if my hon. friend did discuss it. My hon. friend seems to keep away from it.

Mr. FOSTER. Why, the very moment that I touch the fringe of it, I am met by an objection.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Only as a suppositious case.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall go no further on that line. The hon. gentleman sees how far I have got. The moment I go that far, the witness does not answer. The chairman of the committee refusing to make him answer, I appeal from the chair, and the committee sustains his ruling. But unless I am allowed to ask that question, my whole investigation has to cease. I then ask that I may be allowed to appeal to the House and carry my case from the committee to the creator of that committee. Unless I am granted that appeal and my appeal is maintained, I cannot go any further in the investigation. Why, the remedy which my right hon. friend proposes is no remedy. He says that by and by, when the whole thing is concluded, I may appeal to this House. But the thing is not concluded and I do not want it concluded until I can examine this witness and others on the same lines. Therefore I have no remedy at all, if the remedy the right hon. gentleman proposes is the only one. There is not a record in the Public Accounts Committee which shows that, in the case of such a request, we have ever been refused an appeal to the House. Why should we ? When we are in Committee of the Whole House and the Deputy Speaker is in the chair, and a question of order comes up, and the Deputy Speaker

makes his ruling, any hon. member has the right to appeal to the Speaker and discuss the whole matter in the House. The House appoints a committee to do certain work. We, the minority on that committee, are trying to do that work. We are the only militant part of that committee, as regards the examination of accounts, and we are refused the right to put certain questions to a witness, and when we ask to be given an appeal to the House, we are met with an absolute refusal.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the hon. gentleman remember who it was in the committee that made the objection?

Mr. FOSTER. I quite remember. It was made by one of the ministers. The objection was made in this way. The minister rose in the committtee and said: This is impossible; we could never transact business if we are to allow you an appeal when ever you ask for it; the whole time of the House will be taken up in connection with these appeals. Well, the same thing was said with reference to original papers. If every original, they said, were to be brought down whenever required, all the original papers in a department could be brought down. How foolish that objection was is shown by the subsequent surrender. This is precisely a parallel case. If we have the right, before we vote supplies, to have the information, we have the right, after the supplies are voted and the money expended, to make the fullest and freest inquiry into that expenditure. We have the right to question whether any supplies at all shall be granted for the future. All we ask is common fair play and justice. We may not get that at the hands of the House; but if we get an appeal to the House, we get publicity and we get the chance to lay our case before the people who are the final tribunal. Will the hon. gentleman have some clerk of his go through the reports of the Public Accounts Committee from 1896 to 1908 and find out in how many instances any member supporting the government ever asked for papers to be brought down or an investigation to be instituted into any public expenditure. How many? I think you can count them on half the fingers of one hand. What does that mean? It means that investigation into the public expenses in the Public Accounts Committee is made by the members of the opposition alone. I doubt if you would have that committee called together during the whole session if it were not asked for by members of the opposition, and I am certain you would never have had an investigation into the Merwin supplies, the dredging contracts, or travelling expenses, or any other government expenditure, were it not for members of the opposition. The only active investigating force you have in the Public Accounts Committee is the members of the opposition. With that machinery the work of investigation is done, and it can at the best be done but very imperfectly on account of the opposition it meets with. Under every government, we have to rely on the opposition for investigating and criticising the public expenditure. The government makes the expenditure and their supporters endorse them, and the government supporters are not the ones who are going to institute an investigation into themselves. That must be done, if done at all, by the opposition. So that when you paralyze the opposition, that is tantamount to saying that you do not want and will not have any investigation into public expenditure by any committee. Can we afford to take that position? We cannot, and the opposition does not propose to dispossess itself of its rights and duties. We have work to do in the Public Accounts Committee and we propose to do it, and we propose to keep up the fight if necessary all summer and all autumn until we get a fair chance to carry out our duty of investigating into the public accounts. We would have no business sitting here if we did not do that. When we are refused that right in the Public Accounts Committee, that is bad enough; but when the majority in this House say: We will not only refuse you the right in the committee but will absolutely prevent your appealing to the House to see whether we are right or not, then the minority are uttterly helpless and the public interest is without any safeguard. If the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was absolutely wrong when he said that the minority in this House have no rights except what the majority choose to give them, his supporters are as much wrong in the Public Accounts Committee when they assert to the minority there: You have only such rights as we choose to give you.

Mr. FIELDING. Will the hon. gentleman deny that any member of this House can only have such rights as the majority gives him? Does he deny that?

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman, as a Liberal, or one who professes to be a Liberal, will meet me on that ground, if he is willing to take that ground before the public, I am quite willing to meet him. If he wants to go before the people and say, We are the majority and the representatives of the minority in this House have no rights except such as we choose to give them, we are quite willing to meet him on that ground.

Mr. FIELDING. I said the other day, in answer to a question concerning certain motions, that any hon. member could only have such rights in this House as the majority afford him. Surely the hon. gentleman does not dispute that. If the majority exercise that right unwisely, there is the remedy in publicity. I repeat the statement I then made, no hon. member in this House

can have any rights, in the procedure of the House, except what the majority in the House see fit to give him.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not care to discuss that question with my hon. friend. The majority might say: We have a greater number here than you people have, and we will pass a resolution that no member of the opposition shall speak a word in this House. Have they the right to do that?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. No public deliberative assembly could be conducted upon any other principle than that the wish of the majority shall prevail. If that majority acts foolishly, harshly, then the remedy is in public opinion. I repeat the statement that in this or any other deliberative assembly no member can have a right in the deliberations of the House except what the majority gives him.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad that the hon. member has come out even more strongly than before. It does not help his case.

Mr. FIELDING. Is it true?

Mr. FOSTER. The people will see what Liberalism we have in this twentieth century.

Mr. FIELDING. Is it true?

Mr. FOSTER. Absolutely not true. Why, the man who would say such a thing puts his foot on history, constitutional and otherwise. He would set at naught the long struggle for equal rights and free speech that has gone on among civilized peoples for centuries. We did not commence to live to-day. We do not get our rights because of the present votes which we happen to have the power to cast. Our rights are the outcome of centuries of struggle, of growth, of historical development; and it does not lie in the mouths of Liberals to defend a doctrine that is simply a declaration of tyrannical power. You might as well have Czardom; I would far rather have a Czar with one head than this many-headed Czar that is now proposed.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not see how that alters the facts.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman is willing to take what he claims as the facts and make the canvass on that—come on.

Mr. FIELDING. I am willing; for the facts are there, and nothing can alter them.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) is cocksure——

Mr. FIELDING. I believe in what I have stated.

Mr. FOSTER. He is cocksure to-night, just as he was cocksure when he declared that the province of Nova Scotia should be taken out of this confederation, and he was the man to do it.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) frequently refers to that. Whatever I did in relation to Nova Scotia has received its vindication from the people of Nova Scotia from time to time. And, at least, I never had to leave my own province to find a seat elsewhere.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) is ready to appeal to very small and, I think, unworthy arguments when he finds himself in a corner. Just as good men as he, men who have sat close to him in this House, have been defeated in their constituencies. It is one thing to be defeated in a constituency and another thing to avoid defeat by questionable means. The man who is defeated is in a more honourable and praiseworthy position than the man elected by means he ought not to have used, such means as the hon. gentleman is said to have used in Shelburne and Queens.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman need not speak of what is said to have been done. The record of the court is there, and he can refer to that.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and the hon. gentleman refused to answer questions that were put to him——

Mr. FIELDING. I did not refuse to answer any question having relation to the election under consideration; and, when efforts were made to import other matters into the trial, the judge determined that it was wrong, and the court of appeal said that he was correct.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend relied on his counsel and refused to answer the questions. The record is here, and I could turn to it if there were time. But I am getting away from this Public Accounts Committee. I close my remarks by calling the attention of my right hon. friend again to the inefficacy of his method of relief. It is inefficacious because it stops inquiry, and makes it impossible for the person prosecuting the inquiry to go on with his examination. If I had three or four witnesses in a special case I must examine them largely on the same lines, but I must refrain from examining one of them because the majority has exercised power which I think is beyond their right; and when I ask the right of appeal to the body to which the committee is responsible, such a right of appeal as would be given in any of the courts of the country, the brute majority prevent the exercise of that right. All that this resolution seeks to gain is this right of appeal. The object is to make this House an open forum where we may discuss before the country whether the line of examination proposed in the committee was a proper one or not. But to keep the question within the walls of the committee room and give the committee's majority the power to refuse us the right to appeal to this House, our powers are checked and we are stopped from doing the work which, I believe, the people wish us to do.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenburg). At this late hour I shall not detain the House at great length in discussing this matter, which, after all, is an academic question. One not knowing the hon. member for north Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and listening to them for the first time, might leave this chamber believing that the majority of the committee, presumably supported by the government, had refused the minority access to the public documents necessary to the investigation of the Public Accounts, and that the committee improperly urged witnesses to refuse to give testimony. But, speaking as a member of the House of Commons, knowing these gentlemen, I have no hesitation in stating that, for my own part, I very much question their sincerity in making these accusations against the majority of the committee. I have heard these hon. gentlemen talk about the purity of the Conservative party. In fact the hon. member for North Toronto only a few moments ago had something to say about the by-election in Nova Scotia a year or two ago, when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) went back for re-election after being unseated. Listening to these gentlemen speaking about their own political purity and righteousness, the Lydia Pinkham righteousness that would boast itself as the cure of all political ills, one would think that they were not capable, either collectively or individually, of perpetrating any violation of the election law of this country. But I observe in the Montreal 'Star' of yesterday a despatch which shows that our friends are not just as righteous as they would have us believe. There is an election going on in the province of New Brunswick, concerning which we heard a good deal this afternoon, and this despatch from St. John refers to it:—

The 'Sun' this morning publishes an affidavit from Dr. George M. Pearson, of Sussex, to the effect that in response to appeals by Mr. George W. Fowler, M.P., he had consented to accept nomination on the provincial opposition ticket in Kings county, and began to canvass his friends for votes, but that some days later, three members of the party came and asked him to contribute $1,000 to an election fund.

This fund was going to the party of purity.

They told him one candidate had agreed to put up a thousand and each of the other two must do the same.

That would be $3,000 altogether. The affidavit continues :

Mr. James A. Murray became the candidate instead of Dr. Pearson.

This is very recent evidence of the fact that hon. gentlemen are not the political purists they would have us believe and so far as I am concerned I place no more credence in their pretensions to political purity than I do in their pretensions that the Public Accounts Committee have, in this or any other year, improperly obstructed the business of this country or improperly refused to anybody the right to place before the committee evidence that should properly be placed before it.

My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) referred to the investigation of last session into the so-called Collingwood matter. I took the objection that that evidence had not been reported to the House.

Mr. BOYCE. Very improperly.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I would not like to accept my hon. friend's judgment as to what is proper.

Mr. BOYCE. You apologized for doing it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. At the time the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) was able to present to the House the fact that upon the records it appeared that the evidence in this case was ordered to be reported to the House by the committee. I have since referred to the minute book of the Public Accounts Committee and I find that no such report was ordered by the committee, that there was no such motion and that these reports appearing as the report of the Public Accounts Committee in the Sessional Papers were altogether unauthorized. The only motion passed in the Public Accounts Committee was the following which was moved by Mr. Barker, on April 9 :

That the committee recommend that the evidence taken to this date be printed, whether the respective inquiries be concluded or not, and that rule 72 be suspended in regard thereto.

The same paper which contains his notice of motion sets forth a number of inquiries, namely, the Collingwood dry dock, the Ross rifle and sub-target matters and others I cannot fairly complain of, the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce) or the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) for using the reports as they appear in the Sessional Papers, although they appear improperly, but still I wish to place this matter before the House according to the true facts in order to put myself right. Many gentlemen know that so far as the Ross rifle and the sub-target matters are concerned it was generally understood, in fact I believe it was agreed between the leader of the government and the leader of the opposition that these two inquiries should be left over until the present session.

This resolution is condemnatory of the practice of the Public Accounts Committee in receiving or excluding testimony. If the Public Accounts Committee properly excluded testimony then surely I am right and logical in saying that this resolution should not be passed, but if hon. gentlemen

assert, as they do assert, that evidence is improperly excluded by the majority of the committee then it is a fair matter for question and examination as to what the duties of that committee are. I do not think it has been questioned that the duty of the Public Accounts Committee is to investigate the expenditure of parliamentary appropriations. The English House of Commons have a similar committee and the powers and duties of that committee are well stated in one of their standing orders, No. 7:

There shall be a standing committee to be designated the Committee of Public Accounts, for the examination of the accounts showing the appropriation of the sums granted by parliament to meet the public expenditures.

I submit that it is clearly evident, and it should not be necessary to make the self-evident statement, that the Committee on Public Accounts is simply to inquire as to the expenditure of parliamentary appropriations. There seems to be some confusion as to the duties of this committee and as to the latitude that should be permitted. I find that Bourinot's parliamentary procedure, third edition, edited by Mr. Flint, states in respect to the parliamentary committees:

It is a clear and indisputable principle of parliamentary law that a committee is bound by, and is not at liberty to depart from, the order of reference.

The order of reference addressed to the Public Accounts Committee is to examine the public accounts; the Auditor General's Report for the preceding year is placed before them and all inquiry must refer only to such matter contained within the Auditor General's Report.

This principle is essential to the regular despatch of business; for, if it were admitted that what the House entertained in one instance and referred to a committee, was so far controllable by that committee that it was at liberty to disobey the order of reference, all business would be at an end; and, as often as circumstances would afford a pretense, the proceedings of the House would be involved in confusion. Consequently if a Bill be referred to a select committee it will not be competent for the committee to go beyond the subject-matter of its provisions.

I also find this statement in reference to the procedure :

Committees are regarded as portions of the House, limited in their inquiries by the extent of the authority given them, but governed for the most part in their proceedings by the same rules which prevail in the House.

Therefore, I submit, as I have already stated, that the inquiry of the Public Accounts Committee is restricted altogether to the public accounts. If hon. gentlemen could give us an instance where the Public Accounts Committee have refused the reception of testimony which would elucidate or explain in any manner whatever any public expenditure that would be a fair matter of complaint, but I say they are not in a position to point to a single instance, so far as I know, in the last four years at least, where the Public Accounts Committee refused a single word or line of testimony which would elucidate or explain any particular item of public expenditure.

Mr. SPROULE. Was that not the case in the North Atlantic Trading Company?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I say no. The committee travelled far out of its jurisdiction and received testimony which was absolutely unnecessary and absolutely beyond their power to receive, and it was only owing to the courtesy of the majority of the committee that such a volume of testimony was received as now appears on the record.

Mr. SPROULE. You have a strange idea of your duty.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I do not propose taking the word of hon. gentlemen opposite when they say that evidence which has been in the past, and is now being refused, must therefore be important or relevant. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down referred to proceedings before the Public Accounts Committee and undoubtedly referred to the sub-target inquiry. He did not mention it, but stated circumstances which make it quite clear to my mind that it was that which he had in mind. The evidence which the hon. gentleman in that case wanted to obtain from the witness was correspondence between two members of the company.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. member should refer to what is going on in the committee and has not yet been reported.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. If the objection is taken, of course, I must bow to it ; only I thought that the House might permit me to refer to it to the same extent as it did the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). It was, after all, perhaps a supposititious case. But, let me suggest a case like this : A company is organized to sell an article—say a piece of ordinance to the Department of Militia and Defence. Suppose that a contract was made in 1904 and that the contract is concluded, suppose that the contract becomes the subject of inquiry before a parliamentary committee and that questions are asked as to correspondence or conversations between members of that company, a year or more after the contract is made and concluded.

Mr. BARKER. That is not the case.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not know the case I am referring to.

Mr. BARKER. I know your supposititious case.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I submit that no fair reasoning man will say that before a committee of inquiry it is pertinent or relevant evidence to inquire as to any correspondence passing between members of that company a year or so after the contract is made. It is only fair and proper that there should be some restriction as to the admissibility of testimony. If hon. gentlemen were to have full fling in the Public Accounts Committee and were allowed to retail all their tittle-tattle and scandal there would be no end to the sittings of that committee, and I say it is only proper and it is the duty of every member of the committee to see that the inquiries are so restricted. Instead of hon. gentlemen opposite reprehending or censuring members of the committee who may be supporters of the government, it would be more proper and it would be perfectly correct, for members of the committee supporting the government to censure members of the opposition for the time they waste in that committee.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. gentleman permit me ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Yes, I will not assume the attitude of the leader of the opposition ; I will permit you.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon ; I told him he was at perfect liberty to ask me any question, but when he arose in the midst of my speech and commenced to make comments upon it I reminded him that I had the floor.

Mr. BLAIN. What would my hon. friend think of a case where a witness is on the stand giving his evidence and a prominent member of the committee sits beside him and whispers to him all the time he is giving his evidence ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I have no reason to say what I think of such a case because I have not heard of it.

Mr. BLAIN. Such a case occurred in the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I have no knowledge of the case and I would not accept any statement of such a case unless I knew something about it.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman was present.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. The Committee on Public Accounts must have some power to determine what shall be the line of inquiry. Surely they must have some power to state what line of questioning shall be admitted, or what the limits of the testimony shall be. But I do admit that there are certain cases were the contention now put forth that hon. gentleman opposite have a right to appeal to the House may be perfectly justified. Just shortly before six o'clock the hon. leader of the opposition was making a statement and I asked him, very quietly and gently, I thought, as to the cases within his knowledge or experience in which appeals were taken from the rulings of the chairman of the committee or of the committee and I was, with a great deal of force and feeling, I thought, immediately referred to the Merwin case. The hon. gentleman, having made this answer, I thought that I was surely entitled to reply to him but he burst into a cyclone of fury and attempted to extinguish me because I ventured to make the statement that the appeal in the Merwin case was on account of the refusal of the witness to answer a question. I do admit that there are certain cases in which the minority should have the right to appeal to the House, or the committee—I should not say the minority. I suppose it is not strictly correct. In the case of a witness refusing to answer a question the practice is clear, although no procedure is laid down, that, upon the request of the committee, the refusal of the witness to answer the question should be reported to the House. I do not know of any case in which this has been refused ; at least I have no recollection of any at the present time. In the Merwin case, Mr. Merwin refused to answer a certain question as to the cost of an article. Some one moved that the question and his refusal to answer be reported to the House. The committee immediately consented and if you go back to the records of the committee you will find several cases reported to the House on account of witnesses refusing to answer questions. If a witness refuses to answer a subpœna, it is also quite evident that it is the duty of the committee to report to the House the refusal of a witness to answer the subpœna. That has often occurred and reports have been made to the House upon such cases. If the committee refused to subpœna a witness upon the request of one member of the committee I would think that would also be a fair matter for reference to the House. But, you can go through the records of the Public Accounts Committee, you can search the records of parliament as closely as you like, and, I submit, you will find no authority or precedent for the position assumed by hon. gentlemen here to-day. Why should the proceedings of the committee be reported to the House because a witness refuses to answer a question which may be absolutely silly and absolutely irrelevant to the question before the committee for inquiry ? Surely there must be some limit to it. If a witness refuses to answer a question which, legally or morally, is irrelevant and unnecessary to the inquiry, and that should be reported to the House, then, if any member of the committee chose to ask a witness what style of a coat he wears or what the size of his boots, it would be just as reasonable for any member of the committee to stand

up and move that his refusal to answer these questions be reported to the House. I do not suppose that such a case would be likely to occur, but the reasoning is just as good in one case as in the other, and therefore the question gets down to this, that if a question is asked a witness which he refuses to answer or to which the majority of the committee take exception as being irrelevant, and which the chair rules irrelevant, and should not be answered, until hon. gentlemen show that the evidence which has been excluded is relevant and pertinent to the inquiry they have no right to come to this House and complain about the action of the committee. The cases which I have cited are fair cases for appeal to the House, namely, the refusal of a witness to answer a question or the refusal of a witness to answer a summons. The reason is obvious. The committee has no power over the witness. The chairman or the majority of the committee cannot compel a witness to answer and we must come to the House for authority.

Hon. gentlemen opposite pursue the same course about this matter as they do about their political purity cry. When they were in power I suppose they had a majority in the committees. They then did not take the position that private matters should be inquired into. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) practically shed tears over the fact that the Public Accounts Committee even took the ground that matters of a private nature should not be made public. I would like to give the House a few instances of the objections taken by hon. gentlemen of the party opposite when they were in power, in order to contrast it with the position they are assuming to-day.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. Wait until the member for East Grey comes back.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. On the 29th of July, 1891, one William Peart was being examined on certain affairs relating to the Department of the Interior and he was asked by Mr. Somerville then a member of the committee :

Q. How much money did Mr. Dewdney pay you privately?—A. I am not at liberty.
Q. You are at liberty to tell all you know? —A. I am not at liberty to give my private affairs in this way.
Q. Who told you that?

Here Mr. Foster objected.

Q. I want you to tell us who told you not to tell?—A. My private affairs belong to me.

The chairman ruled that the question should not be answered and on an appeal to the committee the ruling of the chair was sustained and I find that in that vote sustaining the ruling of the chair there appears the names of Mr. Foster, Mr. Taylor, and Mr. Sproule. I believe this Mr. Sproule is the same gentleman who now occupies a seat in the House and he was then willing to say that private affairs should not be examined into.

Mr. J. D. REID. What was the examination about ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Matters relating to the Interior Department. On the 31st of July, 1891, Mr. Mulock asked a witness whether any contractors of the Langevin block contributed to the Langevin testimonial fund, and no objection being taken the chairman ruled against the question on the ground that it did not relate to the inquiry and the witness should not answer. I find that on that motion Mr. Foster, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Bergeron, and Mr. Haggart, voted to sustain the chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. Quite right.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Let me give a few other cases. On the 8th of September, 1901, before the Public Accounts Committee one Mr. Thomas A. Scott was being examined under oath and he was asked whether the Dominion Type Foundry Company subscribed to the Dominion election fund. The Dominion Type Foundry Company were selling a good deal of supplies to the government at the time and no doubt to-day the member for North Toronto and the member for East Grey would say it was a very relevant question, but when that question was put Mr. Foster objected to it and the chairman ruled the objection was well taken, and on appeal being taken I find that Messrs Bergeron, Foster, Sproule, and Taylor, voted to sustain the chair. I find that on the same date a Mr. J. D. Rolland was examined and he was asked whether in 1887 and since he or his company or any member of his company paid to Mr. Dansereau or any person for him any money as a gift or otherwise, and here our historic objecter, Mr. Foster, struck in again, and objected to the question and the chairman ruled the objection well taken, and Messrs. Bergeron, Foster, Taylor, and Sproule stood by the chairman. On the 31st of July, 1891, Mr. Mulock moved that Mr. Joseph A. Charlebois be summoned to appear before the committee touching contributions of money to any newspaper in which Sir Hector Langevin had or still has a pecuniary interest. Objection was taken that the motion not being based on any item in the papers before the committee it was out of order, and the chairman ruled the point well taken and I find that Mr. Haggart, Mr. Foster, and Mr. Taylor, supported that ruling on the ground that the question did not relate to an item of the Public Accounts in the Auditor General's Report. Well, there are one or two other cases which perhaps I might give to the House. On August the 4th, 1891, one Mr. John Graham was giving evidence and he was asked whether the Postmaster General of the day had visited

Mr. Graham himself or whether Mr. Graham had any conversation with him as to the cause of Miss Graham's absence.

Mr. BENNETT. Why was the late Minister of Public Works absent from the country all last year ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I understand the late Minister of Public Works was absent from this country on account of illness.

Mr. BENNETT. Is that all ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I do not see what that has to do with these matters, but I notice that the same old objection was taken and sustained by the Chair, and that Mr. Foster, Mr. Haggart, Mr. Taylor and Mr. Sproule voted to sustain the ruling of the Chair. On August 14, 1891, one Mr. George H. Kernick, of Montreal, was asked to produce an alleged agreement made between Mr. Berthiaume and the New England Paper Company regarding paper to be supplied to the Government Printing Bureau. The objection was taken,—and the chairman ruled the objection as being well taken,—that these documents were not proper ones to place before the Public Accounts Committee but should be brought before the Privileges and Elections Committee or otherwise the Public Accounts Committee would be usurping the privileges of the Privileges and Election Committee. This document which was asked to be produced referred directly to a contract in which the government was interested. The chairman's ruling on that case was sustained by a considerable majority, and I find that Messrs. Bergeron, Foster, Haggart, Taylor, and Tisdale stood by the ruling of the chair on that occasion.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the hon. gentleman find in his research any case where the minority appeal was refused by the committee ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I can find no case of an appeal being asked for upon a vote of the majority of the committee to the effect that certain evidence tendered was irrevelant and did not appertain to the inquiry ; not a single case. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say the whole question is whether the evidence which hon. gentlemen opposite state has been refused by the majority of the committee, is relevant or not. The Prime Minister put the matter very well this afternoon when he pointed out that in 1906 nearly 1,000 pages of evidence and last year 700 pages of evidence were printed. I say that if the Public Accounts Committee have erred at all it has been in the way of allowing too great a latitude in the mode of examination and in permitting testimony to be placed upon the records which did not relate to the questions before the committee. One word more ; it is a favourite matter of criticism against the Public Accounts Committee—and the member for East Grey referred to it to-night—that lawyers on that committee are constantly taking the objection that the evidence is not legal evidence. Now, I have been a faithful attendant upon that committee during the last three sessions of parliament and I do not believe I ever heard a member of that committee who is a professional man invoke the laws of evidence to prevent the reception of testimony. The exception taken is this generally,—and it is only a matter of common sense, and if the hon. gentleman for East Grey will exercise what amount of common sense he has, he will reach the same conclusion by the same process of reasoning which the professional gentleman would, namely, that if evidence does not strictly relate to the inquiry before the committee it should be excluded for reasons which are many and obvious. Concerning this whole question, I say that gentlemen who call themselves the minority are properly treated before the committee by that element of the committee which they call the majority. I say that no evidence which should be properly received is ever rejected ; no evidence which would go to elucidate or explain in any manner whatever the public accounts of this country as appearing in the Auditor General's Report and placed before the committee has ever been excluded. I say further that if the committee err at all, and I believe they do, it is in expanding the records by permitting all sorts of evidence to be received which has no relevancy to the inquiry, and I say in conclusion there is no necessity for the adoption of this resolution because the facts which are alleged to be the foundation of this resolution do not exist and never did exist.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) commenced his address by saying that he did not credit statements made by the members of the opposition. I think, after the exhibition he has made of himself to-night, he was the last man that should have made such a remark. When the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) referring to a case which he thought had been reported to the House, the hon. member for Lunenburg raised the point of order. You, Mr. Speaker, would not rule because you were not in possession of the fact whether the case had been reported or not. Then the hon. member for Lunenburg got up and made the statement on his responsibility as a member that the case had not been reported. Then my hon. friend from East Simcoe withdrew, making no further reference to it. But presently you, Mr. Speaker, having looked up the record, made the statement that the case had been reported, after the hon. member for Lunenburg had stated on his personal responsibility as a member that it had not been reported. He tried, in lawyer style——

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Do you say that my statement is not true?

Mr. TAYLOR. I take the statement of the Speaker of this House, who raised the point without any member of the opposition having raised it, and I accept his statement and the record as being true. The hon. member for Lunenburg has referred to my name in connection with many votes of the Public Accounts Committee; but he cannot point to a case in the days of the Conservative government in which the minority were refused an appeal to the House—not one. I have been a member of that committee—and I think my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the right hon. Prime Minister are the only two other members who have been—from 1882 to the present time; and I challenge the hon. member for Lunenburg to search the records of that committee. Look at the case of Senecal, of the Printing Bureau; look at the case of Mr. Rykert, who represented Lincoln; look at the case of Sir Hector Langevin; and there were thousands of other cases. Sir John Thompson and others of the majority said to the opposition: We will take down the bars and give you a full and fair investigation. But how has it been in the Public Accounts Committee for years under this government? The hon. member for Lunenburg and other gentlemen I might name look as if they were sent there as paid agents to prevent the opposition looking into the mass of corruption which the Auditor General's Report exposes. Just as soon as the committee meets at eleven o'clock, one of these gentlemen will take the floor and talk against time until the adjournment, and the opposition have no opportunity of examining a witness or making a statement. As soon as one of these fellows gets tired, another gets up and pumps wind over a legal point and prevents investigation. It is my opinion and the opinion of the country that the government are afraid to have these accounts opened up. The Minister of Finance says the minority have [illegible] right in this House except such as the majority gives them. It looks like it. I want to say, as a representative of some 6,000 or 7,000 electors, that if I have only such rights in this House as the majority see fit to give me, I am one of those prepared to stay here till Christmas. I want to advise the premier to call off his dogs if he wants to get any supplies this year. If we are to be hounded as we are every day in the Public Accounts Committee by several lawyers sent there for the purpose, the right hon. gentleman will have to wait for his supplies. The Minister of Finance will admit that the opposition have some rights in the voting of supplies, and we are going to exercise them. So far as I am concerned, if the hon. gentleman is not going to give the minority fair-play in the Public Accounts Committee, then I can tell him that the supplies will not be voted for several months. He had better deal with the hon. member for Lunenburg, and two or three other hon. members like the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. L. G. McCarthy), who argued the other day about such evidence as we were tendering not being allowed in court. The Public Accounts Committee is not a court of law; it is a committee of inquiry, and it is our right to inquire into everything that is pertinent to the case submitted to us. None of the cases the hon. member for Lunenburg mentioned bore any comparison to any of the cases brought before the Public Accounts Committee either this session or last session. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister, when in opposition, did not attend the Public Accounts Committee, but he sent a lot of stalwarts there, such as Sir William Mulock and Mr. McMullen; and everything was thrown open to them, and there was nothing done to prevent them making the fullest inquiry. But when they brought up matters such as the hon. member for Lunenburg referred to to-night, which were irrelevant, it was our duty to protect the rules of the House, and not allow private matters to be investigated. It was our duty not to allow men to be asked—perhaps some contractor or some member of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—if they contributed to a fund for Sir Hector Langevin. If our High Commissioner in England, Lord Strathcona, were brought before a meeting of the committee and asked if he had made a present of an automobile to the right hon. the premier, I would jump up immediately and say that that was his business, and he could give his money to the premier if he wanted to. That is the kind of case referred to by the hon. member for Lunenburg—whether a contractor contributed to a private fund for Sir Hector Langevin, as honest and upright a man as ever lived in this country; but because he was a poor man, not getting rich, like some of the men surrounding the premier to-day, his opponents wanted to bring men before the committee and make them tell whether they contributed to such a fund or not; and such questions were properly ruled out. I challenge the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to point to a case where that minority although they scraped every pigeon hole they could in order to find some charge against the government, was ever refused an appeal to the House. In every instance they were given an appeal the moment they demanded it. But, if they did not ask for an appeal, as in the cases cited by the hon. member for Lunenburg, it is simply because they saw in the committee that they had no case and were ashamed to ask for an appeal. The hon. gentleman cannot point to cases under the late government, as we can under this government, when session after session is occupied by lawyers

addressing the committee and arguing as to whether a witness should be made to answer or not. Under the late government, when the Committee on Public Accounts met, witnesses were summoned and examined, and time was not taken up, as it has been by these hon. gentlemen last session and the present session so far, in making frivolous objections and preventing the evidence from coming out. I would advise the right hon. the First Minister to call off his bull dogs if he wants this session to close some time before Christmas.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). When the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) rose to his feet, I expected, after the activity he displayed in the Public Accounts Committee, that he would attempt to justify the course he took there, but to my surprise and disappointment I found that he evaded the resolution before us altogether, and devoted all his energies to finding out whether the Conservative party in past years had, in some way or other, tried to block the evidence in similar instances. He began by reading something from the Montreal 'Star' in connection with the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) and relating to electoral corruption. Then he branches off to the Collingwood dry dock and Bourinot on 'Parliamentary Practice,' and then discussed what took place in the Public Accounts Committee in 1891. I would suggest that my hon. friend, from the conduct he has followed not only in the Public Accounts Committee but in this House, should be the very last one to attempt to argue against the adoption of this motion. His record is such that I think it would be exceedingly indiscreet on his part to put himself on record. As the hon. gentleman quoted so glibly an article from the Montreal 'Star' against the hon. member for Kings and Albert, let me give him the views of that journal with reference to himself. I find the following in the Montreal 'Star' of February 13 :

Grievances and Supply.

Sir Wilfrid was right in suppressing one of his more bumptious followers who thought that it would be a convenience to the government side if the historic right of parliament to discuss grievances on the motion to go into supply were limited to the extent of requiring two days' notice. That is, parliament could not by right express a grievance—no matter how urgent—until it were two days old, unless the government, against whom the grievance very probably would lie, graciously gave its permisison to voice its complaint.

My hon. friend is a very close colleague of the hon. Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Finance laid down the doctrine very positively indeed that the minority have no rights except what the majority gives them. His first lieutenant Mr. Maclean) is doing his best to disseminate that principle and put it into practical effect. He went into past history and endeavoured to give some instances of parallel cases in 1891, but the cases he cited were not parallel at all. In none of the cases he cited was there any request that the decision of the committee supporting the chair should be reported to this House. Therefore my hon. friend was trying to draw a red herring across the trail. But what is the position in which we find ourselves to-day ? The motion of my hon. friend from Peel has for its object the affirmation of a very desirable principle, the salient part of which is contained in the last paragraph, and that is the paragraph to which the First Minister dissents, namely :

That any action of the majority of that committee in excluding evidence or restricting inquiry should be subject to appeal to this House, and upon request for that purpose the necessary report of the proceedings ought immediately to be ordered.

If the members of the committee, representing the government side of the House, are not desirous of suppressing the truth, why should there not be an appeal to the House. The hon. member for Lunenburg says that if a witness in that committee refused to answer, there should be an appeal to this House therefore, he admits the principle that in some circumstances there is a right of appeal from the committee to the House. But if the right exists under one set of circumstances, namely, where a witness refuses to answer, surely there must be a similar right where a witness is advised not to answer and is protected, in his refusal to answer, by the majority on the committee. Again my hon. friend says that if a witness refused to attend he could be reported to the House. But in that respect he is in conflict with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), who raised the point the other day that there was no jurisdiction in this committee to report to the House, that the decision of the committee itself was final, and that it had no jurisdiction to go any further. My hon. friend, however, is at variance with that doctrine because in three distinct cases he allowed that there is an appeal from the committee to the House.

And the principle being broken into, it must, in the ordinary course of reasoning, follow that any refusal by the witness whether countenanced or not countenanced by the committee ought to be and must be reported to the House. But I have been a member of the Public Accounts Committee and have occasion to resent very strongly the procedure followed. Take a case: A witness is asked a question. Of course, credit must be given to the opposition for honesty in their efforts to bring out evidence, and so it must be assumed that the question leads up to a certain point. It may be, as in a case within my own experience, the point to be led up to is the production of documents. But, so surely as that evidence appears about to

reach a climax; the production of a document admitted to be in the possession of the witnesses, so surely will some hon. member of the persuasion of my hon. friend from Lunenburg rise and object that the evidence is irrelevant and that the production of the document should not take place, though the fact that it is in the possession of the witness is still admitted. Other tactics have been followed—for instance, warning and instructing witnesses in the committee. If the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) were to attend that committee as an interested listener, I venture to say that he would find the portions of this motion with which he says he is heartily in accord very widely departed from by his own followers, some of whom have spoken upon this occasion. With the statement that the Committee on Public Accounts is constituted for the purpose of affording a full and free examination and inquiry into the receipts and expenditures of public money and the circumstances in connection with it, my right hon. friend says he has no quarrel. But let him see for himself the workings out of the principle in the Public Accounts Committee and he will recognize the need for this appeal again and again. This amendment goes on to say:

That in the public interest the greatest possible freedom of investigation and inquiry should be enjoyed by that committee.

Is the fullest freedom enjoyed when members interrupt witnesses who are themselves anxious to tell the truth? I have seen cases in the Public Accounts Committee where a witness has been asked a question and has declared that he had no objection to answering it, and yet a member of the committee has interrupted to say: 'I do not see why you should answer.' And when the witness has been asked again, even after a hubbub of objections in which he took no part, the witness said again: 'I have no objection to answer,' there came the same objection from a government member of the committee. And then a whispered consultation—can you believe it, Mr. Speaker?—a whispered consultation between the government member of the committee and the witness under oath; the necessity for two appeals to the chairman of the committee to prevent that conversation, and finally the witness, warned, made suspicious, made to believe that something dreadful hung upon the question which, until then, he had no objection to answer, not desiring to suppress the truth, timorous, and at long last, after waiting to see whether he had the gracious permission of the government member of the committee who had interfered and intimidated him, giving a half-hearted and reluctant answer to the question. That is a state of facts within my own knowledge, and it took place this very morning in the meeting of that committee. And the member who interfered with the witness was the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. A. Johnston).

Mr. SPEAKER. It appears that the hon. member (Mr. Boyce) is referring to a matter in a committee not yet reported to this House.

Mr. LENNOX. It will never be reported.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I was not paying great attention to the observations of my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce). What has he got to say with regard to the hon. member for South Cape Breton?

Mr. BOYCE. It is very possible indeed under these circumstances——

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I submit that in all fairness the hon. member (Mr. Boyce) should answer the question of the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston).

Mr. JOHNSTON. If you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, an hon. friend has told me that the hon. member for Algoma has said that I indulged in a whispered conversation with a witness in the committee this morning. I wish to give this statement coming from my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) a most positive denial. I did—when a question was put to the witness this morning, a question upon lines exactly similar to the question referred to by the hon. member for Lunenburg—I did say that that was a question that had absolutely no reference to the matter under consideration by the committee; I did say to the witness, that if he had no objection to answering the question, I saw no reason why he should not answer it. But when the hon. gentleman says that I indulged in a whispered conversation with the witness, I give that statement a most emphatic denial. And I leave it at that; any statement my hon. friend may make with regard to that matter will not disturb me in the least.

Mr. BOYCE. I can only say that I was examining that witness——

Mr. SPEAKER. I called the hon. member's attention to the fact that he is making reference to something that occurred in a committee that has not been reported. It is a rule, time and again enforced, that such a reference is out of order.

Mr. BOYCE. Then I will proceed with my remarks. I have just this to say that if a state of facts such as the instance I have given——

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. What?

Mr. BOYCE. Such as I have referred to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. What is that?

Mr. BOYCE. I will take what the hon. member for South Cape Breton admits he did, and say that, that being the state of facts, which is a frequent——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Boyce) is continuing to refer indirectly to the same matter. That cannot be permitted.

Mr. BOYCE. I am not——

Mr. SPEAKER. Surely the hon. member will see that it can refer to nothing else.

Mr. BOYCE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will say that if such things had taken place at any past time in the Public Accounts Committee; if there had been any interference with a witness and interruptions of a witness and communications with a witness in that committee; if these interruptions had been objected to and yet persisted in; if my hon. friend from Lunenburg was present and participated in all this——

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. That has never occurred in my presence in the Public Accounts Committee. So the hon. member's suppositious case is worthless.

Mr. BOYCE. I would remind my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) that he is not allowed to refer to anything in a committee unless it has been reported. If such cases were of frequent occurrence, of what avail is the specious statement of my hon. friend that he desires the fullest and freest investigation into the public accounts in the Public Accounts Committee? Let him or those associated with him make that inquiry so full and be of such assistance to those prosecuting the inquiry that any refusal to answer relevant questions shall be impossible, and that all the facts concerning all public accounts under investigation shall be made public. Then this side of the House at least will be inclined to pay a great deal more attention to the ethics of my hon. friend's statement than we are inclined to now. My hon. friend has referred to misdoings and improper votes in the Public Accounts Committee during the Conservative administration, going back to 1891. When the Conservative administration was in power it did not hesitate to grant investigations into wrong-doings, whether by its own friends or by adherents of any other political party. When these investigations had been made the evidence was fully brought out, no attempt was made to stifle the evidence, the facts were reported and justice was done; the offenders were prosecuted, and in some instances were landed in the public prisons.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. They soon got out.

Mr. BOYCE. They may have soon got out. Can my hon. friend point to any case where one of the offenders against this government has been investigated or prosecuted or punished? No, the converse is the case. This government goes to the public jails to get some of their officials, they wait for them at the doors until they come out, then they appoint them and promote them, giving them increases of salaries. That is the contrast between the Liberal and Conservative administration.

If we are to have a Public Accounts Committee which is to do the work assigned to it, a committee that will afford full and free examination into the expenditure of this country, that will probe into every expenditure and expose extravagance and misappropriation of public moneys, that committee must be hampered in no way by any technical objections or by any technical applications of so-called law or usage, as indicated by my hon. friend. That committee, if it is to do its work, and if the right hon. gentleman is desirous it should do its work, should have its scope and sphere strengthened so that the full light of day should be let in on the matters investigated there, and that the public should be seized of the grave nature of the scandals which affect the public expenditures of this country.

Mr. GEORGE W. FOWLER (Kings and Albert). I should not have participated in this debate, but I understand that my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) read an affidavit contained in the Montreal 'Star' which had some connection with the present local election in New Brunswick. I scarcely understand the relevancy of the selection which the hon. gentleman has read, but as it was permitted I suppose it will be quite in order for me to read from a newspaper published in New Brunswick an article relating to the course that is being pursued by friends of the hon. gentleman. The article is as follows:

Did Mr. Goodspeed put up the $1,000?

Admission of a serious nature made by government candidate—Money for votes, rum, &c.

How does Councillor Clarence Goodspeed happen to be a member of the government ticket in York county after the statements that he made before becomng a candidate?

That is a question that the electors of York county may well consider in connection with the splash and splurge which the organs of the grafters——

That is the government organs; it is unnecessary to say that, of course.

—are making over the fact that Dr. Pearson is not a candidate of the opposition party in Kings county.

The case of Councillor Clarence Goodspeed is one that all electors of York county may well consider and think over seriously.

Some little time before the convention of the government party in this county Councillor Goodspeed's name was mentioned as a possible candidate and he was asked by some of the party managers to become a candidate.

During the month of January, Councillor Goodspeed was in the city attending a conference between representatives of the provincial government and the municipality of York regarding the payment of some board of health bills and that day he met a representative of the 'Gleaner' on Queen street.

Councillor Goodspeed ws asked whether he was going to be one of the candidates and replied in the negative.

When pressed for a reason as to why he would not be a candidate Councillor Goodspeed stated very plainly and truthfully that if he was to be a candidate on the government ticket he would have put up at least $1,000 to be used for buying votes, rum, &c.

Such an admission on the part of Councillor Goodspeed would seem to be of a very serious nature.

Has Councillor Goodspeed put up the '$1,000 or more for buying votes, rum, &c.' ?

As I understand, the selection read by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean), no suggestion was made that this money was for other than legitimate purposes. It will be remembered that some time ago the member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) stated that he himself had been obliged to spend over $1,200 for legitimate purposes in his own county.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He did not swear to nearly that amount.

Mr. FOWLER. That is what he stated in the House, and when he states it in the House it is equivalent to an affidavit.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They do not hitch, though.

Mr. FOWLER. That is a matter for the hon. gentleman to reconcile with his own conscience. It was not stated in this affidavit that this money was for other than legitimate purposes, but in the statement which Mr. Goodspeed made he gave the reason for not accepting the nomination, stating that the $1,000 was for buying votes and rum in the election. I think that is entirely irrelevant, but I think it well to give both sides of the case, so that the House will understand that if there be any fault, it is certainly not all on one side.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE (South Essex). Mr. Speaker, I shall not, at this late hour, detain the House long and shall not follow the last speaker on matters that do not pertain to the resolution now before the House. It is perhaps proper that, as chairman of the committee which is the subject of this debate, I should say something on this resolution, because naturally I am very jealous for the honour and reputation of that committee. On looking over the resolution, it seems to me that it unnecessarily reflects upon the committee which has charge of the investigation of the public accounts. The resolution appears to me entirely out of accord with the principle of parliamentary institutions relating to select committees. I am glad that the debate has come up. I have been groping for light and information as to the proper procedure which ought to rule in that committee. The result of my investigations is that the House has such confidence in the committee and in its character and ability, that it gives it an absolutely free hand, relying on that confidence, to investigate the matters brought before it.

In Todd's 'Parliamentary Government in England,' I find the principles relating to the appointment of such committees, and it seems to me that this committee has been appointed in accordance with the practice there laid down.

Such committees are usually appointed either at the suggestion or with the direct approval of the government, and are composed of a fair proportion of leading men from both sides of the House, including members of the existing and of former administrations, in order that, as a general rule, the balance of parties may be maintained, and the feeling of the House represented thereon. In the appointment of select committees, it is the usage that a majority of one should be given to that side which possesses the majority in the House itself. Men should be selected to serve on public committees who, from their abilities, experience, or the special interests they represent, are peculiarly qualified for such service.

I take it that this has been the rule which has been followed in the selection of the Public Accounts Committee. As I understand it, the leaders and whips of both political parties were those who selected those who, on account of their fitness, ought to become members of the Public Accounts Committee and it seems to me, that, where that has been done, where that committee has been approved of by both sides of the House, with the ability of the members composing it, something serious should be brought forward before any reflection is made upon a committee which has been entrusted with such important affairs. I believe that the committee which has been appointed does credit to those who are responsible for their appointment. I believe that there are on that committee men on both sides of the House who are there with an earnest desire to investigate and to arrive at the very truth with respect to the matters which have been referred to them. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has said and, perhaps with a good deal of truth, although I think, subject to some qualification, that the majority of the committee are not disposed to probe into the expenditure. I do not entirely agree with that. I think that members on the government side are quite as anxious to know how the money of this country is being expended as the members on the other side of the House are. The truth is that we have so alert an opposition that members on the government side possibly are not so actively engaged in bringing these matters forward. True it is that members on this side of the House have not the information which members on the other side of the House have because we know full well that where there is a disappointed contractor or some other disappointed person he immediately carries all

his complaints to the members of the opposition in order that they may make a point against the government, or some successful tenderer or something of that sort. There is another interest to be guarded. Although the interest of the majority may not be as active in investigating matters, there is another interest in respect to which the minority ought to be watched and it is their anxiety to bring out matters which may prejudice and which may throw obloquy upon the members of the government or those who are carrying out the government, and it is the duty of the majority on that committee to see not only that matters which reflect upon the government and those connected with the Public Accounts are brought out, but also to bring out matters which are in their favour. The formula is very well settled as to what is to be referred to this committee. I do not know what the intention of the first paragraph of the amendment is. I do not know whether it is intended by that to give the committee more jurisdiction than it has at the present time. The amendment proposed does not use the words of reference which are used and which have been used since confederation in referring matters to the Public Accounts Committee. The formula is very plain. The committee is appointed with power to examine and inquire into all such matters as are referred to it. Surely that is plain enough and if it is not intended to go any further I do not see what the object of the first paragraph of the amendment is. The second paragraph of the amendment is:

That in the public interest the greatest possible freedom of investigation and inquiry should be enjoyed by that committee.

If this is taken literally I am absolutely opposed to it. I do not think it is intended to be taken literally, but that what is intended is that there should be free inquiry in matters which are referred for investigation. Otherwise, we could investigate the domestic brawls of people in Ottawa. I do not think that is the intention of the mover of the resolution. The intention apparently of some speakers on the other side is that the committee should be allowed to proceed absolutely without regard to any rules of evidence. As chairman, I would be very glad indeed if that were adopted, because there would be no necessity for ruling upon questions which are referred to the chair. But what a dangerous thing that would be in any community! What a dangerous thing it would be if, at the instigation of some malicious person, some person who might seek to discredit an individual, questions could be asked which would damage that person without the person giving the information being responsible for the statements which he made! What I think ought to be regarded in asking a question of a witness in that committee is, first, that it should be relevant to the inquiry, and, second, that it should be responsible evidence. Let me put this case: Suppose, for instance, a charge is brought against—I do not refer to any one in the committee because it might be said that I am referring to some question which has been brought up—but suppose a charge is made against some person, I will say, the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy)—he is old enough not to object to his name being used—for alienating the affections of his neighbour's wife. I write to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) certain things saying that I know this charge is true. The hon. member for Leeds is put upon the witness stand and he is asked: Did you not get a letter from Mr. Clark saying that the hon. member for New Westminster had alienated the affections of his neighbour's wife? The hon. member for Leeds says: Yes, I got that letter on such an occasion. That goes on record. Here you have a statement put on record that the hon. member for New Westminster is guilty of a very serious offence and this statement is made on the evidence of the member for Leeds, who knows nothing about it. It is possible for some wicked and designing person to write a letter and for the contents of that letter, without having any responsible witness before the committee, to be made public and put on record to the irreparable damage of innocent people. That is what I object to and I, for my part, will be as astute as possible to see that hearsay matters which reflect upon people who have no opportunity of defending themselves are not brought before this committee in an irresponsible way because where they are not brought forward by a person who knows, but on a statement got in an offhand way, we have not the authority to receive such statements. It seems to me a most dangerous proceeding, and it is certainly one in which the rules of evidence ought to be strictly enforced. I have heard members of this House get up and make statements about business men outside, and I have been consulted by these men and asked if there was no process by which they could hold these members responsible for defamation of character. I have had to tell them that there was not, that by the privilege of parliament members could say anything they liked whether it was malicious or not. Such are the responsibilities of members of parliament and whether it is in parliament or in the committee I submit to the House that one of the most important things to be guarded against by the committee is the making of statements by irresponsible people who are not there to back them up and be cross-examined upon them. If the intention of that second paragraph in this resolution is that any question must be answered whether it

is relevant or second hand, I certainly am very strongly opposed to it.

The third paragraph is one of a great deal of importance :

That any action of the majority of that committee in excluding evidence or restricting inquiry should be subject to appeal to this House, and upon request for that purpose the necessary report of the proceedings ought immediately to be ordered.

I had hoped and expected that those who brought forward this resolution would have been able to show some precedent for the practice which they propose to adopt and which has never before been adopted as far as I am aware. No precedent has been given, and it seems to me impossible that with the confidence which is placed in committees such a precedent can be found. In the same volume of Todd's parliamentary government in England to which I have already referred, page 429, I find the following :—

Nothing is more remarkable than the tender forbearance with which the House of Commons treats its own select committees; though, if their proceedings were strictly canvassed, there are perhaps few parts of our system of government which can less support criticism.

In England, in the mother of parliaments, although the proceedings are very open to criticism, nothing is more remarkable than the tender forbearance with which the House treats its own select committees. Powers are delegated to that committee. The House says it has confidence in the committee because, better than the whole House together, it can transact the business. Men are placed on the committee who are most competent for that purpose and for that reason, and probably for that reason alone, no provision has been made in England or in any other country so far as I am aware by which there would be an appeal on questions of evidence from the committee back to the whole House. I do not know whether it would be a good thing to have such an appeal; I do not see what could be gained by it. How can it be expected that the whole House could intelligently discuss matters of that sort better than a select committee which is especially appointed for that purpose. There is bound to be more or less difference of opinion about rules of evidence, and I am sorry to think that my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) should reflect in the way he did upon the hon. member for Vercheres, a man of high standing both in his legal attainments and his integrity. Because that hon. gentleman's ruling last year, did not happen to suit a particular person he is made the object of attack. That is most unfair. Many a time have I had the experience of being overruled in court, and I have perhaps felt that the judge who ruled against me on some question of evidence was prejudiced or something of that sort. It is a natural feeling and it probably always will be the feeling with regard to those who disagree with you, but there must be disagreement on such questions, and I can say that my experience up to this is, that the rulings that have been given by the chairman have been given conscientiously and I think fairly. Something has been said about lack of courtesy to the minority, but my experience is that there is no foundation for that charge. We have been in session for nearly two months and I venture to say there have been more than 100 motions made for papers on almost every possible subject and from every department, and no matter what member of the opposition made the motion there never has been a single obstacle placed in his way to having all the papers brought down and the fullest information given. The only complaint hon. gentlemen opposite have to make is that in their opinion the committee has been wrong in regard to some of the rulings on evidence, but they have not told us of the rulings that have been given in their favour and let it be remembered that there are many rulings which do not please those in the majority. But if a ruling happens to displease those in the minority they stop the inquiry and at once rush to the House. It seems to me that is not respectful to the committee on which the two parties are represented in perhaps the same proportionate numbers as in this House. The hon. member for Toronto pointed out that from the Committee of the Whole there is an appeal to the House, but he did not tell us that is the only appeal there is. In an appeal from a Committee of the Whole the appeal is not taken to that committee but it is reported to the Speaker and then the appeal comes before the whole House. In that case there is only one appeal and it comes before the same tribunal. Now, in a committee the practice is the same as in the House of Commons. The practice in the House is that you appeal from the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to the members of the entire House. and by analogy if you appeal from the chairman of the committee that appeal should come before the members of the committee. Is there anything so important, that if there should be difference in committee about whether a certain question is admissible the time of the House should be taken up discussing it. The great burden of the complaint of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) in the Collingwood ship yard case was that a certain question was ruled out, but that case was reported and yet he does consider it important enough to bring it before the House and ask to have this House reverse that ruling or send it back for further examination. My experience of these matters is that although one question may be disallowed you can call other witnesses and you may get all the facts of the case, so that at the end of the investigation

for the department to have for this service. But these boats and the engines for them are made in Canada. When the captain requires a boat, Canadians should have an opportunity to tender.

Mr. BRODEUR. Naturally, we would prefer to give the contract to Canadians. Now that we have this boat as a pattern, if it proves a success, Canadian builders can build on the same pattern.

Mr. BERGERON. Was it built on the Pacific coast?

Mr. BRODEUR. In New Jersey, and carried across the continent by rail.

Mr. BERGERON. Then, a boat could be built in any part of Canada, no matter where it was to be used?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. The intention of the department is, if possible, to have the boats built in Canada.

Mr. LAW. Is it the intention of the department to replace the present rowboats at life-saving stations with motor boats?

Mr. BRODEUR. That will be done gradually. It is an expensive change, and cannot be made all at once. But, as the boat we have put on the Pacific coast seems to be a success, I think it would be advisable to supply them to our life-saving stations as rapidly as possible.

Mr. CLEMENTS. In the city I represent, there is a concern with a great deal of capital behind it which manufactures engines for marine purposes, and also builds boats.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Having had a little to do with sending Col. Anderson to investigate motor boats and to give an order for the one referred to, I may be permitted a word or two. This boat was ordered by the Marine and Fisheries Department as a means of protecting life on the coast of Vancouver Island. This was due very largely to the deplorable casualty of the wreck of a couple of years ago which was discussed in this House, during which discussion some hon. members censured the government for lack of life-saving appliances on the west coast of Vancouver Island. The department took the matter up, the result being the ordering in Bayonne, N.J., from celebrated manufacturers there of this life-saving motor boat. Col. Anderson visited the United States life-saving stations on the Atlantic coast and examined their appliances and got into communication with the chief officer of the life-saving stations of the American government. On his advice, Col. Anderson recommended this style of boat as one suitable for the Pacific ocean. The contract price was a little over $10,000. No tenders were asked for—it was quite impossible to call for tenders in such a case. The boat has a 40 horse-power gasolene motor, which is hermetically sealed in the stern of the boat. The vessel is self righting and self-baling.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there a model of her here?

Mr. BRODEUR. The plans and specifications are in the department. Besides this gasolene engine, the vessel is equipped with a mast and sails and with ten pairs of oars. She is 36 feet in length and is made of mahogany as being the lightest and strongest material for this purpose. It is probably the most up-to-date life-saving boat in the world, having some improvements even over those used in the United States. Another reason why this boat was built in New Jersey is that the plans were those of the American government loaned to the Canadian government for this purpose. The superintendent of construction of the boat certified to the department that everything was right. The boat was built under the immediate superintendence of Col. Anderson and the chief officer of the American life-saving station. The boat has made 12 knots an hour. She made the trip from Victoria to Bamfield, a distance of 100 miles, in a heavy sea when very large vessels had to seek shelter. She will go out in any sea and keep up her speed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But will she come back, that is the question ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes. She has been tested in every way, including being upset. The American government have since given an order for a duplicate of this boat to be used along the coast of the State of Washington, immediately south of Vancouver Island. The boat is, to some extent, an experiment, but she is placed in the very best place—Bamfield creek at the mouth of Barclay Sound, immediately contiguous to the place where many marine disasters have occurred within the last ten years.

Mr. CLEMENTS. If the boat is all that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Templeman) has said, the department did not pay too much for her when it gave $10,000? Of course, most of the motor boats made in Canada are for still-water conditions, and not for the conditions which this boat is designed to face. All I want to impress upon the minister is that he should not be prejudiced against Canadian makes and in favour of American. I speak particularly of motors. In Chatham we are making an engine which the best people in New York are anxious to get. Our motor is of the very best French pattern, a pattern which we spent a good deal of money to get ; and we think we are building the best motor in America. In these matters Canadians should be given a chance to tender.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is our intention.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I would urge the hon. minister to consider the advisability of establishing rocket apparatus along the coast. I have consulted with experienced seafaring men who have seen these appliances at work in Great Britain and in France, and their opinion is that ten lives are saved in that way for the one that is saved where the ordinary life boat is used. The life boat can only be used successfully where the wreck occurs on a sand bar or some distance from the shore, and where the boat can be launched in a harbour, cove or some sheltered place. It cannot be launched from a coast on which the waves are breaking. Along the coast line where the water is bold and where the ships are driven close to the shore, you can throw a life line to the ship and her crew and passengers can be taken off by that means much more expeditiously and effectively than by any other. That was done in the case of the wreck of the 'Mount Temple,' which was wrecked on the Nova Scotia coast in the early winter. Every person on board, women and children, was saved by means of a life line which was thrown to the ship. It was a remarkable achievement. This rocket apparatus is inexpensive and easily taken care of and it can be placed on a dray and carried quickly to any point. I am told that these appliances are used extensively in Great Britain and France and that in the English channel, on the Goodwin sands, a very dangerous place, the method adopted is for the life-saving steamer, having life-boats on board, to steam out and get to the windward of the wreck, and let the life-boats go down to the wrecked vessel. That is found practically the only way the vessel can be reached because the life-boats cannot successfully work their way through the breakers. If these rocket apparatuses are capable of doing the work claimed for them, and they proved very efficient in the case of the 'Mount Temple,' it would be well to have a number of them established along our coast where the water is bold and wrecks are likely to occur. They will be better than the ordinary life-saving boat. I am informed by sea captains that along the north shore of Prince Edward Island, when wrecks occur at all, those rocket apparatuses would be much more effective than the ordinary life-boat and very much less expensive.

Mr. BRODEUR. I had occasion to see some of these and I find that they are in great use, especially in the United States. I do not know that they are used to the same extent in Great Britain and France. The system of the United States is quite different from that in England. In France I believe there is a government subsidy contributed to a voluntary system, but in Great Britain the system is entirely voluntary and supported by private subscription. This rocket apparatus is more expensive than my hon. friend thinks. I had occasion to see some of them in the United States and they appeared very expensive. We have already some established in Canada. There are four places where we have those rocket apparatuses. The vote at the disposal of the department is not very large. It is just a beginning. No doubt the rocket apparatuses would be very useful but I could not promise, out of the vote at my disposal, to increase their number very materially.

Mr. SPROULE. Was any money voted for the purchase of these motor boats?

Mr. BRODEUR. The appropriation was for the life-saving stations generally. The amount voted last year was $31,600. Out of this amount, the expenditure for keeping up those stations has of course to be paid. Out of that vote we took the necessary money to purchase that motor boat, as we thought it very useful to make experiments with.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the cost of keeping up the stations?

Mr. BRODEUR. I see that the maintenance of existing stations is $12,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How many of them?

Mr. BRODEUR. In Ontario, at Cobourg, Collingwood. Goderich, Pelee Island, Port Hope, Fort Stanley, Toronto Island, Longue Pointe and Kincardine.

Mr. SPROULE. You have none at Lion's Head, Saugeen Peninsula?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a very dangerous place, and several wrecks have occurred there. I brought this to the attention of the minister last session. They have neither boats nor anything else there in the event of a wreck. A good deal of shipping passes there and a good many accidents occur. Does the hon. gentleman say that the up-keeping of all these stations costs $12,000?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, that is the appropriation we are asking for out of this vote of $31,600. The vote has been spent during the curent fiscal year.

Mr. SPROULE. The boat was purchased out of that vote?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, out of the vote of $31,000.

Mr. BERGERON. There remains about $10,000 to the credit of the department?

Mr. BRODEUR. But we are going to establish some new stations, and out of the money appropriated for that purpose we took $10,000 for the purpose of purchasing

this motor boat. The question was discussed two years ago, when the department was seriously criticised because there was no life-saving apparatus on the Vancouver island coast, and we have been providing for these stations, because I found that on that coast there were more wrecks registered than at any other place in Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister not think that it would be wise to establish a life-saving station at Lyon's Head?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. I will get Captain McElhinney to make a report on that.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it the custom of the department to provide life-saving apparatus at large public wharfs or piers? Some time ago I brought to the attention of the department the case of the piers at Rondeau harbour, where hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent in dredging. The place is a summer resort, to which thousands of people come in the summer. The piers are very long and the water very deep, and drowning accidents occur every year. I would strongly recommend, not a life-saving station, but that some apparatus for the saving of life should be provided at that point.

Mr. BRODEUR. So far the policy of the department has not been to provide for the equipment of wharfs with life-saving apparatus. What we have been doing was to establish life-saving stations at points on the great lakes or on the sea-coasts where wrecks have occurred. It would be very expensive to provide life-saving apparatus for all large wharfs. In Montreal last year the harbour commission provided life-saving apparatus for the wharfs there at their own expense.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I quite admit the reasonableness of the city providing for its own vicinity ; but at Rondeau I do not think this could be done. I strongly recommend the minister to place some life-saving apparatus there.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it contemplated to establish more life-saving stations in the coming season?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have asked for reports concerning the establishing of new stations, and money not required for the up-keep of the existing stations will go towards the establishing of new ones and the purchase of some other boats, if the one we proposed to place on the Pacific coast proves to be a success.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the life-boat in connection with the whaling stations of which the minister spoke, available at all times?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the arrangement as to it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Captain Balcom who has a whaling station there, when applying for a whaling license said he was willing to put at our disposal the life-boat he has in connection with his whaling boat with no cost to us. He keeps it for his own service, but it is at our disposal if it is required for a wreck. If he renders any service of course we pay him for that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the rate fixed ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, no rates have been fixed.

Mr. DANIEL. Why is part of the salary of the chief examiner of masters and mates paid out of this vote for investigations into wrecks ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Captain Demers, the chief examiner for masters and mates is also the assistant wreck commissioner, so one part of his salary is paid out of the vote for masters and mates and the other out of the vote for investigations into wrecks.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Ruthenian Catholic Mission of the Order of St. Basil the Great in Canada.—Mr. Wilbert McIntyre.

HAMILTON RADIAL ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 25) respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. This is a very important measure and a large number of hon. gentlemen who desire to participate in the discussion are not here to-night. Furthermore the Bill was ordered to be reprinted owing to the large number of amendments made to it during the nine days that it was in the hands of the committee. The reprint has not yet been distributed. I think it is inopportune to proceed with the Bill, and I therefore move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. CLARKE. I think the request is a very reasonable one. I would ask if the Bill has been reprinted. I think it ought to be before it is discussed in this House.

Mr. HENDERSON. The clerk intimates to us that it has been reprinted but not distributed.

Mr. CLARKE. It will be ready then for Monday ?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Not necessarily Monday, but possibly during the week.

Motion agreed to and progress reported.

SUPPLY.

The order for private Bills having been exhausted the House resumed in Committee of Supply.

Investigation into wrecks, $9,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How many wrecks were investigated last year ; what were the names of the vessels and where did the investigations take place ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Investigations were held in the following cases : Collision of the 'Cassandra' and 'John Lambart ; collision of the 'Sovereign' and 'Germaine'; collision of the 'Havana' and 'Prescott'; 'Mary' sunk at wharf ; stranding of the 'Montrose'; collision of the 'Prince George' and 'Lowwood'; collision of the 'Rosalind' and 'Senlac'; collision of the 'Wandarian.'

Mr. SPROULE. Where do these inquiries take place ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They take place generally near where the collision occurs. If an accident occurs in the lower part of the St. Lawrence the investigation would take place in Quebec; if between Montreal and Quebec, at Montreal; if on the Atlantic coast at Halifax; if on the Pacific coast, at Victoria or Vancouver; and if on the great lakes, at Toronto. We have in Montreal a court room established for that purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in understanding that six inquiries took place this summer?

Mr. BRODEUR. Eight.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I think there are thirteen mentioned at page P—34 of the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. BRODEUR. I did not understand the last question of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule).

Mr. SPROULE. How many of these examinations took place ? I understand that some took place in England.

Mr. BRODEUR. There was only one in England, the one into the accident between the 'Mongolian' and the 'Huronia.'

Mr. BOYCE. According to the return brought down, there were twelve wrecks in 1906 on the great lakes. The order of the House was that this return should show whether in each case an investigation had been held, also the loss of life. But this return only gives the number of casualties.

Mr. BRODEUR. I cannot understand why it does not give the other information.

Mr. DANIEL. At six o'clock I asked when the supplement to this report would be brought down, containing information we are asking for regarding these wrecks. The departmental report says :

A full statement of wrecks and casualties that have occurred in Canadian waters and to Canadian sea-going vessels in other waters will be found in the supplement to this report.

So far as I am aware there is no supplement.

Mr. BRODEUR. Perhaps I am responsible, not for that statement in the report, but for the delay. I find in several reports of the department that we have been mixing up one fiscal year with the other. Sometimes we took the fiscal year and sometimes also, in the same report, not the fiscal year, but the season of navigation. That made the report difficult to understand. I have given instructions that in the future the reports shall be for the fiscal year only.

Mr. DANIEL. Our period of navigation is all the year round as it is on the west coast of Canada. The period of navigation limited to summer months only applies to inland waters.

Mr. BRODEUR. In some places the season would be very late, until November. In St. John the navigation is always open. In order to prevent any misleading, I gave instructions that in the future the reports shall show the fiscal year and give all the casualties that occurred in that year. In this report, the casualties are given which occurred during the past season of navigation. It should be, however, a report for the last fiscal year 1906-7 and should be ready for the opening of parliament in November. The fiscal year ends the 31st of March, which would give some months to prepare the report and have it ready for the opening of parliament.

Mr. DANIEL. What about the supplement ?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend will see that in the beginning of his report the deputy minister says :

I have the honour to report on the transaction of the Marine Branch of the department for the nine months ended March 31 last.

Often in the appendix we find the casualties which have occurred since. That creates confusion. The most regular way would be to have the report made for the fiscal year.

Mr. DANIEL. I think parliament should have a full report before it, so as to be able to discuss those matters intelligently. They are of importance to shipping, and the

report of the department is not as complete as it used to be a few years ago. I do not think we can have too much information on these matters, especially where the department is developing a good many new patents in the way of aids to navigation which are of immense interest to those engaged in the shipping and fishing industries. I hope the minister will take the suggestion in good part and that in future he will give us fuller reports than we have received in the past year or two. We have not at the present time the particulars in regard to wrecks that we should have, and we are consequently not in a position to discuss the question.

Mr. BRODEUR. The brevity of the report is to some extent due to the custom of the department to present a report covering, not only the fiscal year, but the past season of navigation as well. Parliament now meets in November, just at the close of the summer navigation, and the information is not ready to present to the House. The officers have not received instructions to start at the beginning of each fiscal year the preparation of the report for the past fiscal year, and it is expected that in future that report will be ready to present to the House at the opening of each session. That change will, I think, meet the views of my hon. friend.

Mr. SPROULE. What has become of these American experts who were employed to reorganize the departmental system of bookkeeping; what are they doing?

Mr. BRODEUR. The report which they have presented shows that numerous payments have been made during one fiscal year which should have been paid in the previous fiscal year, and under the new system of bookkeeping the payments will have to be made during the current fiscal year, so that we will be able to tell at almost any day how the accounts stand.

Mr. SPROULE. We have paid $40,000 to these bookkeeping experts who have been working at it for the last two years, and it is time we should see some result of their labours.

Mr. BRODEUR. When the report, which is very voluminous, is brought down it will be shown that important improvements are suggested.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will there be any saving of money under the new system?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think so.

Mr. HENDERSON. That will be a most extraordinary thing in the Marine Department. A great many have suspicions that such a thing cannot be done.

Mr. BRODEUR. Don't rely on suspicions.

Mr. HENDERSON. There is no doubt that a good system of bookkeeping would prevent a great deal of covering up, and would be likely to give us fair and honest statements of the accounts, a thing which is most desirable.

Mr. SPROULE. It is currently rumoured that these American experts have not made very great changes in the departmental system of bookkeeping. If their report is not brought down until next year, they will have been three years engaged on the work.

Mr. BRODEUR. They finished in the month of May last.

Mr. SPROULE. How long were they at it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Five or six months.

Mr. SPROULE. How many of them were employed, and how much did it cost the country ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I cannot tell off-hand.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you no idea at all?

Mr. BRODEUR. I could get the information, but as it does not concern the matter we are discussing I have not got it with me now. I am glad my hon. friend takes an interest in this matter, and I would invite him to come some morning to the department and I will show him the old system of bookkeeping and the new.

Mr. SPROULE. We want the information in the House.

Mr. BRODEUR. I cannot bring the ledgers and account books before the House and explain them here.

Mr. SPROULE. For instance, in the report of the department Commander Spain says that a full statement of wrecks and casualties will be found in the supplemental report, but as a matter of fact there is no supplemental report. Then the reports and the accounts of the department are so muddled that you cannot tell what belongs to one financial year and what belongs to another. It will be a good thing if these experts succeed in simplifying the accounts of the department, because as they are now no one can understand them. The minister says they have been six months engaged on this work, but we have not yet seen any result from their labours, and we paid them $40,000, if not more.

Mr. BRODEUR. Less than that.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to know how much.

Mr. BRODEUR. If my hon. friend will be kind enough to wait until we reach the item on which this can be discussed, I shall be very happy to discuss the matter with him. The question of bookkeeping and the question of reports are two different things.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister told us that the experts had to do with the reports as well as the bookkeeping.

Mr. BRODEUR. I did not make myself clear if the hon. member understood me as saying that. I was saying that the reports laid before parliament last year covered not only the fiscal year, but the last season of navigation. That made it somewhat difficult to understand the situation, and I gave instructions that the report and the appendices should be for the fiscal year only, and that will be the case for the future.

Mr. SPROULE. It would seem to me that if the department cannot get out a more understandable report than this one, it would be well to direct the attention of the experts to that.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend does an injustice to the department, because if he looks at the report for last year he will find that Commander Spain reported on the season of navigation opening in the month of May or April, 1907, and closing in October or November. But in future, to avoid that confusion, the report will strictly cover the fiscal year.

Mr. SPROULE. We have here a list of casualties, most of them collisions, several of them on the great lakes. We have not any information yet as to what inquiries were made into these, what the findings were, and whether there was any available information obtained from these examinations. The navigation of the inland waters of Canada is becoming increasingly important every year, and to minimize the dangers as much as possible it is necessary to ascertain the causes of these accidents. The hon. minister has not given us information about any of them, so far as I know.

Mr. BRODEUR. When a judgment is rendered in a formal investigation, that judgment is published in all the papers. Of course, we cannot reproduce all these documents in the report which is presented to parliament; but the report gives the accidents that took place and those which have been investigated for the year to the 25th of October.

Mr. SPROULE. There were more than these.

Mr. BRODEUR. These were the only ones which happened in that period. The accidents mentioned by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce) took place in 1906. Only one accident which took place on the great lakes this fall has been investigated.

Mr. DANIEL. I take it that the minister does not hereafter intend to issue that supplement, but that what it contains will be included in the next annual report?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. My intention is that in the report which will be laid before parliament next year we shall have the results of all the investigations which shall have taken place during the fiscal year which began on the 1st of April last to the 1st of April next.

Mr. BOYCE. This return mentions the number of wrecks that took place on the great lakes in the year 1906 and in the fall of 1905. Among them were some very serious ones: the 'Monkshaven' on November 17, 1905; the 'Theano.' on November 17, 1906; the 'Golspie,' on December 4, 1906; the 'Monarch,' on December 6, 1906; and the 'Strathmore,' on November 8, 1906, I am uncertain from this return, which the minister admits is not complete, whether or not investigations were held into these five wrecks, and I would ask the minister to state who held the investigations, where they were held, and what were the findings as to the causes of the wrecks.

Mr. BRODEUR. There was an investigation in the case of the 'Golspie.' It appeared that the accident was not caused by any fault or mistake of the officer in charge of the boat, so his certificate was not cancelled. There was an investigation also in the case of the 'Monarch,' but Commander Spain says that although he tried to get proper witnesses he could not.

Mr. BOYCE. Was there any cancellation in that case?

Mr. BRODEUR. No. There was no investigation into the other wrecks referred to, except the reports handed over to the department by the shipping masters or the officers who made the report at the time of the accidents.

Mr. BOYCE. By whom is the information in the report as to the value of the boats wrecked furnished?

Mr. BRODEUR. By the owners.

Mr. BOYCE. I see here that the value placed upon the 'Golspie' by the owners was $20,000. Mr. Bennett suggested that the minister had paid an extravagant price for the boat when he leased her for two and a half months and paid $7,500 or almost one-third of her total value.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is true the 'Golspie' was chartered to supply the lighthouses on the great lakes. We experienced difficulty in getting boats to perform this service, and although we call for tenders we cannot obtain tenders. If a boat is regularly engaged elsewhere, and has to make this journey from Montreal to the upper end of Lake Superior, stopping at every lighthouse, she loses her business. In this case the season was advancing and we had to have the service performed. It must be remembered that this rental of $7,500 includes coal, crew, provisions, and everything so that it is not fair to say that $7,500 was paid for the

boat alone when her value was only $20,000. It will be recognized that these lighthouses must be supplied; the hon. gentleman would consider it very bad administration if we left the lights without proper supplies for even one night.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister contradicted my statement that the reorganization of the accounting system of the department cost over $40,000. I have here the formal reply of the minister to a question by Mr. Foster upon this subject and I find from it that the sum total was $42,062.

Mr. BRODEUR. I must have been mistaken when I contradicted the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the minister's own return.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend will understand that some times one may mix these figures in speaking from memory. The statement in the formal answer would be correct.

Mr. SPROULE. I find in this report that a number of accidents occurred opposite the Lime-kiln crossing in Detroit. And I see that a commissioner has been appointed to hold investigations in all parts of the Dominion into shipping casualties. Who is the party who has been appointed, and also what reports has the minister received with reference to what took place in the Detroit river ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Some years ago the government of that day gave the Americans power to carry on dredging and set out lights on the Canadian side of the Detroit river.

Mr. BERGERON. A good thing. They were doing our work.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know that it was a good thing. We have national pride enough to carry on there works in our own waters. Certainly, so long as I have anything to say in the department, our policy will be that, if aids to navigation are required in Canadian waters, we will not invite Americans to do the work.

Mr. BERGERON. The minister (Mr. Brodeur) knows where this work was to be done. The channel is very narrow there, and it would be very hard to deepen the water to twenty-five feet on one side without working on the other also.

Mr. BRODEUR. But the Limekiln crossing is entirely in Canada. I do not want to blame the late government for giving this permission, but I think that Canadians should have enough national pride, where such works are to be done, to do those works for themselves.

Mr. SPROULE. But the present government allows the work to go on.

Mr. BRODEUR. We are bound by the order in council of the late government.

Mr. SPROULE. How long does it bind you ?

Mr. BRODEUR. As long as the work is not finished. They were permitted to dredge a channel and to light and buoy that channel.

Mr. BERGERON. And our vessels use that channel.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, but such a work should be undertaken by Canada and not by a foreign country.

Mr. BERGERON. What harm if the other country does the work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) may think that we should put everything into the hands of the Americans——

Mr. BERGERON. No, I am speaking of this work.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, what was the result ? They wanted to commission some patrol boats and to make rules of the road for those waters. Being given power by the late government to do this work, they seemed to think that, by and by, the channel would come entirely under their control.

Mr. BERGERON. Can the minister lay before the House that order in council ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly.

Mr. ALCORN. Surely, the government could rescind that order in council whenever they chose. There was nothing in it of the nature of a contract.

Mr. BRODEUR. But that would be breaking faith. Well, we decided to make rules of the road convenient for Canadian shipping. And, we have put out a patrol boat—

Mr. SPROULE. And violations of the rules of navigation on the part of Americans are reported to Washington, and on the part of Canadians to Ottawa?

Mr. BRODEUR. No. But the Lake Carriers' Association undertook to prosecute all American vessels that violated the rules of the road agreed upon between the Canadian and American government. This Limekiln crossing is under our control and we have our patrol boat. We have changed some lights this year, and the intention of the government is to take entire possession and control of this part of the Detroit river, as the Americans are doing with regard to some parts of the St. Mary's river or parts of the Detroit river that are in their territory.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not the government allowing the Americans to do work in the St. Mary's river ? It was some few years ago.

Mr. BRODEUR Work in their own territory.

Mr. SPROULE. No, Canadian territory.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think so. The boundary line in the St. Mary's river runs north of the islands. Perhaps, the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) thought the islands were in Canadian territory.

Mr. SPROULE. No, but passing that way on a trip, we saw American dredges working, and a gentleman who seemed to know all about it and seemed to be a friend of this government, said that the work was being done in Canadian territory at the expense of the United States, and he claimed great credit to the government for getting the work done without expense to Canada.

Mr. BERGERON. I should be glad to see the order in council which the hon. minister (Mr. Brodeur) refers to in this censorious way. It is a very narrow channel. I passed through it not very long ago.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is on the eastern side of Isle Aux Bois Blanc and is altogether in Canadian territory.

Mr. BERGERON. That may be, but I know it is very narrow and very shallow. Our Canadian boats passing through there draw generally about 14 feet of water, but in the olden times before the enlargement of the canals, boats drawing nine feet of water would travel over that place and, of course, at that time the river was deep enough. The American boats draw 24 to 25 feet of water—it may be that some of them draw more—and the American government found it necessary to facilitate the navigation of their own boats to deepen that part of the river. There was no harm in allowing them to do this work in the channel. I would like to have that order in council produced because, instead of criticising the former government my hon. friend would say that it was good policy to allow the Americans to make this channel. Any Canadian vessel drawing less water than the American vessels can pass through that channel which was built entirely by the American government and which did not cost Canada a cent. Instead of criticising the old administration the hon. gentleman ought to offer it his congratulations. This is the first time in ten years that any work has been done by the Department of Marine and Fisheries without costing Canada anything.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not agree with that policy at all. If there is any place in Canada where dredging is required we should not get the Americans to do that work. I am strongly of the opinion that in these cases the work should be carried out by Canada and not by a foreign nation. I do not think it is compatible with the dignity, honour and pride of Canada that such a thing should be done. Of course, there may be a difference of opinion on that question. That is the policy of my hon. friend.

Mr. BERGERON. No, I favour the very same policy as my hon. friend on the point of honour. We do not differ on that at all. I would be very sorry to see the Americans dredging the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec. But, if the previous government had not passed that order in council the American government might have made a channel 100 or 200 feet farther to the south or west. It would not have done us any good ; it would only have forced them to make the channel in a different place than where the natural channel was before, but by obtaining the permission of the Canadian government they were enabled to deepen the old channel for their own use. All they asked from us was permission to do that work and the request was granted upon the understanding that our own vessels should use the channel. I do not see anything to hurt the national honour in that. We can pass our own vessels through the channel. The work has been done by the American government and it has not cost us a cent.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend says that if the Americans were to deepen the River St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec he would object. Why should he object? The River St. Lawrence is open just as much to the Americans as the Detroit river is, and if there is an objection in one place why should there not be the same objection in another place?

Mr. BERGERON. The case is different altogether.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, it is not different. The permission seems to have been given or they have taken permission to erect on our shores lighthouses, buoys and aids to navigation.

Mr. SPROULE. When was that done ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Some years ago.

Mr. BERGERON. Then my hon. friend ought to see to it.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is what I have done. I have taken the precaution to see that the rules of the road are those suitable to this government. The patrol boat which directs the vessels where to pass the Lime-Kiln Crossing is a patrol boat flying the British flag and the buoys and lighthouses are going to be maintained by this government.

Mr. BERGERON. That is why I think it would be important to see the order in council. Permission was given by the Canadian government to the American government to deepen the channel and nothing else. If there is any infringement in the shape of buoys and lights it comes under the supervision of my hon. friend, and he should see to it.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the minister may amuse people who know something about it, but he certainly would not interest them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think we are wandering away from this item.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the minister ought to be put right. If not, he may fall into that error again.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked in regard to the wrecks that took place at Lime-kiln Crossing.

Mr. BENNETT. The facts of the case are these: Twenty years ago American vessels drawing 18 feet of water were going down to Cleveland with iron ore. How many vessels were employed on the Canadian side at that time? There were practically none but a few small lumber boats from the Georgian bay ports going down the river. The Canadian government, no doubt, were appealed to by the American government who said: Here, you do not require to have that channel deepened; if you permit us to deepen it we will do it. Do you imagine that the Canadian government would have been so childish as to have said that because we did not want it deepened ourselves we will not allow you to do it? Any man who knows anything about the shipping of the upper lakes knows that they had vessels drawing 18 feet of water on the American side. Does any one think that the government at that time was guilty of disloyalty to the country? The minister may amuse some people by talking as he has done, but it will not go beyond that.

Mr. SPROULE. I imagine that one of the very serious disadvantages of the work is that it prevents the possibility of the parasites who usually surround the government for dredging getting a rake off from it.

Mr. JACKSON. While we are on this wreck business I wish to make some little inquiry with reference to a wreck that happened on Lake Erie during the last summer. We were directly interested in that. I believe that the vessel that did the damage was one of our own boats. Has there been any investigation in reference to the collision of the government boat 'Vigilant' and the 'Nettie B'?

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand that no investigation has taken place as yet. It was intended by the department to make an investigation, but the crew was away, and we wanted these people to give evidence so that it had to be postponed until they came back.

Mr. W. JACKSON. Has any of the crew of the government steamer been dismissed on account of this accident?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. W. JACKSON. Have the government in any way made good the damage which was done to this schooner?

Mr. BRODEUR. The case is now before the Justice Department.

Mr. W. JACKSON. But this part that I have reference to must have come within the notice of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Is it not a fact that the government steamer was, after this accident, engaged in fishing the nets of this schooner?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, I remember the circumstances. I think that our boat, while she was lying in the harbour of Port Stanley, struck a little boat that was nearby. The preliminary investigation, the result of which we got in the department, showed that the captain said that he gave the order to go ahead, but whether the bells were working or not, the engineer seems to say he got a different order and he went astern instead of going forward.

Mr. JACKSON. I may tell the Minister of Marine that some of the officers on some of these government boats lack judgment, and it is just possible that some of them in charge of the boat in the harbour that day were not in their right frame of mind or else the accident would not have happened. There are some of the officers of that ship who have demanded an inquiry so that their skirts may be clear.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have heard that there was some man who was not absolutely in his ordinary frame of mind that day and I have given instructions that a complete investigation be held. If there is any officer guilty of what the hon. gentleman has referred to he will have to suffer.

Mr. W. JACKSON. By whose authority can one of these fishery cruisers be taken off her regular work to do work she is not intended for?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know what kind of work the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. W. JACKSON. By whose authority is that fishery cruiser taken off her regular work to go into the excursion trade or the political campaign trade? If that were done, by whose authority would it be done?

Mr. BRODEUR. No authority was ever given to the cruiser to go into the excursion trade.

Mr. W. JACKSON. Is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries not aware that just before a by-election in Western Ontario, instead of that boat being used in the fishery service she was used in the campaign service conveying ministers of the Crown from one point on Lake Erie to another?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not aware of that fact.

Mr. W. JACKSON. Well, I can tell the minister that such is the case.

Mr. BENNETT. Who were the ministers?

Mr. W. JACKSON. The Minister of Justice and the ex-Minister of Public Works were two of a party of twenty-five or thirty who had the privilege of using that boat for that purpose. The trip was not advertised in the press or by posters, but as a matter of fact it was advertised among the party friends of the government that they could go on the boat.

Mr. SPROULE. That was the 'Minnie M' over again.

Mr. W. JACKSON. Yes, but this was on a larger scale. My statement is absolutely true, and when I had to make the same trip I was not extended an invitation to join the party but I had to take the overland route for it.

Mr. BERGERON. And cold water.

Mr. W. JACKSON. As a matter of fact the boat was engaged in a demonstration to boom the Liberal candidate in a by-election, and she was taken off the fishery protective service for that purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister told us that the accident occurred because the steamer went backwards instead of forwards. It is wonderful what the force of example will do; the boat acted just as the government does.

Mr. ALCORN. On page P—31 of the Auditor General's Report there is a payment to Judge Auley Morrison, of British Columbia, for services in connection with an investigation into a collision between two steamers. What is the explanation of that item? We know that some three years ago a Bill was introduced into this House, by the then Attorney General, and passed into legislation, providing that the judges should be limited solely and entirely to their judicial duties, and should not be employed on any of these commissions. This would appear to be an instance of the government themselves appointing their own judge to hold an investigation contrary to the provisions of the Act passed on the suggestion of their own Attorney General.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know that the law to which my hon. friend refers goes as far as he says. The judges must undertake judicial work and I do not see any objection to their being called upon to exercise their judicial functions. If my hon. friend looks at the Shipping Act he will find that judges are empowered to hold these investigations.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens). That refers to judges of the Admiralty Division.

Mr. BRODEUR. It refers to investigations of this kind.

Mr. ALCORN. Under whose authority did Judge Morrison hold this investigation.

Mr. BRODEUR. The appointment of the government.

Mr. ALCORN. In what form was the appointment.

Mr. BRODEUR. By an order in council.

Mr. ALCORN. In effect that was by a commission.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. ALCORN. My recollection of the Act is that that is precisely what it is directed against.

Mr. BRODEUR. Not at all. If my hon. friend will read section 781 of the Shipping Act he will find that the minister may appoint any officer of the government of Canada or any judge of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec or any judge of the county court or any local judge in Admiralty of the Exchequer Court.

Mr. ALCORN. Judge Morrison is none of these.

Mr. BRODEUR. He is a judge of the Admiralty Division. This inquiry is for the purpose of determining whether a man holding a certificate is guilty of negligence and if he is he is liable to have his certificate cancelled. It is very important that those who discharge these duties should be men in whom the public should have complete confidence, and I should think that no better men than judges could be found for discharging these judicial duties.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens). Does Captain Spain always have a judge with him in these inquiries?

Mr. BRODEUR. No. He is wreck commissioner and it is not necessary.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens). Was this a wreck investigation?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Why was it necessary to appoint a judge?

Mr. BRODEUR. Because it is less expensive.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. You first said it was necessary, but I do not think that is correct.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is less expensive to appoint a judge in British Columbia to hold an investigation than to send Captain Spain from Ottawa.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What pay did the judge receive?

Mr. BRODEUR. $25 a day.

Mr. ALCORN. Does the minister say that Judge Morrison is a judge of the Admiralty Court ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, he was acting for Mr. Justice Martin.

Mr. ALCORN. Is he permanently appointed a judge of the Admiralty Court?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know.

Mr. ALCORN. If he is not and is appointed, as the minister says, under a special commission for the investigation of this particular case, I still think that is a direct contravention of the Act I speak of.

Mr. BENNETT. This seems to be a serious matter which has been pointed out by my hon. friend, that a boat which the people of Canada have paid for, and I have no doubt paid pretty well, should be employed by cabinet ministers to go around electioneering. I suppose the next thing will be the hiring of horses and carriages for the ministers to travel about the country in. I am sure that the minister is jealous for the reputation of his department and everything that pertains to it. Is the 'Vigilant' fitted with a piano?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know ; I was never on her.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps some of the minister's officers can tell.

Mr. BRODEUR. No ; I am told it is not.

Mr. BENNETT. Then the minister is falling behind in the procession ; because, when the late Minister of Public Works, Mr. Hyman, bought that palatial yacht, the 'Speedy,' with the money of the people of Canada, he had a piano put into her, and he stretched his legs under a mahogany table, in the company of his convivial friends, and sat in a mahogany arm-chair, and the guests sat in chairs costing the people of Canada $12 apiece. Perhaps we shall have occasion later on, when we discuss the estimates of the Public Works Department, to find out all about this. But in the meantime I want to admonish the minister that if he wants to keep up with the procession of the merry souls in the cabinet, he will have to improve the equipment of this boat.

Mr. HENDERSON. The strange part of the whole matter is that the captain of this vessel, an officer of this government, should have taken on himself the responsibility of taking the vessel out of its course——

Mr. BRODEUR. That is a question which will come up under the vote for the fishery service, and we will discuss it then. Let us confine ourselves now to the investigation of wrecks ; we are making good progress.

Mr. HENDERSON. I dare say the hon. gentleman is making fair progress, but this is too important a matter to be cast aside in that way. Since the matter has been spoken of, the people will be anxious to know at once by what authority the captain of this boat took her out of her course. Did the minister himself give instructions to these men who were going out to hold a political demonstration?

Mr. BRODEUR. I raise the point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The discussion has no bearing on the item before the committee. If the point is insisted on I have to sustain it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I hope we shall have an opportunity of referring to it again.

Mr. SPROULE. I have asked the minister two or three times who is the commissioner of wrecks.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have already said twice that he is Commander Spain.

Mr. SPROULE. How is he paid for that work?

Mr. BRODEUR. He does not get anything as commissioner of wrecks. He is paid as Commander of Marine Service.

Mr. SPROULE. We have not had much information yet with regard to the upper lakes. I asked the minister before six o'clock whether the government had done anything towards establishing or maintaining a wrecking plant on the inland waters.

Mr. BRODEUR. We shall reach that item in a few minutes, and I shall then have the information.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the object of employing Judge Morrison when Commander Spain could have adjudged that case?

Mr. BRODEUR. Because Commander Spain was here in Ottawa, and it was considered less expensive to have a man there ; and, if I remember rightly, the matter was a most pressing one.

Mr. BERGERON. Surely it is necessary for the judge to have technical qualifications?

Mr. BRODEUR. No ; he requires two assessors, two men versed in the merchant marine service, to sit with him.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the government doing anything towards lessening the loss of life and property on these inland waters?

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall be glad to furnish that information when we come to the question of wrecking plants or that of the maintenance of lights. I do not think we should mix up the discussion of different items, as it creates confusion.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see how it can create confusion. We have asked as to the causes of these wrecks, but have had practically no information. We follow that up by asking what the government is doing to lessen these accidents, and we are told that we are not on that question. It seems to me that it is so closely allied to what we are discussing that it is quite in order to endeavour to ascertain what is being done in that direction.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend's inquiry would come more properly under the item 211.

Mr. SPROULE. I have scarcely asked a question to-night to which I have not had the same answer. I am always promised information on some other item.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have explained the investigations into wrecks, and now my hon. friend is inquiring about aids to navigation. We have a special vote for that purpose. When we come to that vote, we will discuss that question. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has decided not to let me pass an item but I cannot be expected, when a vote is submitted, to give information on some other subject.

Mr. SPROULE. I have never tried to delay the passage of an item one minute. I have asked how many wrecks took place, how many lives were lost, how much property was destroyed, what inquiries the department held, what was the result of each inquiry, and could not get any information. Then we got on to discussing some wrecks that took place opposite the Limekiln crossing and we did not get much information about those. We were told that the government have bought a life-boat for the Pacific coast, and I asked what was done for the purpose of providing help to disabled steamers and to save life and property. I inquired if anything in that connection was done on the lakes, but could get no information. I know that some years ago there was a wrecking plant up there, which got some little assistance from the government and I have asked whether there is any wrecking plant there now and whether the government is giving it any assistance, but can get no information.

Removal of obstructions in navigable rivers, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. I notice in the Auditor General's Report, P—32 an amount paid of $3,900 for removing the wreck of the barge 'Tasmania.' How was that called for?

Mr. BRODEUR. I sent the information to my hon. friend.

Mr. SPROULE. I returned the memo. the minute it was sent me. All it said was that tenders were called for, but it did not say what was the mode of advertisement.

Mr. BRODEUR. When we call for tenders, we do so by advertising in the newspapers or by posters.

Mr. BENNETT. The memo. which was passed to me said that there were two tenders, one by the Reid Wrecking Company of Sarnia and the other by the Midland Towing and Wrecking Company. It looks very suspicious that down in St. Clair river, where there are so many powerful tugs, no one was interested in trying to get this contract, and it went to a company which sent a tug some hundreds of miles to do the work. It would be interesting to know whether a circular was sent to these two friends of the government alone or whether there was a public advertisement.

Mr. BRODEUR. I sent the paper over to my hon. friend and I cannot find it now.

Mr. BENNETT. I returned the paper, but that would not help the minister because it simply said that tenders were invited.

Mr. BRODEUR. That means public tender.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the minister the file there?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, the only information I have is what I sent to my hon. friend.

Mr. BENNETT. It seems strange that at the Detroit river, where there are large American tugs, none of these people would tender, and that persons should bring a tug from Midland away down there. It seems very odd that no one right on the ground should put in a tender. If there had been any more than the two tenders, it might have looked less suspicious, but when there are only two tenders, that looks very suspicious. However, I shall be content to let the item pass if the minister will permit me to ask a question, when he resumes his estimates, whether there was a newspaper advertisement.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. When the government removes a wreck from a river, is there any obligation on the owner of the wreck to pay the expenses ?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is in the law.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Suppose the party refuses to pay, does the government sell the wreck ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, and the proceeds are given for the payment of the expense of removal and the balance goes to the owner of the vessel.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I desire to call the attention of the department again to a matter

to which I referred twelve months ago. There is a wreck at the mouth of Jeannette's creek, a navigable stream which is a tributary of the river Thames. It is the wreck of the schooner 'Defiance.' This wreck lies squarely at the mouth of the stream, and is impeding navigation there. I understand a report was sent to the department that there was no impediment to navigation. But I want to tell the minister, in all sincerity, that this is not correct. The expense of removing this schooner would not be great. I understand there is a resident of that district who would be ready to remove it at an expense that would not probably exceed $150 or $200. I hope the minister will have this obstruction removed.

Mr. BRODEUR. When did the wreck occur?

Mr. CLEMENTS. About three years ago. The schooner was loaded with coal.

Mr. BRODEUR. She is not obstructing navigation.

Mr. CLEMENTS. She lies at the mouth of the stream, and half the stream is obstructed by the wreck.

Mr. MORIN. In what rivers was work done last year?

Mr. BRODEUR. Detroit, Sarnia, Bay of Quinté and Saguenay.

Mr. ALCORN. What work was done in the Bay of Quinté ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The removal of a sunken vessel—the 'Dobie.'

Mr. MORIN. How much work was done in the Saguenay river?

Mr. BRODEUR. There was the removal of the 'Protector,' which lay sunk at the mouth of the Saguenay. The work was not properly in the Saguenay, but in the St. Lawrence.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). In the Auditor General's Report the only item that I can find relating to this service is, 'Removal of obstructions, $7,377.20.' But last year we voted $22,000, and this year we are asked to vote $20,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. We are reducing our vote this year from $22,000 to $20,000. The main reason for asking an increase of appropriation last year was because of one work —removal of the 'Protector' in the St. Lawrence. This work alone cost about $12,800. The amount required varies according to circumstances.

Mr. BENNETT. What became of the barge 'Tasmania'? Was she blown up or was she handed over to the owners? If the department remove a vessel, the owners should pay for her.

Mr. BRODEUR. According to the law, the owner is obliged to pay for the removal of a wreck, but, as a rule, the owner does not do the work and we have to do it. Then the vessel is sold for the benefit of the department and to pay for the removal of the wreck.

Mr. BENNETT. Was anything realized from the 'Tasmania' ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). The minister has not explained where the rest of the money went over this $7,377.

Mr. BRODEUR. This was for nine months, and those including the winter months when least was done in removal of wrecks. It happens that that year little expenditure, relatively, was involved in the removal of wrecks, but last year in one case, that of the 'Protector,' we spent $12,500. There was a heavy tide, so that the men could work only at certain periods of the day.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). But if the money is not expended, should not the amount unexpended appear in the estimates as a revote ?

Mr. BRODEUR. If the money is not expended, it remains in the public chest.

Mr. SPROULE. Formerly there was a column in the estimates showing how much revote, if any, there was in each item. But these estimates do not give us that information.

Mr. BRODEUR. The rule concerning public votes is to vote as much as is expected to be spent during the year ; and if it is not expended within the year, it is revoted. In this case we are not doing the same thing.

Mr. SPROULE. Why?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is not a particular work being carried on, but is a general vote.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not a revote for a particular piece of work, it is a general vote for removing obstructions in navigable rivers.

Mr. A. MARTIN. How much of that vote was not expended?

Mr. BRODEUR. In 1906-7, from April 1 to November 30, the expenditure was $7,-377.20. I have not the appropriation here. Last year the appropriation was $22,850 and we spent $22,698.58.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this not used for other purposes than removing sunken vessels, &c., from navigable rivers? My recollection is that there was an expenditure for removing obstructions from some rivers in British Columbia, I think to permit of the driving of logs.

Mr. BRODEUR. That was for spawning purposes, the removal of rocks and dams which prevented the fish from going up the rivers, to the spawning grounds. My hon. friend will find it in vote 116.

Tidal service, $30,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the explanation of the increase?

Mr. BRODEUR. The increase of $2,000 is to provide for increased salaries on the boat and to meet the increased cost of supplies. This work is under the control of Dr. Dawson, an eminent man, who has published reports of a very interesting character. Here is one which gives information connected with the ship channel between Montreal and Quebec. The work of the boat last year was mostly in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

Mr. DANIEL. What is included in this tidal service? I notice in the Auditor General's Report the expenses of the steamer 'Gulnare' are included in this? What did she do?

Mr. BRODEUR. Dr. Dawson has been studying the currents in the lower St. Lawrence. An examination of the currents has been made in the Strait of Belle Isle. New results have been obtained and the former information, obtained in 1894, has been carefully compared and incorporated. The tidal stations on the St. Lawrence and the Atlantic coast have been maintained as well as five stations on the Pacific coast and we are also having observations taken in Prince Rupert the terminus selected for the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. DANIEL. Are the tidal gauges self-registering and do you get daily reports?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, they are self-registering and we get daily reports.

Mr. LAW. I think the 'Gulnare was engaged last year in the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. BRODEUR. And it is proposed to send her there this year.

Mr. LAW. I am informed by the mariners of Yarmouth that the bulletins issued by Dr. Dawson have been very useful indeed.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is intended to continue that work down to the southern end of Nova Scotia.

Mr. DANIEL. For what service was the schooner 'Laura' employed? At page P—33 you will find that this schooner was chartered for the seasons of 1905-6 and 1906-7. She must have been a small schooner.

Mr. BRODEUR. That was before we got the 'Gulnare.' The 'Gulnare' was then at some other work and this boat was chartered for that purpose.

Mr. ALCORN. This does not appear to be a service which one would fancy would involve a large amount of public printing, but I see at page P-33 an item of $1,223.63 for public printing and stationery. What is the explanation of that?

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for the purpose of printing tide tables and reports which are distributed amongst mariners.

Mr. MORIN. Have you any of these tables to give away?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, we give them away to mariners.

Mr. MORIN. But to members?

Mr. BRODEUR. I will be very glad to supply members also.

Mr. SPROULE. I see that there is an increase of $2,000, and I do not think the minister has given us an explanation of this increase. I presume that there was the same number of hands on as were employed last season and the season before. Unless you increased the wages of the crew or something, as $28,000 was sufficient for last year, you would imagine it would be sufficient for the coming year.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have several persons engaged in the tidal service, and this is to make provision for giving them increase of salaries. We must provide for these engineers.

Mr. SPROULE. Hnw many are engaged in this work?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are three engineers and the crew of the vessel.

Mr. SPROULE. How many are there in the crew?

Mr. BRODEUR. There were last year the master, 1st officer, 2nd officer, 1st engineer, 2nd engineer, 3rd engineer, stewards, cooks, carpenters, quartermasters, firemen, seamen, tide watchers and watchmen.

Mr. SPROULE. There are fourteen in all? This was used to increase the salaries of the men?

Mr. BRODEUR. To increase the salaries and to pay for the extra cost of this vessel.

Mr. SPROULE. I was supposing that the same number would be on the year before when $28,000 was voted. Was not the full estimate of last year used in the work?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed by the deputy that Dr. Dawson is going west this year and will require another engineer to be left in charge of the work.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not the question I asked. I asked was the full amount of the item that was voted last year expended?

Mr. BRODEUR. The deputy informs me that there was a small balance.

Winter mail service, $16,000.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. At page P—33 I find :

Detailed under Dominion steamers: 'Minto,' $2,635; 'Stanley,' $2,635, $5,270.

How does the minister come to charge that to the winter mail service, and what is it for? I cannot find it detailed under the head of the 'Minto.' What part of the item which should be charged to the 'Minto' is eliminated from that and charged to the winter mail service, and why?

Mr. BRODEUR. I will get the information.

Mr. A. MARTIN. While he is getting the information the minister might tell the committee if he has any information about the whereabouts of the 'Stanley' and 'Minto' at present?

Mr. BRODEUR. We did not get any information to-day.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Well, I have had a little bit of news.

Mr. BRODEUR. In the papers?

Mr. A. MARTIN. No. I asked the question in the House to-day where the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) was going to buy seed grain for the Northwest and he told me that he had proposed to purchase 100,000 bushels of oats in Prince Edward Island, but that the Intercolonial Railway would not undertake the carriage because the winter steamers were not performing their service.

Mr. BRODEUR. They were not performing their service?

Mr. A. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. BRODEUR. If they are not performing their service it will be only to-day. I do not think that my hon. friend has any information that so far they have not performed their service.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The information I had from the Minister of the Interior was that the Intercolonial Railway would not guarantee the carriage of these oats supposing they were bought in my province. I told him that the price of grain down there was a little lower than in most parts of Canada, and I asked him if he was going to buy any there. He told me that his difficulty was that the winter boats were not in a position to carry the grain, and that the Intercolonial Railway would not guarantee the carriage of it. Besides that I have information that these boats are not regularly performing the service. We have had no mail from Prince Edward Island to-day.

Mr. FIELDING. For two or three days during the past week we had no mails from Toronto.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Indeed?

Mr. BRODEUR. And they did not talk separation.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The Finance Minister did that. The very least information that the minister could give us is to tell us where these boats are. This is a very important service which is under his command, and I think he should have some information as to the whereabouts of these boats, whether they are sunk, or whether they are running or what they are doing.

Mr. BRODEUR. The only information I have in regard to these boats is what was published in the newspapers this morning. That the boats were caught in the ice.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (P.E.I.) I think the Minister of Marine should tell the Minister of the Interior that the boats are only temporarily in the ice, and that they will be able to transport the oats to the west. The farmers of Prince Edward Island have oats to sell, and there is no reason why the government of Canada should buy oats in the United States when Prince Edward Island can furnish better oats than can be found in Washington or Dakota. For the credit of his own department the Minister of Marine should take a trip over to the Interior Department and put Mr. Oliver right about that, and if he does so he will receive the gratitude of the men in Prince Edward Island who have oats to sell.

Mr. BRODEUR. We are making every effort possible to render the service by the 'Minto 'and 'Stanley' as efficient as possible. It may happen that they may be caught in the ice, but we are building a very much more powerful boat than either of these, and I believe it will perform the service under all conditions. My hon. friend knows very well that not only steamers but even trains are sometimes prevented from making their usual runs. Only a few days ago the trains between Montreal and Ottawa were cancelled on account of the heavy snow storm and it may very well happen that in Prince Edward Island the boats may be temporarily unable to perform the service.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (P.E.I.). The minister has misunderstood me. The Minister of the Interior told the House to-day that he would not buy the oats for the west in Prince Edward Island because the steamers were in the ice, and could not transport the oats. What I ask now is that the Minister of Marine should set the Minister of the Interior right on that point. I am not now complaining of the temporary interruption of navigation between the island and the mainland, but I am complaining that the department of the Interior has been furnished with incorrect information with reference to our winter service. I want the Minister of Marine to tell the Minister of the Interior that the steamers are now in a position to carry the oats.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will be very glad to tell the Minister of the Interior that we are doing our best to carry out the service to Prince Edward Island promptly. Probably the Minister of the Interior has taken his ideas from the fact that whenever there is an interruption in the service, my hon. friends from Prince Edward Island are ready to proclaim it to the whole world, and to announce that the province is going backwards. I think that does harm to the island. I do not like to give advice to my hon. friends, but I think it would be better if they would not so widely advertise the occurrence of these accidents. If I were to tell my hon. friend what we are doing about the service between the island and the mainland, I think I could show him that there has not been any prolonged interruption.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Marine is obstructing his estimates now.

Mr. A. MARTIN (P.E.I.). If the hour were not so late I might point out to the minister that if his government kept their promises with regard to the service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, there would be no necessity for us to remind him about it. To my mind, in order to remedy the grievance we suffer under we must keep it ever present before the minister and the government. There is no use for the minister or anybody else saying that the country does not know when these boats stop running, for it is proclaimed in the newspapers and by telegraph to every part of Canada when that occurs. Are we to sit silent here when the terms of confederation are not carried out? When the minister makes such a charge against us he is resorting to a subterfuge that I resent. I tell the minister that the people of Prince Edward Island are able to compete for the supply of part of that 600,000 bushels of grain that is required in the west, and the Minister of the Interior told us to-day that he cannot buy the oats in Prince Edward Island because navigation is interrupted. I do not think it becomes the Minister of Marine to tell us that we should be silent when the service over which his department exercises control is not performed as we were led to believe it would be performed. I won't take a reprimand like that from the minister or any one else in this House. There is no use in him telling us that he should cloak up this thing; for my part I will ventilate the grievance in this House until the remedy is applied and the minister had better understand that.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens). The minister has not explained the charge of $2,655 for repairing the steamer 'Minto' and $2,635 for repairing the 'Stanley'.

Mr. BRODEUR. The accountant of the department tells me that these boats are performing the mail service between the island and the mainland, and as the appropriation for Dominion steamers was exhausted, they took the money out of the appropriation for the winter mail service in which the steamers were engaged.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (P.E.I.). I do not think that is an explanation because you will find that out of the total expenditure $60,180.19 for winter mail service, there is deducted less charged to winter mail service $2,635, and $5,000 for the construction of lights. But in the detailed items for the 'Minto' these items do not appear and the only charges are those which were paid for the maintenance of the steamer. So far as I can see there is nothing charged in the detailed account of the 'Minto' for carriage of the mails. We have often asked in this House for a statement of what it costs to run the mails in the winter time but we have never succeeded in getting that statement.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend will find all these details of the expenditures of running the 'Stanley' on pages 25, 26 and 27. The $45,504.22 was not taken entirely from the vote for Dominion steamers; $2,635 was taken from the vote for winter mail service.

Salaries and expenses of cattle inspection, $3,600.

Mr. SPROULE. How does that come in here? Should it not be in connection with quarantine in the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not exactly. It is for the purpose of seeing that the cattle are inspected on the boat, and especially that the boat has the proper equipment; so that it is a question of marine more than a question of agriculture, though it is for the protection of the cattle on the ship.

Mr. W. JACKSON. What are the regulations in reference to the space for cattle on ships?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are printed regulations. I shall be glad to supply my hon. friend with a copy.

Mr. W. JACKSON. Have these inspectors anything to do with the inspection of the food for the cattle?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. W. JACKSON. Suppose there is a certain quantity of hay to go on for each bullock; the shipper of the cattle can put on more feed than that if he sees fit?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. How many inspectors do this work?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Delorme and Mr. O'Grady of Montreal. Mr. Buckley at St. John, Mr. Welsh at Charlottetown.

Mr. DANIEL. Does this inspection include all kinds of animals?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes; sheep, horses and cattle.

Mr. W. JACKSON. Do these inspectors have to say on what part of the ship these cattle will be allowed to be carried?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. We have absolute control in that respect and we have the right to determine what kind of accommodation they shall receive on the vessel and what space each shall occupy.

Mr. DANIEL. I notice that the only place that reports is Montreal. How is that? There must have been cattle exported from other ports.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, I will inquire how that is.

To continue subsidy for wrecking plant at Quebec, Maritime Provinces and British Columbia, $30,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. There are three places in Canada where we subsidize wrecking plants—one at Victoria, B.C., one at Quebec, and the other one on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is subsidized in British Columbia, and where is the plant located?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is located at Esquimalt.

Mr. SPROULE. What subsidy do you pay?

Mr. BRODEUR. $10,000 at each place.

Mr. BENNETT. Who are the parties at the different points?

Mr. BRODEUR. At Quebec it is Davie and Son; at Sydney, the Dominion Coal Company; at Esquimalt, the Esquimalt Marine Railway Company.

Mr. SPROULE. Do they keep up a wrecking plant of their own and what kind of a wrecking plant have they?

Mr. BRODEUR. They have a complete wrecking plant composed of all the necessary apparatus, and they have to keep their boats always under steam. Every boat, before it is subsidized, is examined by our inspectors.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the increasing navigation of the inland waters, especially Georgian bay, Lake Superior and Lake Ontario, would require some wrecking plant. That has been neglected very much by the government. Something ought to be done to assist in keeping up a wrecking plant or in subsidizing some individual or company.

Mr. BRODEUR. Where would the hon. gentleman suggest that such a plant should be located?

Mr. SPROULE. I would not, on the spur of the moment, give advice as to the particular locality, but I frequently talked the matter over with men engaged in the navigation of these waters, and the government should inquire and ascertain where would be the most suitable place.

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall submit the matter to the Dominion Marine Association. I was under the impression that there are several wrecking plants on the great lakes.

Mr. BENNETT. There are more big tugs on the upper lakes now than ever before.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the hon. gentleman will find that there are four or five plants there distributed at different points. What would be the result if we were to subsidize one?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not aware that there are four or five plants there.

Mr. BRODEUR. So I am informed. There is one in Kingston.

Mr. BENNETT. One in Sarnia and one in Midland too.

Mr. BRODEUR. It would be rather serious to subsidize one plant because that would work to the detriment of the others.

Mr. SPROULE. Why is it we have to get American plants to do the work in those waters, if we have these wrecking plants of our own?

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall have the matter inquired into and consult the Marine Association.

To provide for the organization of a naval militia and expenses in using the cruiser 'Canada' as a training ship, $10,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. Some years ago we built the cruiser 'Canada' and we decided to have a certain number of young men trained on board that cruiser in gunnery exercise and seamanship. There are sixty-five including the crew. The intention of the government is to extend that service. When the boat we are building for the British Columbia coast is finished, we shall have her manned in the same way as the 'Canada.' We intend carrying out the same policy with regard to the 'Vigilant' and the 'Curlew' and in fact all the boats in the fishery protection service. In that service we have decided to have all the appointments made solely by promotion and merit. This policy has been followed in the appointments lately made. In order to bring discipline into the service, promotion should be made according to merit.

Mr. SPROULE. How many are now training on the 'Canada'?

Mr. BRODEUR. Sixty-five.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the training kept up the whole year round?

Mr. BRODEUR. During the fishing season they go around the maritime coasts of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and during the winter they are stationed at Halifax in the dock yard. A year or two ago they made a trip to the West Indies.

Mr. SPROULE. Under what terms are they taken on and for how long?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are engaged during the pleasure of the minister. There is no length of service. The able seamen get $25 a month and the ordinary seamen $20 a month.

Mr. DANIEL. From the statement of the minister it is evident he intends using this appropriation, not for the purpose of training men to compose a naval militia, but simply for the purpose of manning the 'Canada.' He is simply speaking of the crew of that vessel. There appears to be no effort to have an organized naval militia, with officers of their own, drilled, uniformed and disciplined. It simply means, as I take it, from the description of the hon. minister, that he counts the crew of the 'Canada' as a naval militia, and he says he intends to add the crews of the 'Vigilant' and other vessels to the number. This is all very well if we knew just what he means by it. But if there is to be a militia, there must be some headquarters and some officer at the head of that branch or department, and there must be some organization. The minister has been voted $10,000 for the last two or three years, but we do not know what he has done with it. He has the crew of the 'Canada,' but they are simply paid the wages that come to them as a crew. The crew of the 'Canada,' under the minister's arrangement, would be a permanent force, but that is not my idea of what the minister would mean by a naval militia. I should think it would be persons trained and ready to be called upon when needed, and not a permanent force made up of the crews of these several crusiers.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Daniel) knows that this is merely the nucleus of our naval militia. The naval militia is based upon the fisheries' protection service. Some day, instead of having only special boats for the fisheries protection service, I hope to have the naval militia take part in that work. At the time when the 'Canada' was built, there was no organization except some boats like the 'Curlew' and the 'Vigilant' to patrol the coast. But it was thought we should have a boat on which a certain number of young men would be trained under the rules of the British admiralty. That has been done for the last few years with satisfactory results. I should like our organization to be made in such a way. Commander Spain has supervision over this naval militia, that is of the fisheries' protection service. In order to continue this organization, I started this year the idea that any appointments made to these vessels should be made from the ranks of the men who have been in the fisheries' protection service or in the 'Canada.' Some objections have been raised to the method of promotion, but I have stood firmly to the principle and carried it through. We are to build another cruiser for the service of the British Columbia coast. Other boats will be organized in the same way and on the same principle with a view to carrying out effectively this idea of a naval militia.

Mr. W. JACKSON. But you can only carry small guns. Is there a training in gunnery on these boats?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the treaty prevented that.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a treaty governing the great lakes, but I was speaking particularly of the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

Mr. SPROULE. But there is a fisheries' protection service on Lake Erie and Lake Ontario.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, there is the 'Vigilant' there, and we have to observe the treaty.

Mr. W. JACKSON. What are the regulations for ordnance in the cruisers on inland waters?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not the treaty before me, but there are provisions concerning the guns to be carried on these boats.

Mr. W. JACKSON. The look of the 'Vigilant' has been spoiled by what has been done. Four heavy guns have been placed on her, two forward and two aft. On the old 'Petrel' we had only one small gun, which seemed to answer the purpose. As well as I can understand, there are not men on the 'Vigilant' who could handle the ordnance with which she is armed.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think that that is correct.

Mr. W. JACKSON. Let me make myself clear. Of course, the 'Vigilant' is possibly most of her time during several months of the year in the town where I live. I believe an instructor was on the boat instructing the men in gunnery after the guns were installed, but I am informed that when he left there was not a man on that government boat capable of handling one of those guns.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is mistaken, because I know some of the officers

have attended gunnery schools. The first officer, I am informed, has passed through the gunnery school.

Mr. W. JACKSON. Were the guns purchased to be placed on the 'Vigilant,' and what price was paid?

Mr. BRODEUR. I could not answer the first question—they were purchased some years ago. With the ammunition they cost $4,500 each.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the calibre?

Mr. BRODEUR. One and a-half pounds, quick fire.

Mr. W. JACKSON. I have heard it suggested that Canada was not within her treaty rights in placing such a heavily armed cruiser as the 'Vigilant' on the great lakes. Perhaps the minister would not care to answer that question.

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall read over the treaty, but I am quite sure that we are within our right.

Mr. DANIEL. I was glad to hear the minister's statement that he intends to introduce something like naval discipline on these fishery protection cruisers, and am only sorry that orders to that effect have not already been given. If the minister could let it be thoroughly known by the officers and men on these boats that they are under the command of the commanders of the boats and that it is to them only that they must look to for promotion, that their promotion depends entirely upon their efficiency and good conduct without any regard to political influence, he would be doing the best thing possible in the interests of the cruisers and of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there the same training in gunnery on all the fishery cruisers as there is on the 'Vigilant'?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any other training except gunnery?

Mr. BRODEUR. Seamanship also.

Mr. SPROULE. Are these men engaged as they would be on a regular training ship; are they engaged for a specific term?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are engaged during the pleasure of the minister. If an officer or seaman was not discharging his duties properly he would be dismissed. The seamen on engagement are required to sign declarations that the Act applicable to their engagement has been read to them and that they engage to comply with all the provisions of the Act during the pleasure of the minister.

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Monday will be the regular private members' day?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 17, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

HAMILTON RADIAL ELECTRIC RAILWAY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 25) respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). As this is a very important Bill and as there are certain matters in connection with it which are now under consideration I would ask that it be laid over for the present. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. LENNOX. I propose to take what may be considered in a certain way a preliminary objection, and probably it might be well if I brought it to the attention of the committee so that it can be dealt with, and it may serve the purpose the minister has in view as well. My point is that the Bill is not before the committee in a form in which the committee can deal with it. The preamble of this Bill has been amended in very important particulars. As the Bill was introduced the preamble set forth:

Whereas the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company has by its petition represented that it was incorporated by chapter 88 of the statutes of 1894 of Ontario, whereby, and by subsequent amendments of the said Act, the said company was authorized to construct various lines of railway from the city of Hamilton to different places in the province of Ontario as in the said Act and amendments set forth.

Up to that point there is no amendment made by the Railway Committee. The original preamble then continues:

And whereas the said company has been advised that, under and by virtue of the provisions of sections 306 and 307 of The Railway Act of 1888, and sections 91 and 92 of The British North America Act, 1867, its railway, on crossing the line of the Grand Trunk Railway Company at Burlington in the year 1897 became and has since been subject to the exclusive legislative authority of the parliament of Canada; and whereas applications have been made to the legislative assembly of Ontario for Acts extending the time for constructing the said company's lines of railway, and such Acts have been passed, but, as the said company has been

advised, without authority or jurisdiction; and whereas the said company has by its petition asked for authority to carry out certain extensions and works beyond provincial jurisdiction; and whereas it is advisable that all questions as to jurisdiction should be set at rest, that everything done by the said company in pursuance of the several Acts relating thereto should be confirmed, and that the said company should be enabled to carry out its various enterprises.

The alteration in this part of the preamble affects the question that is now coming before us. Objection was taken to the part of the preamble which recited the crossing of the line of the Grand Trunk Railway Company at Burlington in 1897, and also to the statement in it that the Acts of the provincial legislature were without jurisdiction and also to the recital that everything done by the said company in pursuance of the said several Acts relating thereto should be confirmed. I moved that these different parts of the preamble should be struck out. Subsequently it was moved by the promoter of the Bill that the preamble should be amended. Not exactly in the lines that I proposed, but by providing as the Bill now provides :

And whereas doubts have been raised whether in and by virtue of sections 306 and 307 of the Railway Act of 1888 and sections 91 and 92 of the British North America Act of 1867 the said railway company by crossing the line of the Grand Trunk Railway Company at Burlington in the year 1897 became and has since been subject to the exclusive legislative authority of the parliament of Canada.

It was altered in the respect that the reference to the company being so advised was stricken out and the expression that 'doubts had been raised' was substituted. Then the preamble was amended further by striking out the words referring to the Ontario amendments in lines 17 and 18. The words further down in the preamble were struck out as follows :

That everything done by the said committee in pursuance of the several Acts relating thereto should be confirmed.

These are very important alterations in the preamble of the Bill and as a matter of fact discussion of this question occupied three or four days in the committee. Now, I desire to call attention to the fact that the committee in making their report to this House have not complied with rule 106 of the rules of the House. The report of the committee is :

Your committee have had under consideration Bill (No. 25) an Act respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company, and have agreed to report the same with amendments; all of which is respectfully submitted.

Rule 106 is as follows :

The committee to which a private Bill may have been referred shall report the same to the House in every case; and when any material alteration has been made in the preamble of the Bill, such alteration and the reasons for the same, are to be stated in the report.

I need not go into the reasons why that rule is framed as it is. The rule provides that not only the alterations shall be stated in the report of the committee, but also the reasons for making those alterations. Therefore I move :

That Bill (No. 25) be not now proceeded with, but that it be reported back to the House in order that it and the report of the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines thereon, be referred back to the said committee, with instructions to the committee to amend their said report by stating the alterations made by the committee in the preamble of the said Bill, and the reasons for said alterations, as required by rule 106 of this House.

I ask the minister if he will allow me to put this in so that we may have the point decided one way or the other.

Mr. GRAHAM. The chairman of the committee which made the report is not here. There is some force in the point raised by my hon. friend. I think that will perhaps fully justify my motion to let the whole matter stand for another time, when we can consider that point as well as some other things that I have in mind.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not see any objection to that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That motion will have to be made when the Speaker is in the Chair.

Mr. GRAHAM. The first thing we will discuss when we get into committee again will be the hon. gentleman's objection.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Speaker, I will move now, on the understanding that the minister does not want the matter proceeded with now :

That Bill (No. 25) and the report of the committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines thereon, be referred back to the said committee with instructions to them to amend their said report by stating the alterations made in the committee in the preamble of the said Bill, and the reasons for said alterations, as required by rule 106 of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. This will stand as a notice of motion.

Mr. LENNOX. I would ask the minister to let me know when this Bill is coming on again, as I would like to be here.

Mr. GRAHAM. It will probably be a week from to-day.

Mr. CLARKE. The point which my hon. friend raises could be considered to-morrow evening, during the hour for private Bills.

Mr. LENNOX. I am quite ready to have it considered now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Railways has truthfully said that the Bill is an important Bill, and I would suggest that we have a few days notice of the time it is to be taken up. I understand that the present intention is to bring it on a week from to-day.

Mr. GRAHAM. I want to meet the convenience of hon. gentlemen as far as possible. It strikes me that it will be better to let it stand for a few days, so that everybody may be in a better position to discuss it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. All I wish to ask is that we may be informed a few days in advance.

Mr. GRAHAM. Surely.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND ELECTIONS.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a telegram, which I wish to read :

Alphonse E. Leblanc, travelling passenger agent Intercolonial Railway, is out canvassing here for local government candidates, and has announced that he intends to open a committee room at Dupuis Corner and hold it open day and night until after election. Henry Leblanc is an employee of the Intercolonial Railway in audit department of general offices in Moncton; is also going out through Shediac and Dorchester parishes from schoolhouse to schoolhouse decrying and denouncing the opposition candidates.

I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if he will kindly inform himself as to these particular delinquents and answer to-morrow, and I hope his information will be that he has called them off.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will certainly make inquiries.

QUESTIONS.

TIGNISH HARBOUR.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Is the government informed that the north block of the Tignish breakwater recently built needs repairing, and has the government any report from its engineers regarding the same?
2. What report has the government received from its engineers regarding repairs and extension of the harbour at Tignish, and what is the intention of the government thereon?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Minister of Public Works) :

1. No.
2. (a) The resident engineer has asked for the sum of $500 for general repairs to breakwaters. Petitions have been received asking for an extension to the breakwater and the enlargement of the harbour, with respect to which requests the resident engineer reports that the additional desired accommodation may be obtained by the still further inward extension of the breakwaters. This would have the effect of nearly doubling the harbour space and afford good and secure shelter. The proposed improvement leaves no doubt that the space between the breakwaters would scour out so as to carry a depth of from four to five feet at low water, which will be sufficient for the class of boats usually making use of the harbour. The estimated cost of the work would be $20,000. (b) The matter is under consideration.

ST. ANICET WHARF.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. When was Mr. Dupuis appointed wharfinger at the St. Anicet wharf?
2. What revenues did the government receive from such date until now from year to year?
3. What were the expenses incurred in such wharf since then, each year, respectively?

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

1. By order in council, 14th September, 1896.
2. 1897-1898, $22.53 ; 1898-1899, $74.63 ; nothing since.
3. There has been no expenditure for this wharf by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. E. A. WALLBERG.

Mr. STAPLES asked :

1. Has the Marine and Fisheries Department made a contract with E. A. Wallberg for large quantities of reinforced cement ? If not, is it their intention to do so ?
2. Has it been arranged with the department or any official of the department to allow Wallberg to take out a patent covering some point in connection with this cement so that there can be no competition with him ?

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

1. No. Mr. Wallberg's company has a contract for $6,095, on which $3,000 has been paid, to heighten the Heath point tower. The quantity of concrete is small, the locality and conditions being largely responsible for the price. Very little reinforced concrete work is contemplated for the coming season.
2. No.

FROZEN BONELESS MEAT.

Mr. J. D. REID—by Mr. Sam. Hughes—asked:

1. Has the attention of the Minister of Agriculture been drawn to the following item in the 'Daily Mail' newspaper of January 27, 1908, printed in Manchester, England :—

FROZEN BONELESS MEAT.

Mr. John Burns advised to stop imports.

The local government board medical inspector, in a report issued to-day says :—

The unchecked admission of boneless scrap meat into the United Kingdom appears to constitute a definite risk to health.

Most of this meat, coming frozen in boxes, is from the United States, a little, but not of the lowest class, from the Argentine ; there is at times a small trade from New Zealand, but practically none from the continent. Boneless beef consists of 'chucks,' in practice trimmings from all parts of the carcase, a by-product of the canning trade. They are from animals of inferior quality. The exports are mainly in winter, because in summer they may go bad after leaving cold storage. The wholesale price is about 3d. a pound. The chief sale is in Glasgow and the north, the purchasers in London being pie and sausage makers. The importation, mainly by six firms, was in 1905, 2,722 tons. Similar pork and ham cuttings are variously known as 'box pork,' 'boneless butts,' or 'Boston butts.' Some of the trimmings may even be from tuberculosis animals.

Mr. Burns is enabled by the Public Health Act to deal with the matter, and the report says that the trade is so small that to prohibit all such imports would cause little trouble.

To guard further against the danger of tuberculosis from pork coming from Holland, Denmark, and other countries, besides America, it is suggested that only carcases should be imported containing the parts enabling inspectors to detect disease, and portions less than carcases only when bearing an official mark approved by the board, such approval depending on the guarantee supplied by the exporting countries.

2. Has there been any correspondence between the Imperial and Canadian governments with reference to frozen meats in boxes or barrels or packages ?

3. Has the government a system of inspection now in operation by which all frozen meats in boxes or other packages for export are duly inspected and properly stamped and certified before shipment ?

4. If not, is it the intention of the government to adopt such a system ?

5. Would any action such as proposed in this article, that such meats be prohibited by the British government, affect shipments of Canadian products even though duly inspected by Canadian government officials and properly certified to ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. The item substantially as quoted was published in the Canadian papers at the time of its appearance in England and was then read by the Minister of Agriculture.

2. No.

3. Yes. All meat food products prepared in establishments engaged in export or interprovincial trade are, under the provisions of the Meat and Canned Foods Act, subjected to thorough and careful inspection by officers specially trained for this duty. All such meat food products, as well as the boxes or other packages containing them, are duly marked before leaving the establishment in which they are prepared, and in case of products destined for export by sea, provision is made for the issue by the inspector in charge of the establishment of origin, of a certificate of inspection and approval which must be filed with the customs authorities before clearance can be granted to the vessel carrying such products.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. At the present this is a matter of conjecture, and in any case, rests entirely with the British authorities.

MAILS—PORT AU PIQUE TO CASTLEREAGH.

Mr. STANFIELD asked :

1. When was the contract for carrying mails from Port au Pique to Castlereagh, Colchester county, last awarded ?

2. How many tenders were received, and what was the name and amount of each tenderer ?

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

1. 1st July, 1900.

2. Four. Abner A. Crowe, $65 ; Robert Collins, $80 ; James Leet (starting point Portapique), $94 ; Robert Gamble, $99.56. The first three tenderers not being in a position to carry out the conditions of the contract on account of their not residing at Castlereagh. the starting point, the contract was awarded to Robert Gamble.

GOVERNMENT COAL LANDS.

Mr. AMES asked :

In respect of the undermentioned coal lands leased by the government, who was, in each instance, the original grantee, what subsequent assignments have been reported, and who is the present owner or occupant:—South ½ section 10, township 10, range 16, west of 4th meridian; south half-section 2, township 10, range 17, west of 4th meridian ; north ½ section 33, township 9, range 17, west of 4th meridian ; east ½ section 35, township 9, range 16, west of 4th meridian.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). No leases have been issued by the government of any of the coal lands above described, but sales have been made of these four half-sections for coal mining purposes as follows :

South, ½ section 10, township 10, range 16, west 4th meridian. Coal mining rights sold to Alexandrina Aubin. No assignments recorded, so that the sale is still in the name of the original grantee.

South ½ section 2, township 10, range 17, west 4th meridian. Coal mining rights sold to John R. Haig; subsequently assigned to the Tabor Coal Mining Company, limited, who in turn assigned to the Canada West Coal and Coke Company, Limited (now the Canada West Coal Company, Limited). The present owners, therefore, are the Canada West Coal Company, Limited.

North ½ section 33, township 9, range 17, west 4th meridian. Sold to W. Probert and W. R. Stevens; subsequently assigned to the Independent Coal Company, Limited, and now stands recorded in the name of these assignees.

East ½ section 35, township 9, range 16, west of 4th meridian. Sold to Robert Lawson and by him assigned to Reginald Stewart, in whose name the half-section now stands recorded.

MR. A. W. STEVENSON.

Mr. WHITE—by Mr. Perley—asked :

1. What amounts have been paid to A. W. Stevenson, chartered accountant of Montreal, by the Department of Marine and Fisheries during the last five years for auditing or expert accountants's work?
2. In what years were these amounts paid and wherein are they set forth in the Auditor General's Reports?

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

1. I am not aware of any amounts having been paid to A. W. Stevenson of Montreal, for auditing or expert accountant's work in the Department of Marine and Fisheries.
2. Answered by above.

PAYMENTS TO EXPERT ACCOUNTANTS.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. What amounts have been paid during the last five years by the Department of Justice in each year to John McKay, or John McKay & Co., of Toronto, John Hyde, of Montreal, and W. H. Cross, or Clarkson & Cross, of Toronto, for auditing or expert accountant's work?
2. Wherein are these payments set forth in the reports of the Auditor General?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). None.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY HARD PINE TENDERS.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

1. Were tenders called for the furnishing of hard pine for the Intercolonial Railway for the season of 1908?
2. If so, when did time expire for receipt of such tenders?
3. How many tenders were received, from whom, and what was the amount of the tender in each case?
4. Was any tender accepted? If so, who was the successful tenderer, and what was the amount of his tender?

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

1. Yes.
2. December 24, 1907.
3. The Georgia Pine Company, Baltimore, $27 per thousand feet, board-measure, delivery St. John.

Thomas Nagle & Co., $28 per thousand feet, board-measure, delivery St. John.

Hirsch Lumber Company, N.Y., declined to quote.

Rhodes, Curry & Company, $27.50, delivery Moncton.

S. S. Ryan, $25.75, delivery St. John ; $25.80, delivery Moncton.

Eppinger & Russell, N.Y., $27, delivery St. John.

W. Hilyard Shaw, $31, delivery St. John.

Jos. A. Likely, $25.95, delivery St. John.

Jos. A. Likely, $26.95, delivery Moncton.

Macon Lumber Company, does not quote price.

G. H. Barnes, St. Louis, does not quote price.

Mason, Gordon & Company, $26.25, Standard grade, delivery St. John ; $28.25, merchantable grade, delivery St. John.

Sumner & Company, $26.90, St. John ; $27.75, delivered Moncton.

4. Yes. S. S. Ryan's tender was accepted at $25.80 per thousand feet board-measure, delivered at Moncton, his being the lowest.

BROCKVILLE COLD STORAGE PLANT.

Mr. R. N. WALSH—by Mr. Blain—asked:

Has the government disposed of the cold storage plant at Brockville? If so, to whom, and under what conditions?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). No. It was leased for one year from January 1, 1907, to A. A. Ayer & Company, of Montreal, at a rental of three hundred dollars ($300) a year and the department is now in correspondence with that company regarding a renewal of the lease.

BATE & COMPANY AND EDWARDS & COMPANY.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. What amount has the firm of H. N. Bate & Co. received from each department
2. What amount has the firm of W. C. Edwards & Co. received from each department of the government since the year 1896 for supplies, giving the amount paid each year separately?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Stand as a notice of motion for a return.

LEASE OF GOVERNMENT LANDS.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. In respect of section 11, township 8, range 4, west of the 5th, when and to whom was right to lease originally granted?
2. When and whom did the original grantee assign his right to lease?
3. To whom did the first lease issue?
4. When was said lease dated?
5. For how long was it to run?
6. What was the annual rent and royalty?
7. In whose name does this lease now stand?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Right to lease granted December 10, 1902, to W. H. Nolan, of Montreal.
2. On January 20, 1903, an assignment from W. H. Nolan to Malcolm Mackenzie of Macleod, dated December 6, 1902, of his interest in this lease was registered in the department.
3. The lease issued to Malcolm McKenzie of Macleod.
4. Lease dated April 1, 1903.
5. The lease is for twenty years from April 1, 1903.
6. The annual rental as established by the regulations is 30 cents per acre payable half-yearly in advance and the royalty 10 cents per ton.
7. The lease now stands in the name of the West Canadian Collieries Limited, of Blairmore, Alberta.

TRURO 'MIDLAND TIMES.'

Mr. STANFIELD—by Mr. Blain—asked :

What amount has been paid to the proprietor of the Truro 'Midland Times' newspaper for advertising during the years 1906 and 1907, separately

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Stand as notice of motion for a return.

CANCELLATIONS OF LAND ENTRIES.

Mr. PORTER—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Has any investigation been held by the inspector of Dominion Land Agencies, Brandon, Manitoba, or Mr. Martin or any other person, concerning the cancellation of the entry of Thomas J. Oliver, and the entry of Fred. Hintz in north east ¼, section 32, township 36, range 16, east 2nd meridian?
2. Has any report been made thereon?
3. If no investigation has been held, when and by whom will it be made?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. On November 16, 1907, Mr. R. E. A. Leech, inspector of Dominion land agencies, Brandon, Manitoba, was advised that an investigation should be held either by himself or Mr. Martin, assistant inspector.
2. No report of the investigation has yet been received.
3. Mr. Leech has been asked by wire to rush his report.

FISHERIES QUESTION.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

Is it the intention of the government to have a conference with the provincial governments with a view to a settlement of the fisheries question with regard to jurisdiction, &c.? If so, when is such conference to be held, and what matters will be brought before it?

Mr. AMES.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). As stated previously in this House an agent has been appointed by this government with power to discuss with accredited representatives of the various local governments affected, the question of the relative rights and jurisdiction with respect to the fisheries.

STATION AGENTS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. What are the respective salaries of the station agents at Tignish, Alberton, O'Leary and Conway?
2. Has any petition been received by the government for a station at Alma, on Prince Edward Island Railway?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Station agents at Tignish & Alberton are paid $65 per month. The agent at O'Leary is paid $55.50 per month. The caretaker at Conway is paid $100 per year besides commission on ticket sales, $90.
2. The department is not aware of any petition being presented for a station at Alma.

CAPTAINS OF GOVERNMENT VESSELS PLYING BETWEEN MONTREAL AND QUEBEC.

Mr. DELISLE—by Mr. Louis Lavergne—asked :

1. Have all the captains of the government vessels plying between Montreal and Quebec passed the necessary examinations?
2. If not, is it intended to have them pass such examinations?

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

1. Yes.
2. Answered by No. 1.

MAIL BETWEEN ST. PASCHAL AND KAMOURASKA.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. Who has the contract for carrying the mail between St. Paschal and Kamouraska?
2. How many tenders were received, what is the name of each one who tendered, and at what price?
3. Who are the bondsmen for the contractors?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (for the Postmaster General) :

1. Thomas Deschenes.
2. Thomas Deschenes, $260 per annum; George Langlois, $405 per annum.
3. Joseph Deschaine and Pierre Raymond.

MR. HENRY C. HUNTER.

Mr. STANFIELD asked :

1. Was Henry C. Hunter an employee of the Railway Department on November 28, 1907?

2. If so, is the department aware that he took a prominent part in the election held on that date, and was an agent in one of the polling booths?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Henry Hunter was a temporary employee of the Intercolonial Railway on November 28, 1907.

2. The government is not aware that he took a prominent part in the election held on that day, nor that he was an agent in one of the polling booths.

ROSS RIFLE—SEALED PATTERN.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has the so-called 'sealed pattern' Ross rifle, for some time missing, been discovered?
2. If so, where, when, under what conditions, and by whom was it discovered?
3. In whose keeping was the sealed pattern prior to the time of its being lost?
4. Was the original sealed pattern that of a Mark I. rifle?
5. Was any other sealed pattern subsequently adopted?
6. If not, in conformity with what pattern or specification were rifles Mark II and Mark III. manufactured?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. and 2. The sealed pattern of the Ross rifle has never been missing.

3. The sealed pattern in question has been in the possession of the Inspector of Small Arms.

4. Yes.

5. No, but a model was tentatively agreed upon.

6. There is no Mark III. rifle. As regards Mark II. rifles, they have been manufactured in conformity with model mentioned in No. 5 and inspected with the aid of specifications, drawings and gauges.

ROSS RIFLE—DISPOSITION OF RIFLES MANUFACTURED.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What has been the disposition of the Ross rifles manufactured to date?
2. In what places and in what quantities are they stored?
3. Have any of these rifles been rejected? If so, how many, and of what mark?
4. How many Ross rifles are in the hands of the permanent force at this date, and how many in the hands of the militia?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence):

1.

On store charge	23,091
Issued	9,409
Total	32,500

2. Stored as follows:

M. D. No. 1, London	327
" " 2, Toronto	1,120
" " 3, Kingston	240
" " 4. Ottawa	1,004
" " 5-6, Montreal	625
" " 7, Quebec	16,017
" " 8, St. John	309
" " 9, Halifax	1,522
" " 10, Winnipeg	1,009
" " 11. Victoria	470
" " 12, Charlottetown	148
" " 13, Calgary	300
Total	23,091

3. A rifle is not rejected as a whole. Each component is separately inspected and any defective parts are sent back to the factory to be replaced or altered as required. and the rifle re-submitted for inspection. No rifles have been rejected after final inspection.

4.

In the hands of the permanent force.	3,015
In the hands of the militia	4,637
To rifle associations	1,757
Total	9,409

DOMINION CAMP EQUIPMENT COMPANY.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Is the Dominion Camp Equipment Company, Montreal, an incorporated company?
2. If so, where and how is it incorporated?
3. Who are the directors?
4. Who are the shareholders?
5. Was the contract of this company with the Department of Militia and Defence for stores (Auditor General's Report, 1906, Q—66) given by contract or not?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence):

1, 2, 3 and 4. Information not available at the Department of Militia and Defence.

5. The stores were supplied under the same conditions and provisions that were stipulated in the original contract dated March 8, 1904.

MINING RIGHTS, SECTIONS 20, 28 AND 32, TOWNSHIP 8, RANGE 4, WEST FIFTH MERIDIAN.

Mr. PERLEY asked:

1. On what dates and to whom were the original grants made of the mining rights of sections 20, 28 and 32, in township 8, range 4, west of the fifth meridian?
2. What transfers of the same are registered in the department, on what dates, and to whom?
3. Who are the present owners or occupants?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

East half section 20, township 8, range 4, west 5th meridian:

Date of sale, December 9, 1902; to Angus J. Leitch; transferred to Archibald McVit-

tie, June 6, 1906; transferred to James A. Nowell, June 6, 1906; transferred to Henry L. Simons, August 3, 1907; present owner, Henry L. Simons.

West half section 20, township 8, range 4, west 5th meridian:

Date of sale, November 5, 1903; to Duncan McCallum; transferred to Augus J. Leitch, June 6, 1906; transferred to Archibald McVittie, June 6, 1906; transferred to J. A. Nowell, June 6, 1906; transferred to Henry L. Simons, January 7, 1908; present owner, Henry L. Simons.

East half section 32, township 8, range 4, west 5th meridian:

Date of sale, April 13, 1904; to William G. White; transferred to Angus J. Leitch, March 1, 1905; transferred to Archibald W. McVittie, March 1, 1905; transferred to James A. Nowell, June 6, 1906; transferred to Henry L. Simons, September 12, 1907; present owner, Henry L. Simons.

No grant or sale of the mining rights of section 28 and the west half of section 32, in township 8, range 4, west of the 5th meridian would appear to have been made.

PAYMENTS TO THE ROLLA L. CRAIN COMPANY.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

1. What amount has been paid the Rolla L. Crain Company, of Ottawa, in each year since 1896?
2. What is the general character of the supplies furnished?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). As this question refers to several departments, it will be necessary to move for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for return.

PAYMENTS TO THE ECLIPSE MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

1. How much money has been paid since 1896 to the Eclipse Manufacturing Company, of Ottawa?
2. How much each year?
3. What was the general character of the supplies furnished?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Same answer.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for return.

DREDGING AT MIDLAND, 1906.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

1. Were tenders invited for dredging done at Midland during the summer of 1906? If so, who tendered therefor, and what were their respective rates?
2. Who obtained the contract and performed the work?

Mr. OLIVER.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works):

1. (a) Yes.
(b).

Names.	Rates.	
	For rock.	For other materials.
	$ cts.	$ cts.
The Owen Sound Dredge and Construction Co.	2 00	0 34
The Dominion Dredging and Construction Co.	2 50	0 34½
Weddell & Co.	2 00	0 35
W. E. Phin	2 75	0 50
The Canadian Dredge and Construction Co., Ltd	4 00	0 80

2. The Owen Sound Dredge and Construction Company.

DREDGING DONE IN 1907.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

1. How many tenders were received for dredging done in 1907, and what were the names and rates?
2. Were the contracts given to the lowest tenderer at each of the following places in Quebec:—Point Cavagnale, Becancour, Raquette river, Blanche shoals, River Jesus, Dorion, Hay island, St. Placide and Maskinonge?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works). I am informed that all the papers in connection with this question are with the Public Accounts Committee. There are no records in the department giving this information.

SELKIRK HATCHERY AND BERINS HATCHERY.

Mr. SCHAFFNER asked:

1. Is the government aware that the spawn shipped to Selkirk from the east is said to be a failure, and that the hatchery at Selkirk, with a capacity of 400 jars has 20 jars only of spawn, with a great probability that within thirty days there will not be one jar of good spawn?
2. What has been the expenditure to date from October 1 last in connection with the Berins hatchery?
3. What has been the expenditure to date from October 1 last of the Selkirk hatchery?

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

1. Yes.
2. $3.533.60.
3. $1,255.30.

Mr. SCHAFFNER asked:

1. When was the Berins river hatchery in Lake Winnipeg built, and what was the cost of said hatchery?

2. Who is in charge of the Berins hatchery, what was the previous occupation of the person in charge, and what was his qualification for the position?

3. Who is in charge of the Selkirk hatchery, what was the previous occupation of the person in charge, and what was his qualification for the position?

4. Is the government aware that Berins hatchery is said to be closed on account of the failure of those responsible to secure spawn?

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

1. 1905. $18,768.98.

2. and 3. F. W. Hooker. Records do not give previous occupation. He made himself conversant with the duties required of him by attending a Whitefish hatchery in Ontario, whilst in operation.

4. The hatchery is closed owing to the fact that sufficient eggs were not secured to warrant operation this season.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing the individual name and place of residence of the captain and crew of each of the government steamers 'Lansdowne,' 'Aberdeen,' 'Druid,' 'Brant,' 'Lady Laurier,' 'Minto' and 'Stanley.'—Mr. Stanfield.

For a copy of reports, plans, surveys, and other data, in connection with the proposal to construct a branch canal from Balsam lake, on the Trent canal, to the head of Gull river waters, in Haliburton county.—Mr. Sam. Hughes.

For a copy of all contracts, correspondence, accounts, &c., concerning a payment of $18,000 to the Canadian Towing and Wrecking Company, as set out at page P—102 of the Auditor General's Report of 1906-7; also, a copy of the contract and all correspondence relating to services performed by said company in the month of December, 1907, for the sum of $30,000 for similar services as above at Port Arthur.—Mr. Bennett.

For a copy of advertisements calling for tenders for dredging work on Holland river, Trent Valley canal system, tenders received, schedules showing prices paid, recommendation of person for inspector, date of payments made to contractors, and the contract with contractor.—Mr. Bennett.

For a copy of the contract and all correspondence relating to a payment of $3,900 to the Midland Towing and Wrecking Company, as set out on page P—32 of the Auditor General's Report for 1906-7, and of the advertisement calling for tenders.—Mr. Bennett.

For a copy of all tenders, specifications and plans for the construction of the new railway station at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, together with a copy of all orders, instructions, and corrected specifications or plans, and of all correspondence between the government or the Department of Railways and the inspector of the works or the contractor, respecting specifications and plans, and the construction of the work, including order for change in nature of work, and for extra work, and all other correspondence, statements and information in possession of the government relating to the works, with a statement of all moneys paid to the contractor and inspector of works to date.—Mr. A. A. McLean.

1. For a return showing how many applications for timber licenses were received by the government of Mr. Mackenzie, what area in square miles they covered, how many licenses were issued, what area they covered, and under how many of these licenses operations were actually carried on, and what area these included.

2. How many applications for timber licenses were received by the government from November 1, 1878, to July 1, 1896, and what area in square miles they covered, how many licenses were issued and what area they covered, under how many of these licenses operations were actually carried on, and what area they covered.

3. How many permits to cut timber were given to applicants as above in leases where licenses had not issued during each of these periods.—Mr. Foster.

For a return showing what quantity or quantities of goods or supplies have been furnished by the Office Specialty Company to the Dominion of Canada in every department of the service since 1896, and the total amounts for each year.—Mr. Bennett.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND BRANCH LINES.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.) moved:

For a copy of all corrrespondence, telegrams, reports, memoranda, resolutions, and any other information in possession of the government or any member or official thereof, respecting the construction of branch railway lines in Prince Edward Island.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I shall ask the attention of the House to a few words in regard to the construction of branch lines of railway in Prince Edward Island. Prince Edward Island is geographically situated differently from any other province in Canada. It also occupies a very peculiar position in regard to railway construction. Prior to its union with Canada the island was far in advance of any other section of Canada in this respect. The people of that province believed in railways, and comparatively had more railways under construction than any other part of Canada, as will be seen by reference to the statistics showing the number of miles then constructed in Canada. Two hundred miles of railway had been constructed at the cost of the people of the province before they entered confederation. While the rest of Canada had only one mile of railway for every 1,000 people Prince Edward Island had under construction a mile for every 480 people. But to-day the position is reversed, and for some strange reason which I cannot explain Prince Edward Island has fallen behind in the race. She does not to-day compare as favourably with the rest of Canada as she did before confederation. The situation may be partly explained by the fact that the railways which have been built since we entered confederation have been built large-

ly at the expense of the federal government, while the 200 miles of railway under construction in Prince Edward Island at the time she entered the union was built at the expense of the province, and the province justly complains that railway construction there does not keep pace with railway construction in the rest of Canada. It is undeniable that confederation could never had been brought about without the construction of railways to bind the various provinces together. When the four original provinces were confederated Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would not have agreed to enter the union without the construction of the Intercolonial to connect the provinces so that they could have commercial relations with the rest of the country, and without such a link the union would have been of no earthly benefit, an amalgamation of those provinces would have been impossible. The result of this argument by Nova Scotia and New Brunswick was that the Dominion government undertook the construction of the Intercolonial. Similarly, a little later on, when British Columbia entered confederation, that province would not enter the union until she had a guarantee of railway connection with the rest of Canada; she insisted, she drove a hard and fast bargain with the Dominion government of that day that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be extended to British Columbia.

Every hon. member can see that in my province the situation is different. That province at the time she entered confederation had under construction 200 miles of railway. The argument used by New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and British Columbia would have been a just argument to be used by Prince Edward Island; but the Dominion government drove a hard and fast bargain with that province and saddled it with the cost of her 200 miles of railway. The cost to the province of this railway was $3,144,214. It was a very heavy burden for a small province of about 100,000 people to assume, and I have no doubt, and hon. members will agree with me that it was a huge mistake to burden that small province with the cost of these 200 miles. The fact is that ever since confederation the province has been losing the interest on that money.

In 1873, when Prince Edward Island entered confederation, according to the terms of union, a debt allowance was made to the province of $4,701,050. Accordingly Prince Edward Island would be entitled to the interest on the whole of this sum. But, there was deducted from that sum of $4,701,050 the sum of $3,144,738.11 for railway construction in the province. Any hon. member can easily see that Prince Edward Island was not dealt with at confederation in the same way as the other provinces. That province, at its entrance into confederation, was charged with over $3,000,000 which should have been assumed by the Dominion. The cost of those 200 miles of railway in Prince Edward Island, when we entered the union, should be assumed by Canada as part of the Intercolonial Railway in the same way as they did in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Hon. members may remember that it was said here a few nights ago by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) that there could have been no union between the upper and lower provinces without the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. The Railway Act, would never have passed in Prince Edward Island unless it had been conceded and agreed that branch lines should be built to extend all over the province. Small as the province is it is densely populated and there is no comparison between its resources and those of any other section of Canada. Knowing the advantage of railways the province, should never have come into confederation, without having been equipped with those branch lines for which we have been contending in this House for the last twenty or thirty years. There is no doubt that if the province had remained out of confederation these branch lines which we are asking for and which were promised before confederation would have been built by the local government as well as the main lines. But, we came into the union of Canada. It was assumed when we came into the union that Canada was not to engage in the building of branch lines, that the building of local lines of railway all over Canada should be assumed by the provinces because it was said this was the constitution of the country. Of course, it is the constitution of the country, but when the constitution stands in the way of some of the larger provinces then the constitution is said to be wrong and down it goes. You will find, Mr. Speaker, that when we went into the union the argument which was used against us, in order to keep the Dominion from paying for our road, was that it was a road of local importance only, and they quoted a section of the British North Amercia Act to prove their contention. If you turn to section 92 of the British North America Act you will find these words:

> In each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated; that is to say:
>
> Subsection 10. Local works and undertakings other than such as are of the following classes: Lines of steam and other ships, railways, canals, telegraphs and other works and undertakings connecting the province with any other or others, of the provinces, or extending beyond the limits of the province.

Those are the terms of confederation, but the constitution does not appear to be very binding sometimes upon some governments. The government says that the constitution is very sacred, and that

you cannot change it, but, when it suits some of the larger provinces, it does not stand in their way very long, and this clause, which is part of the constitution of the country, did not stand very long in the way but was perfectly ineffective when railways were required to be built all over the country and subsidies amounting to $40,000,000 have been paid in consequence. My province did not reap one dollar of benefit from these large expenditures. Yet, the statistics of the Railway Department are used against my province in such a way as to lead hon. members of this House and the public generally to believe that in that province larger expenditures have been made than actually have been made. I do not suppose that I can refer to a former debate, but I can quote the words of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson). A few evenings ago the hon. ex-Minister of Railways spoke as follows :—

There have been very large sums of money expended in Prince Edward Island for the construction of railways, I think some $7,000,000 was expended in the construction of railways in that province, and they have railways in every direction.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that $7,000,000 was expended by this government for railway construction in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. EMMERSON. I understand that to be the total expended on the island.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The total expended by whom ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The total expended by the Dominion, or, if originally expended by the province, repaid by the Dominion.

These are the statements which we have to meet in this House, statements which are entirely erroneous and statements which are contradicted in one page of the report of the Department of Railways and Canals and carried out on the next page. I see the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) in his place, and I hope that for the credit of the department, of which he has just taken charge, he will remedy these discrepancies. If he turns to page 10 he will find this paragraph :

The total government expenditure on railways prior to and since confederation, July, 1867, up to March 31, 1907, amounts, on capital account, to $162,050,456.79, which includes the sum of $25,000,000 granted (from capital) to the Canadian Pacific Railway company for its main line. In addition there has been expended from the consolidated fund a total of $167,210,490.44, which includes $35,578,502.54 paid as railway subsidies in addition to the above to the C.P.R., making a total expenditure of $329,260,974. Of this amount the sum of $13,881,460.65 was expended on construction works prior to confederation on portions of what is now the I.C.R. system. This amount does not include the annual payment of $119,700 to the provincial government of Quebec, being interest at the rate of 5 per cent on the sum of $2,394,000 up to 1905 granted by 47 Vic., ch. 8 (1884), nor the annual payment of $107,730, being interest at the rate of 4½ per cent since and including 1905, on the said sum of $2,394,000, for the line of railway between Ottawa and Quebec which sum was transferred to the public debt as a liability, and is dealt with by the Finance Department. (See Public Accounts 1893-94, page 10, and 1906, page 79).

Of this amount—I want the Minister of Railways to note it—$13,881,460.65 was expended prior to confederation on the portion of what is now the Intercolonial Railway. I want next to compare that statement with the statement on page 127 of Railway Statistics, and when the Minister of Railways compares those two figures, and compares some other figures I will give him, I think I will be able to show him that the hon. members of this House are misled by statements contained in this report. At page 127 there is the statement that $7,307,299.21 was expended by the Dominion government in Prince Edward Island. I am going to show the Minister of Railways that that sum is partly made up by the Dominion government taking credit for what was paid by the province itself previous to confederation. Now, I want the Minister of Railways and the Prime Minister to rectify this. We have been asking this government to correct these figures from year to year, and yet here we have published a statement which misled the ex-Minister of Railways the other night. I remember a back-bencher handing him a railway report to bear out his statement that over $7,000,000 was spent in Prince Edward Island by the Dominion government. From that sum of over $7,000,000 I will tell you what you have to deduct, and I will prove it out of the railway report itself. The first amount you have to deduct from that $7,307,299 is $3,114,735.11 which was paid by the province previous to confederation. The next amount you find included in this $7,000,000 is the Hillsborough bridge. Well, every person who knows anything at all about railway matters knows that the province of Prince Edward Island agreed to pay the interest on one-half of the estimated cost of the construction of that bridge, and they are paying it. But in this statement in the report of the department the whole of the cost of that bridge is charged against the province. Why is there not a note to show that the province is paying the interest on one-half of what it originally was supposed would be the cost of construction? Does the Minister of Railways think it is fair to my province that an official statement should be put in the hands of members saying that $7,307,299 was spent in Prince Edward Island by the Dominion government? It is no wonder that some members on the other side of the House get a false impression from it. If $7,000,000 were spent in Prince Edward Island by the Dominion government, I think we would have nearly our full share, but when I am through with this report I will have proven that not one

half of that $7,000,000 has been spent in Prince Edward Island by this Dominion government. The next amount you have to deduct from that $7,307,299 is $400,000, which represents one-half of the cost of the Hillsborough bridge, on which the province has agreed to pay interest, and on which it is paying interest every half year to the Dominion government. But I am not going to admit that even the balance of this $7,000,000 was expended by the Dominion government in Prince Edward Island. The Hillsborough bridge was to be built for $800,000 at the outside, but on account of the carelessness of the department and looseness in giving contracts that bridge is to cost $1,800,000, and you want to charge it all against the province of Prince Edward Island. For my part, I would only allow to be charged against the province the original estimate of what that bridge would cost, and if the contract was let fairly, and if the government had not interfered with the site of the bridge and changed it in order to suit the whims of some of their party in Prince Edward Island, that bridge could have been built for the original estimate of $800,000 made by the Public Works Department. But the government had a pet down in Prince Edward Island, and they changed the site of the bridge from one place to another, and the consequence is that the bridge cost a great deal more than it would have cost had it been placed where it should have been built. Then instead of having one and a quarter million dollars charged against the Murray Harbour railway they should have about the one-half of it charged against the railway. However, I am going to make a very fair allowance for these two sums, and I will say that there is an over-expenditure on that railway and on that bridge of $1,000,000. Now take these sums, first the $3,144,214 paid by the province for railways and add $400,000 the province pays on the bridge, and you will have $4,514,735 of expenditure attributable to the province, which would leave the expenditure in Prince Edward by the Dominion government at $2,893,554.13 in place of $7,307,299.21. But suppose I omit that one million dollars over-expenditure on the bridge and railway, there is still only $3,000,000 expended by the Dominion government in Prince Edward Island instead of $7,000,000. I ask in all fairness, I ask the Prime Minister and I ask the Minister of Railways to correct these mistakes in the report of the department, which are misleading to the members of the House and to the people of Canada generally. I will turn now to page 39 of the railway report, which bears out what I say. At page 39 the Minister of Railways will find that on the Prince Edward Island Railway the province expended prior to confederation $3,114,735. But that is not all. The Dominion government when they took over the Prince Edward Island Railway as a gift made a hard and fast bargain and said the province would have to equip the railway and add rolling stock to it, and when they added the rolling stock the expenditure on the railway by the province was $3,144,000 instead of $3,114,000. Turn then to page 47 of the railway report and see if you do not find a contradiction there. At page 47, under the heading of 'Recapitulation. Government Railways,' you find that the Dominion government expenditure prior to confederation was $13,881,000. Now, in that $13,881,000 is included over $3,000,000 expended in my province, and it is put here as if the expenditure was made in 1867, whereas the province of Prince Edward Island did not come into confederation until the year 1873. That $13,881,466.65 is made up as follows: In round figures, $3,000,000 spent in my province and $10,000,000 spent in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. But the expenditure in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick was made about 1867 and the expenditure in my province was not made until 1873, whereas in this report, at page 67, the expenditure in my province is given as being made in 1867. I would advise the Railway Department in all seriousness to follow the example of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and, if they have not any experts in this country able to keep books, to bring some from the United States as was done by the Marine Department even if they have to pay them $100 or $200 a day as they did then and get their books into a condition in which the people can understand them. At present these reports are as contradictory as they can be; I might even characterize them as dishonest. But we have not only that to contend with. It is bad enough to have the report of the Department of Railways placed in the hands of hon. members of this House and sent broadcast over the land with the statement that $7,000,000 has been spent on railways in my province, but the same statement is repeated in the Year Book of 1905, the last I suppose which has been issued. On page 292 is a tabulated statement headed 'Expenditure for Construction of Government Roads to June 30, 1905,' and you will notice what are called government roads:

Intercolonial	$68,038,703
Cape Breton	3,860,679
Oxford and New Glasgow	1,949,063
Eastern extension	1,324,043
Drummond county	1,464,000
Montreal and European short line	333,943
Canada Eastern	800,000
Carleton branch	48,410
Prince Edward Island	6,719,529
Canadian Pacific Railway	62,785,320
Annapolis & Digby	660,683
Yukon	283,324
Grand Trunk Pacific	784,741
Governor General's car	17,956
	$149,070,394

Now, you may say what has that to do with branch railways in Prince Edward

Island ? It has much to do with them. It has been said time and again across the floor of this House that a great deal of money has been spent in Prince Edward Island. Well, I think I have proven that those statements are incorrect, and that not half of the amount stated has been expended. Well, what do we want in that province? We want to have carried out the original scheme which the province had in view before confederation, that is, to get the province equipped with branch lines. This would involve not a very large expenditure. I have here a return, which was brought down to this House a few years ago, giving the account for surveys in Prince Edward Island in the year 1904, and there has been nothing done in regard to these branch lines since then. I want the government to prepare a comprehensive scheme for these branch lines, and take the question out of the muddle of party politics. The revenue of the late government was not large; it was not half as large as the revenue of the government today; yet that government proposed a comprehensive scheme which would have satisfied the whole province, and I would advise this government to follow their example and not leave this question of branch lines to haphazard, contenting themselves with having some surveys made immediately before election and as soon as the election is over abandoning them. In 1896 a Bill was prepared by the Hon. Mr. Haggart, then Minister of Railways, entitled 'An Act relating to Railways in Prince Edward Island.' This Bill was based on a resolution of which Mr. Haggart gave notice on the 21st day of April, 1896. That resolution is as follows :

Mr. Haggart moved that the House resolve itself into committee to-morrow, to consider following proposed resolution :—

That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to build and operate as part of the Prince Edward Island Railway the following lines of railway, that is to say :

(a) From Southport to Murray Harbour South, with cross line connecting with the Prince Edward Island Railway between New Perth and Cardigan stations, touching at or near Montague bridge ;

(b) From Souris or Harmony station to Elmira ;

(c) From a point between Loyalty junction and York station to Cove Head, and thence to Oyster bed bridge ;

(d) From Emerald junction to Stanley bridge touching at or near Clifton ;

(e) From Summerside to Richmond bay ;

(f) From some point at or near O'Leary's station, to some point on the western coast between Brae and Cape Wolfe ;

(g) From Wiltshire to Victoria.

Here is an estimate of what these lines will cost :

Length of Branches.	Miles.
(a) Belfort and Murray Harbour Ry...	60
(b) Elmira branch..	8
(c) Rustico branch..	9
(d) Stanley bridge branch..	7
(e) Summerside and Richmond bay.. ..	3
(f) O'Leary station branch..	8
(g) Branch from Wiltshire to Victoria...	10
Total..	105

Estimates of Cost.

47 miles of six short branches at $8,000 per mile..	$ 376,000
Three locomotives at $9,000 each, and five combined passenger and baggage cars at $5,000..	52,000
Sixty miles from Southport to Murray Harbour, including rolling stock, engine houses, &c., at $11,000..	660,000
Total..	$1,088,000

I am sure the Minister of Railways will be astonished when he finds that the estimated cost amounted to only about $11,000 a mile. Hon. members will remember that the term of parliament expired in that year by effluxion of time, and the government was held up and was prevented from having its estimates passed. And they were only able to pass a few of their estimates. The Bill introduced was this :

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Did the hon. member (Mr. A. Martin) say that a Bill was introduced ?

Mr. A. MARTIN. I said that the Bill was prepared on the basis of these resolutions of which the Minister of Railways gave notice.

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

1. The Minister of Railways and Canals may locate, construct, equip and work in Prince Edward Island the following lines of railways, extensions or branch lines :—

(a) From Southport to Murray Harbour South, with a cross line, connecting with the Prince Edward Island Railway between Peakes and Cardigan stations, touching at or near Montague bridge.

This branch is pretty nearly completed. It must be built westerwardly from Montague to Belfast.

(b) From Souris or Harmony station to Elmira;

(c) From a point between Royalty junction and York stations to Cove head and then to Oyster bed bridge;

(d) From Emerald junction to Stanley bridge, touching at or near Clifton;

(e) From Summerside to Richmond bay;

(f) From some point at or near O'Leary's station to some point on the western coast, between Cape Rae and Cape Wolfe;

(g) From North Wiltshire to Victoria.

2. The said lines of railways, extension or branch lines should be part of the Prince Edward Island Railway.

3. For the purposes aforesaid ; the said minister and those acting under him should have and may exercise all the powers vested in them with respect to railways to which the Government Railway Act, chapter thirty-eight of the revised statutes applies, all the

provisions of which Act should extend and apply to the lines, extensions and branches in the first section of this Act mentioned, which should be held to be constructed and worked under the said Act.

Now, I think that the government, instead of proceeding as they have done for the last ten years, coming down at every election with a survey here and a survey there, should adopt some comprehensive plan and carry it out on the lines of this resolution or something like it. What is it that we want in Prince Edward Island? I think that the construction of sixty miles of railway would satisfy all the wants of the province at present. I do not think that anybody in Prince Edward Island or out of it will question my statement when I say that the north shore of Prince Edward Island would be the finest fishing ground in British North America if proper facilities for carrying on this industry were provided. The north shore has had good harbours, but they are filling up with sand. Twenty years ago there were fleets of twelve and fourteen vessels sailing out of harbours where to-day there are not three. I am glad that the Prime Minister is in his place to hear what I say, because I would like him to understand the position in which those people are. At present the fishermen who spend the day fishing on the north shore of Prince Edward Island must spend another day in taking their fish from twenty to thirty miles to Charlottetown. Now, if there were railway connection with the north side of Prince Edward Island, this delay would be overcome and these very important fishing grounds could be worked at profit to the people. At present, it is not a lucrative fishery. The first step that the government should take would be to adopt some definite and comprehensive plan that would assure us of some practical result. There should be branches from New London and from Rustico and these should be the first branches undertaken. Then, on the south side, there is the branch from a point near North Wiltshire to Crapaud and Victoria. The government should take this matter up clear of party politics, so that we should not be led every election to fight over a few miles of railway here and there. I have returns here of all the surveys made in 1904; half a dozen of them—made to catch a vote here and there, and nothing done since. The same was true in 1900—and nothing done. I suppose the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knows nothing about these things but he should see to it that this kind of thing is stopped. Whatever the government intends to do, let them come down with a scheme that will satisfy the province, and then let them say plainly what they will do one year, what they will do the next year and so on until the completion of the work. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was in Prince Edward Island a few years ago engaged in the tariff inquiry. He was acting Minister of Railways at that time. I believe that a committee waited upon him to urge upon him the construction of the branch line to New London. As a result of that meeting, leading men representing the two contending routes of the proposed road came to an agreement in order to bring about, if possible, the construction of the line. This agreement is signed as witness by Mr. A. B. Warburton, the candidate for Queen's county in the government interest:

Memorandum of agreement made this ninth day of January, A.D., 1903, between William Campbell, John S. Cousins, Donald Johnstone and Edward Warren, representing the Long river proposed route for the New London Railway, on the one side, and James Andrew Campbell, James M. McLeod, Leslie Woodside and George Simpson, representing the southern or proposed Emerald route for the same railroad; we mutually agree, for the present, to drop all reference to the route of the proposed railroad, and to unite in pressing upon Mr. Fielding, as a member of the government, and upon the government itself, that they place a vote in the estimates for the building of the New London branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway; such vote we request Mr. Fielding and the government to have placed in the estimates, for this session: In pursuance of that agreement, we mutually agree to press upon the government and the Department of Railways, to make it a condition of this vote that the government, or the Department of Railways, should send down a competent, independent engineer, who has not hitherto been over the route.

That is the trouble with the engineers when they get down there, some politician gets hold of his coat tail and pulls one way while the other pulls him the other way. When they were building the Belfast railway, I went to see the engineer surveying the route. I asked him which way the road was going. He said, 'I can't tell; wait till I have seen some of the government politicians, then I will tell you.' These people saw that what was wanted was an independent engineer.

——to thoroughly survey and investigate the bridges and rivers upon the proposed routes, so as to arrive at a conclusion as to practicability and feasibility, from a financial and practical standpoint, of the two routes, with a view to building the road where it can be built to best suit the people and the traffic of that section of country; such road not to be contracted for until such survey and report is made.

Dated this ninth day of January, A.D., 1903.

Witness:

(Sgd.) A. B. WARBURTON.
(Sgd.) WILLIAM CAMPBELL,
" EDWARD WARREN,
" JOHN S. COUSINS,
" DONALD M. JOHNSTONE,
" JAMES M. McLEOD,
" GEORGE SIMPSON,
" JAMES A. CAMPBELL.

This agreement was evidently come to with the consent of the acting Minister of Railways of that time. It would require only a small sum to decide the question between the routes and make that survey. But, apparently, the whole matter has been forgotten.

Now, there is one other thing to which I wish to refer before I sit down, a matter in regard to which we are not making the progress that we should. Last year I asked the Minister of Railways what he proposed to do with regard to building branch lines in Prince Edward Island. He said that the government intended having some motor cars built, and that if these were successful they woud build all the branches proposed in that province. These motor cars were to have been tested on the Prince Edward Island last December, but we have not yet heard a word about them. But whether we get these motor cars yet or not, we are entitled to this expenditure. Prince Edward Island is in a very peculiar position. We have to pay our share of the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway in common with every other province, although the road, which goes through every other province, does not touch the fringe of our territory. All the other provinces have benefited by the construction of that road, which serves as a colonization road for the benefit of every province except our own. Then we are now building a transcontinental railway, which will not touch Prince Edward at all, but its share of the cost Prince Edward Island will nevertheless have to bear. That road will go through every province except our own. The same remark may be applied to the Intercolonial Railway. That road goes through Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec, but does not touch Prince Edward Island. The government are now going to build the Georgian Bay canal and a railway to Hudson bay besides spending a $130,000,000 on the transcontinental. How much do all these expenditures on all these roads amount to? I have gone through the figures and estimates, and the amount I arrived at is over $600,000,000, not one dollar of which has been or is to be spent in Prince Edward Island. Nevertheless we have to bear one fifty-fifth of the cost, since we compose one-fifty-fifth part of the population of the Dominion. Prince Edward Island has therefore to contribute over $10,000,000 for railway construction in the other provinces, the interest on which is at least $300,000 a year. Yet although we have to pay this heavy taxation, the government cannot afford to build a few miles of branch railways in our province. In reply to our urgent representations, we are told that they have to look at big things and are too busily occupied with these to give any attention to small matters. I am still in hopes, however, that the First Minister will look through these railway reports; and when he sees how unjustly we have been treated, will see that some fair share of fair play is given to the little province of Prince Edward Island by the building of these branch lines.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P.E.I.). The subject which my hon. friend has brought to the attention of the House is not only of importance to Prince Edward Island but to Canada at large, inasmuch as the development of any one province is of advantage to the Dominion as a whole. My hon. friend deserves congratulation on the manner in which he has put our case. He has gone into a great deal of detail regarding the construction of railways in Prince Edward Island from the day she entered confederation. He has pointed out that when we entered confederation, the cost of the Prince Edward Island Railway which amounted to $3,144,000, was charged up against our province. When we consider the heavy expenditures made upon the government system of railways, the Intercolonial Railway, in the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and Quebec, besides the expenditure on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the subsidies in various other railways in Canada, we cannot but conclude that gross injustice was done Prince Edward Island in charging this amount against her when she entered confederation. It has been admitted by the ex-Minister of Railways on this side of the House that the $150,000 per annum, being the interest on this $3,144,000, should be returned to Prince Edward Island in the shape of expenditure on the construction of branch lines in that province, so as to compensate her for the loss in revenue caused by this amount being charged up against her. I have myself on several occasions brought this matter to the attention of the House. It certainly was never contemplated when the Prince Edward Island Railway was being built by our local government before confederation, that that railway was to be merely a trunk line of a few hundred miles without any feeders. On the contrary a number of branch lines were then in contemplation, and when the Dominion government took over that trunk railway as a government road, their intention certainly must have been to build branch lines to the outlying districts in order to supply feeders to the trunk line and thus follow the programme which was mapped out before confederation. This was recognized to some extent by the Conservative party building the branch line to Cape Traverse. In 1896 the Conservative government brought down a resolution for the construction of a number of branch lines and drafted a Bill to that effect, but that Bill, owing to the expiry of the parliamentary term, was never passed. The expression of the opinion of the House at that time, certainly on the Conservative

side—and I have no doubt it had strong supporters on the other side—was that justice should be done Prince Edward Island by the construction of these 105 miles of railway. Since then we have had one of these branches built to Murray Harbour, but there are other portions of the island which are just as much in need of small branch lines for the convenience of the coasting districts, not supplied with harbours, and where harbours cannot be built and equipped except at great cost. There are a number of these sections which should be supplied with railways—the building of which would not only be an act of justice to the people of Prince Edward Island, but a paying investment as profitable feeders to the trunk line. Among these branches is one down to Crapaud by way of Tryon.

Another very important branch that I have brought to the attention of this House is from the main line near O'Leary to the west shore. A sum of money was put in the estimates in 1904 for surveys in this district, and as Mr. Martin has said, the government becomes active and seeks to spend such appropriations for surveys about election time, and, judging from the correspondence that has been brought down, with reference to the O'Leary branch, an effort was made to so expend it as to give the greatest benefit to the government candidate. Surveys have been made in this way at different times, and in different parts of the island, always on the eve of an election; and invariably after the election the question of branch lines for Prince Edward Island becomes a dead letter. I would sincerely hope that the government has some other motive in spending money and making these surveys than mere party gain, than fooling the people and using the money and the implied promise for election purposes. Their engineers must have found that these branch lines would traverse populous districts and would well repay construction. In addition to being a great advantage to the people who would be enabled to get their products to market. I hope that this session the Prime Minister will bring down estimates for the construction of these branches. He has the surveys in the department and he should bring down appropriations for the building of at least two or three of these lines. My hon. friend (Mr. A. Martin) has mentioned a very important one to New London, and there is also the one I have suggested, in the west part of the island from West Point to O'Leary. Both of these lines should be constructed at once.

The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) has advocated taking over the branch lines throughout the province of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia which are held by private corporations, and using them as feeders for the trunk line of the Intercolonial Railway. This is a correct

policy and should have been followed from the inception of the Intercolonial Railway. But the situation in Prince Edward Island is such that a similar policy is even more necessary to secure the success of branch lines in that province. The Intercolonial Railway according to agreement was to be built only from Rivière du Loup to Truro, but as the country developed and we had to bring the maritime provinces into connection with the great west, the Intercolonial Railway was extended by successive governments to Sydney, to Pictou, to Halifax, to St. John, and into Montreal; and if this government had followed the advice of the Conservative party before the last election they would have extended it to the great lakes, and I hope that some time this will be done. Branch lines cannot be operated in Prince Edward Island economically and with profit to the people of the province unless they are built by the government and operated in connection with the main line. and with a proper system of this kind the Prince Edward Island Railway would be the greatest feeder to the Intercolonial Railway that you could hope to obtain. I believe that the Prince Edward Island Railway and the Intercolonial Railway should be operated as parts of the same system. Nominally I suppose they are, but it should be an actual union.

I hope that the right hon. the Prime Minister will carry out the intentions he so grandly expressed before becoming Prime Minister when he said that if he attained power Prince Edward Island would be connected with the Intercolonial Railway by a tunnel under Northumberland Straits. I shall not elaborate this scheme to-day as we will have an opportunity of discussing it more in detail at a later date; but I state with sound assurance that the construction of branch lines in Prince Edward Island and the connecting of the Prince Edward Island Railway by tunnel with the Intercolonial Raiway would be justified by the increased traffic that would be secured by the Intercolonial Railway and the increased usefulness and business of the Prince Edward Island Railway. At present the people of Prince Edward Island have to rely to a large extent on sailing craft and steamers to convey their products to their natural markets, and as we have only a few short months from harvest time until the close of navigation in which to place our products we are at a great disadvantage. Almost all of this would accrue to the benefit of Prince Edward Island Railway and Intercolonial Railway.

Our people suffer greatly owing to the high freight rates they have to pay on the railway. Our local rates are very much higher than corresponding rates on the Intercolonial Railway. I have here a table of the rates and I find that from Tignish to Charlottetown, 117 miles, the rates are

higher than from Halifax to Amherst on the Intercolonial Railway, a distance of 138 miles. This will be seen from the following table :—

Class of goods.. ..	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Tignish to Charlottetown, 117 miles..	32	26	24	20	16	14	12	13	12	10
Halifax to Amherst, 138 miles	29	26	22	18	15	14	11	12	11	9
Difference against P.E.I..	3	2	2	2	1	0	1	1	1	1
148 miles on Prince Edward Island Railway costs ..	34	30	26	21	17	18	15	14	13	11.
148 miles from Halifax to Sackville costs..	31	28	23	20	16	15	13	14	12	10
Difference against P.E.I..	3	2	3	1	1	3	3	0	1	1

This illustrates the disadvantages under which the people of Prince Edward Island labour in regard to the local haul. Besides that we have the intermediate haul across the Straits and the haul on the Intercolonial Railway. We have the three short hauls which make it almost impossible for us to compete in our natural markets.

From returns that were brought down, I find that the rate on grain from Montreal to Halifax is 9 cents per 100 pounds in carload lots, while the rate from Tignish to Halifax is in the neighbourhood of 26 cents per 100 pounds in carload lots. The natural markets of the people of Prince Edward Island are in the maritime provinces. Most of our products go to Sydney, Halifax, Sackville, Truro and Amherst, and other points along the lines of the Intercolonial Railway in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and it will readily be seen that the people of Prince Edward Island are up against a hard proposition when they have not only the stiff local rates on their own island, but these two additional short hauls across the Straits and over the Intercolonial Railway before they get their products on the market.

The hon. member for Queens has gone very thoroughly into this case and presented a fair statement of the situation with regard to the right of Prince Edward Island to some consideration in the matter of more railway facilities. I may say, that, while I do not wish to go into the figures, when we entered into confederation it was expected that certain sums were to be expended on the Intercolonial Railway, the canals and the Canadian Pacific Railway. These sums were expended and since that time Prince Edward Island has patiently contributed to the millions upon millions that have been expended in different parts of the Dominion although none of these great works have touched the shores or been of any direct advantage to Prince Edward Island. As the hon. gentleman stated, these sums total in direct payments $474,000,000 nearly, and if you add to that the expenditure of $150,000,000 on the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the expenditures on great schemes like the Georgian Bay canal and other large works that are in contemplation you will have nearly $800,000,000 that Prince Edward Island has contributed indirectly to and will contribute to. We simply want a fair measure of justice, and I think the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would be perfectly justified in giving to Prince Edward Island at least 50 or 60 miles of branch lines to satisfy the present needs of the province.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, the fact that when Prince Edward Island entered confederation she was charged with the full amount expended upon railway construction in that province and that this amount is probably much larger, according to area and population than that expended by any other province, might, I think, establish a fair case for consideration as to whether or not that province should be reimbursed in some way for that amount, or for a portion of it at all events. Of course, we quite understand that the delegates who negotiated the terms of union agreed that this amount should be charged to the province at the time that we went into confederation, but, in all probability, they did not expect that such large sums would be expended for railway construction by the Dominion government in the other provinces of the Dominion. That, I believe, would be a fair subject for consideration. I think that every fair-minded man in this Dominion will admit that the government of the day should give to the people of Prince Edward Island all reasonable railway facilities for travelling and for marketing their products, and all fair-minded men who will consider the subject at all, will admit that the present government has done everything that could reasonably be expected from any government in that regard since it obtained the administration of affairs in this country. I did not intend to say anything that would partake of a political nature on this question, but I noticed that the hon. mover of this resolution (Mr. A. Martin) went out of his way, I thought, to make some party political capital and to unfairly and adversely criticise the present administration. Therefore, I think I am justified in placing the facts of the case as they appear to me before the House. Since the present government came into power they have practically reconstructed the old Prince Edward Island Railway. In addition to that they have built about 60 miles of new railway, whereas their predecessors built about 11 miles of new railway in 18 years. The present government, I say, have practically reconstructed the original railway; they have provided largely

increased terminal facilities at Summerside, built new stations at Alberton and Tignish, largely increased the terminal facilities at Georgetown, extended the railway wharf, improved and enlarged it, built a new station and freight shed there, straightened the line in many places, taking the worst curves out of it, built the Belfast and Murray Harbour branch, the Montague branch, about 60 miles of railway, constructed the Hillsboro bridge, perhaps one of the largest railway bridges in the Dominion, built a new station at Charlottetown, and are building at the present time car shops, machine shops and a railway wharf and are enlarging and practically rebuilding the railway wharf at Souris. All these improvements have gone on and they represent an expenditure in all of about $3,500,000. My hon. friend was, I think, unfair in his criticism as regards the Hillsboro bridge, and he was unfair in his criticism a few days ago as regards the construction of the Murray Harbour Railway. He stated to the House this afternoon that the first estimate of that bridge was $800,000. That may be correct, but a far different bridge was built from the one that was first estimated upon —a far more costly and a far better bridge; in fact it was very difficult to make an estimate at all at that time and I think that when the first estimate was made it was not intended to have a traffic bridge at all but simply a railway bridge. Of that I am not quite certain, because I have not the papers before me, but this I do know, that the character of the bridge was materially changed, and that a very much better bridge was constructed than the one originally contemplated. My hon. friend was unfair in his criticism in regard to that.

My hon. friend who moved this resolution was unfair in his criticism of the present government in regard to the surveys that were made on Prince Edward Island by the government in the year 1904. These were not the first surveys that were made in that province for the construction of branch railways. I remember quite well that in the county which I have the honour to represent, a survey was made in 1882 for a branch railway from Harmony, or Souris to Elmira, and although the late government remained in power for fourteen years after that there was nothing more done in regard to the construction of that branch railway. We must also remember that notwithstanding the evidence that the present government gave of their desire to meet all the reasonable wishes of the people of Prince Edward Island in regard to providing them with railway facilities the majority of the people of that province. particularly in the counties of Queens and Prince, at the last general election disapproved of the policy of the government in that regard.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES

Mr. BLAIN. The general policy of the government.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Perhaps so; but the very section of the country through which the Murray Harbour Railway runs gave a considerable vote against the government candidate, thus clearly demonstrating that the people of that section disapproved of the government extending the railway facilities of the province. My hon. friend from Queens (Mr. Martin) who moved the resolution, referred to a Bill which he said the late government introduced proposing to build several branch railways in Prince Edward Island. He subsequently withdrew that statment and he said the Bill had been prepared but was not introduced, and that it would have been introduced if the resolutions which the then Minister of Railways put upon the Order Paper had been passed,

Mr. LEFURGEY. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the hon. gentleman for Queens (Mr. Martin) made a deliberate statement to try and mislead the House with regard to that Bill?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I am simply stating what he said, and I do not know whether it was his intention to mislead the House or not.

Mr. LEFURGEY. You know very well it was not.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I am simply stating what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) said and the members of the House and my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) can draw their own conclusions. The hon. member (Mr. Martin) said that the Bill had been introduced, and later on he said that the Bill had been prepared and would have been introduced if the resolutions which the then Minister of Railways put upon the Order Paper had been passed by the House. Well, you know there is a history about these resolutions and it is a strange history. As I have already said, the question of building branch lines of railway in Prince Edward Island and of giving greater railway facilities to that province had been before the people and before the government for a great many years. And in my estimation it was a strange thing that the then Minister of Railways should give notice on the 21st of April, that on the morrow he would move the House into Committee of the Whole on certain resolutions to build these branch lines of railway in Prince Edward Island. The notice was for the 22nd of April, and parliament expired by efflux of time on the 24th of April. After eighteen years in power the Conservatives gave themselves just two days to get the railway resolutions through parliament, and to found a Bill upon them which would also have to be passed. That is a strange thing; and it has always appeared to me to be a strange thing. And stranger still, when the morrow came the then Minister of Railways forgot all about

his resolutions, or at all events he never mentioned the matter, and the next day was the 23rd of April, and there was no mention of it then, of course parliament expired on the 24th and that was the end of the resolutions. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been regaled to-day by the hon. member for Queens with the history of that still-born attempt to fool the people of Prince Edward Island in regard to the building of branch railway lines. It was perhaps the most transparent attempt ever made by a government to lead the people of a province astray in regard to such an important matter.

Now, Sir, I will freely admit that a further extension of the railway system in Prince Edward Island would be of great advantage to the people of that province, but I do think we can well believe that the Liberal government which has shown its good faith by what it has already done may be safely entrusted to complete the work it has nearly finished, and to build these few short branch lines that are needed to to complete the system. The present government has done so much in that respect, and has so often shown its interest in the people of that province in regard to this matter—and of course if there were other matters under consideration I might make out even a better case—I say the government has done so much already, that the people of that province may well trust it to complete the work that it has so nearly finished and that it was dealt with so energetically during the few years it has been in power. I do not believe that when the people of that province take this matter calmly into consideration they can come to any other conclusion than that this government will extend all reasonable railway facilities to that province so as to enable the people to market their products and to freely travel from one portion of the province to another. I myself give these reasons for the faith that is in me; I think they are good reasons and I think they will appeal to the members of this House and to the people of my province.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.) The hon. member for Queens (Mr. Martin) put his case very ably before this House to-day; he has given the full history of the construction of the Prince Edward Island Railway, and he has submitted the contention of the people for the construction of branch lines and the necessity for the same. It is not my intention to make any extended remarks now, but I cannot help referring to some of the statements made by the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Hughes). He accused my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) of attempting to make political capital out of the matter. Well, any one who heard the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) or any one who will read it, must conclude that it was a fair presentation of the case; that politics were not introduced, and that no blame was attached to any political party unless blame were deserved. Of course my hon. friend did not commend the present government because there was nothing to commend them for. If the present government, as the hon. member (Mr. Hughes) states, made improvements on the Prince Edward Island Railway it was only what the people of Prince Edward Island were entitled to. It was our just due; it was only our due. The statement made by the hon. member (Mr. Hughes) that this government practically reconstructed the Prince Edward Island Railway is not borne out by the facts. Before the present government came into power the heavy rails were laid by the Conservative government on that road, and the roadbed has not been changed since. It is true that some of the old railway stations were pulled down because they became unfit for use; that some of the freight sheds have been burned and new sheds built of necessity; and that a new station was built in the city of Charlottetown. But the old station was a wooden building erected in 1873; it was falling into decay and had become unsanitary and it was absolutely necessary that a new station should be built. Why should the government be commended for doing that? They were only doing their duty to the people of Prince Edward Island and in doing their duty I do not see how they merit any commendation.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Governments and men are to be commended for doing their duty.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.) I do not think there is any commendation necessary in such a case as that. I know that since 1882 there has been an agitation in the county which my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) represents and several demands have been made for a branch line to Elmira, and I believe that in the election contest of 1904 the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Hughes) stated that if he did not get the construction of a branch line to Elmira before the year was out he would resign.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. That statement is incorrect.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens). Well, it is so stated by the people who were present at the meeting at which the statement was alleged to have been made and I never heard it contradicted. The question before this House to-day is whether this government should build branch lines. There is no doubt, as has been stated by my hon. colleague (Mr. A. Martin), that fifty or sixty miles of railway would meet the requirements of the people of Prince Edward Island; that is all that is asked for by them from this government and this House. At present the lines mentioned by my hon. friends the senior member for Queen's (Mr. Martin) and the member for Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) are lines to New London, to Rustico, to New Glasgow, to Crapaud and to

Eldon. These lines are necessary for the welfare of the people of Prince Edward Island ; and in view of the fact that a large expenditure is taking place to-day all over Canada, I think the people of Prince Edward Island are entitled to the construction of these lines at the hands of this government. They would be situated in very fertile portions of the province, where large crops are raised, and where to-day the people are under the necessity of hauling their produce from ten to twenty miles to market. The harbours along the northern portion of the province are not such as to admit of the people sending their produce by vessels. The fishing industry on the north side of the island is also greatly hampered by reason of the inability of the people to send their fish quickly to market. If they had railway communication, they would be in a position to send them to market on the day they were caught, and consequently to receive a very much better price for them than they do to-day. I understand that the government are giving fishermen in the province of Quebec every possible facility for carrying their fish to market, in the way of subsidies to steamers with cold-storage equipment, and when the people of Prince Edward Island ask for a small expenditure of a few thousand dollars for the construction of a few branch lines of railway in portions of the province which are thickly settled, they are only asking what they are justly and honestly entitled to.

A good deal has been said as to the expenditure of $7,317,000 in Prince Edward Island, which it was stated was too large an expenditure for so small a province. The statement made by my hon. friend from Prince showed that the statement in the railway report is incorrect. It included the sum of $3,114,000 which was paid by the people of Prince Edward Island before confederation ; and why this government insists on including this amount in the total expenditure by the government of Canada baffles me. This matter has been brought before this House on several occasions since I came here in 1904 ; and notwithstanding that fact, we find that it is still charged as made by the government of Canada on railway construction in the province of Prince Edward Island. I am not alleging any intentional wrong-doing on the part of the minister or his officials, but I cannot see how the Department of Railways can have proper book-keeping with a mistake of $3,114,000 standing on its books.

My hon. friend also pointed out in connection with the construction of the Hillsborough bridge that a certain sum of money, which was paid by the government of Prince Edward Island and interest on which is deducted from the semi-annual subsidy payable to the province, should be deducted from the $7,317,000. I think the Minister of Railways will agree with me that that agreement is in existence, and is probably in his department or some other, and it would be very easy for him to refer to that agreement and make the correction, and send out a statement in accordance with the facts. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Hughes) stated that the Hillsborough bridge was a credit to the Department of Railways, and was a much better bridge than was at first intended when the estimate of $800,000 was made by the Department of Railways. I want to tell the Minister of Railways that that bridge cost a great deal too much money, and I can give him the reason. The superstructure came from the Miramichi river, having become too light for the traffic of the Intercolonial. Consequently the specifications for the substructure had to be changed, and two caissons had to be constructed where the original plan called for one. The superstructure was a weak structure. It had been in use some thirty years. The hon. member for Kings states that that bridge suits the purpose. What are the facts ? When a team is upon that bridge, no railway train can pass over it, as it is only wide enough for the train. It is true, two teams can pass, but when a train is passing over it the bridge must be closed to local traffic. I think it was never intended, when the people of Prince Edward Island agreed to pay $10,000 a year for a traffic bridge, that they would be given one of this kind. It does not suit the requirements of the people, or even the requirements of the railway, which is often hampered by local traffic being on the bridge when there is a train to pass over. It is also very dangerous to the public. People driving on the bridge are often surprised by the approach of a train, and have to fly for their lives, and horses are frightened. The substructure of the bridge is a very good one, but I venture to say that before very long it will become necessary for the railway company to construct a new superstructure. I hope the hon. Premier will grant the petition of the people of the north side of Prince Edward Island and will at once send an independent engineer, as was agreed when the Minister of Finance was acting as Minister of Railways, and that a policy shall be adopted for the construction of these necessary public works.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). One of the regrets of my short term of office is that I was unable to visit that paradise—as our friends from there rightly describe their Island—during the trip I made over the Intercolonial Railway. But I can promise that I will see that Island very shortly. There can be no doubt that it is not only one of the most beautiful spots on this continent——

Mr. FOSTER. Except Brockville.

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course Brockville is always excepted. Prince Edward Island is also very productive. It is acknowledged to be one of the beauty spots of America, particularly in the summer, but the law of compensation works out there as elsewhere. People who are particularly blessed in one season are not as greatly blessed in another; and perhaps in other sections, where one particular season is not so enjoyable, the people are compensated by striking a good average all the year round.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). But the people of the Island are blessed in them all.

Mr. GRAHAM. I mean in the way of transportation. Anything my hon. friends think they should say on behalf of their province, I shall find no fault with at all. It is the duty of all representatives to bring up everything which they think is in the interest of their own locality. Sometimes I may object a trifle to the construction they may put on certain matters, but certainly in calling the attention of this House to any grievance from which they may think they are suffering, they are certainly performing their duty. I do not propose to go into the history of confederation nor do I believe it would be wise to do so. The fathers of confederation builded better than they knew; and I am content to leave the terms of confederation as they are, without any argument as to their wisdom or unwisdom. But this much I am sure we can all agree on, and that is that confederation was, to a certain extent, a compromise and that, when entering it, every province had to give up some little thing. Some perhaps may have had to give up more than others but all had to give up something which they considered was their right in order to bring about that confederation of the various provinces into one Dominion, of which we are all so proud to-day. Prince Edward Island had to make concessions when she came in later and as had Ontario and Quebec. But, although I am fresh from the provincial arena myself, I do not like to see displayed that spirit of provincialism, of which my hon. friend in particular who has just taken his seat (Mr. McLean) has given evidence, by wanting to compare what some other provinces are getting with the benefit one particular province is receiving.

Mr. LENNOX. Why not?

Mr. GRAHAM. Because I like to consider this country as a whole. My hon. friend says why not? But if we take his view, we can all start rehearsing our provincial grievances and indulge in a good deal of fault finding which would not be beneficial from a national point of view, but would bring us back to the starting point just before confederation and bring to life again those old grievances of by-gone days which we thought dead and buried.

Mr. LENNOX. Is it not good evidence to show that one province is not getting a fair amount as compared with the others?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think the principle is a good one. If we are to argue that certain sections or certain classes or certain provinces are getting certain things which others are not getting, we are raising a point which should not be raised. There can be no objection to the representative of any province drawing attention to what he conceives to be any disability under which his province is suffering, but I draw the line at making a comparison to show that any one class or province is getting something which another is not getting. We can all agree that every portion of confederation is as fairly treated as it can be, not by this or some other government, but by the Dominion as a whole. If each one were to take up the condition of his own province in confederation, I could have a pretty good case, on some points perhaps, with regard to the province of Ontario, but one of the duties I have tried to perform, since I came into this House and into the government has been throughout the province of Ontario to call attention to the viewpoint of the other provinces on some questions. Particularly on the question of the Intercolonial Railway, I have tried to point out to the people of Ontario the point of view taken by the province of Quebec and the maritime provinces with regard to the construction and operation of that line. If we try to understand each other, there will be but little friction as between the provinces. What has the government done for railways in Prince Edward Island? Without saying anything at all detrimental or uncomplimentary to any other department, I think my hon. friend will find that the information given by the Department of Railways and Canals is pretty reliable.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). Will the hon. gentleman turn up his own report, page 137, and tell me how reliable the statement there made is?

Mr. GRAHAM. I was just coming to one statement, which may not be on that page but is on one of the others, to show what I mean. Up to two or three years ago, there was not the same system in the department of furnishing statistics as exists to-day. But I think that my hon. friend, if he will look carefully into the reports to-day and go into the details will find out that the information given is fairly accurate.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). How is it then that the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) did not understand his own report, and I do not believe that the present minister will put on it the same construction as did the ex-minister.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend makes a statement of fact with which of course I

cannot agree. My recollection is that in the report the total cost—not what Canada has spent on the Prince Edward Island—but the total is something over $7,000,000. Now I am going to please my hon. friend for two or three minutes, if that be possible, though I think that if we built branch lines through every concession in Prince Edward Island, that would not please him so long as that were done by this government. Suppose I say that the expenditure was some $4,000,000 odd on the construction of that railway.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). I do not think you would be correct.

Mr. GRAHAM. The total cost is over $7,000,000, but I think he put it at $4,000,000 or thereabouts. Those were his figures and I hope he will be pleased with them. I am not saying that they are accurate and he does not seem to think that they are; but taking my hon. friend's own figures, $4,000,000, or in that neighbourhood—I find that the total cost was $7,000,000 and something over—that brings me to this point, the total expenditure—estimating cost of construction at $4,000,000 on the Prince Edward Island Railway—has been $12,041,628.11 since 1875.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). $12,000,000 ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The total expenditure on the railway for construction and working expenses since 1875 has amounted to over $12,000,000. Now, the revenue has been something over $5,000,000 leaving a deficit of $6,738,000. I am pointing this out not to convince my hon. friend (Mr. A. Martin) that there is anything wrong with Prince Edward Island, but to show him that the Dominion of Canada since 1875, has spent upon the Prince Edward Island road $6,738,000 more than it has received.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). How much did it spend on the Intercolonial?

Mr. GRAHAM. Oh, a great lot of money. We will discuss that when the subject is before us; but in the meantime the hon. gentleman must not find fault if I stick to his own text. The working expenses of the the Prince Edward Island Railway, outside altogether from construction, since 1875 have been $7,848,000. There has been a revenue of something over $5,000,000, leaving a deficit on working expenses, aside altogether from construction, of about $2,500,000. Nor is this to condemn Prince Edward Island, but to point out to my hon. friend and the country that he has a wrong conception of the case when he says that the Dominion has not been doing anything for the transportation facilities of Prince Edward Island.

Now, the hon. gentleman spoke rather harshly of this government—and he does not generally speak harshly of anybody. He condemned us for not spending more money. It will be interesting for my hon. friend (Mr. A. Martin), as well as for the hon. gentleman beside him (Mr. A. A. McLean), who intimated that this government had not done much for Prince Edward Island in the way of construction to know that, in the eighteen years following 1878, the amount expended in construction on the Prince Edward Island Railway was $340,650; and in eleven years since 1896 there has been expended $3,550,000. This is not a question of how many curves were taken out or about the way in which the roadbed was left, it is simply the broad fact that, in the eleven years of its administration, this government spent ten times as much on the construction of railways in Prince Edward Island as did the friends of these hon. gentlemen during eighteen years.

Mr. HAGGART. Does not that $3,550,000 include the deficits year by year on the road?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is the amount spent in construction. and has nothing to do with the revenue of the road. I am pointing out exactly what has been done.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister (Mr. Graham) must be mistaken. That includes all the deficits.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, certainly not.

Mr. HAGGART. But $3,550,000 and $700,000 would be $4,250,000, which, according to the figures given, would be almost the whole amount. It must include the deficits.

Mr. GRAHAM. No. But then my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) is so accustomed to deficits. There is not a deficit on the Intercolonial, but there is on the Prince Edward Island road, and I am going to point that out to my hon. friend. But the difficulty is, and the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) has seen it, as we all see it, that in improving the railway facilities of Prince Edward Island—leaving out altogether the loss of interest—the country has paid a very large sum. Last year, I think, the deficit on the Prince Edward Island Railway was something like $67,000. One hon. member from Prince Edward Island this afternoon spoke of the high rates on the railway. But even with these high rates that he has quoted—and I have not had time to verify them, but I do not question them at the moment—we have not been able to make the railway meet the expenses by something like over $60,000. It is a matter to be considered by the House as well as by the government how much more money we ought to expend in extending railway facilities. The improvements and extensions that have been made have not reduced the deficit, if I remember the figures correctly. Of course, investigation ought to be made—perhaps has been made—and, so far as reasonable, we ought to afford railway facilities to the people of Prince Edward Island. But that province is under the disadvantage, as I have already said, of being an island with

comparatively small population. How far we ought to go in providing railway facilities it is for the House and the government to decide. I am glad the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Martin) has brought this subject to our attention. I will not deal with his pre-election suggestions, for the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) would not want me to deal with them. We can make these charges back and forth, but they will not build branch railways, and that, I take it, is what my hon. friend (Mr. A. Martin) is after. The taking over of branches does not apply alone to Prince Edward Island, but to New Brunswick and Quebec as well, not only taking over branches, but building them ; and, if we take over branches, it will be necessary to build branches elsewhere. This is a large question, and worthy of the attention of the House ; and I intend some day to have something to say upon it. For the present, I assure the hon. gentleman that the government has full sympathy with Prince Edward Island—values it as one of the members of the confederation—and is willing to do anything reasonable to meet the wishes of the people of that tight and prosperous island.

Mr. LOUIS LAVERGNE (Drummond and Arthabaska). I have heard with interest what the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) says about the willingness of the government to do everything reasonably possible for Prince Edward Island in the way of building branch lines. I think that Quebec is entitled to consideration in this regard. For instance, a branch line is very much needed from St. Leonard junction, on the Intercolonial Railway, to make a connection with the Maine Central. This branch would be sure of a great traffic to the United States, and would afford a shorter line for freight and passengers than the present route.

An hon. MEMBER. What county is that in?

Mr. LOUIS LAVERGNE. It would be through Arthabaska, part of Nicolet and part of Wolfe. I confess that I am looking out for my own riding, as the hon. members for Prince Edward Island are looking out for theirs. My riding has a population about half as great as that of Prince Edward Island. That branch line would leave St. Leonard and would cross the rest of the county of Nicolet, run through Arthabaska and into the county of Wolfe. It would traverse a country with a great deal of timber and with lands well cultivated by prosperous farmers. The lumber traffic from St. Leonard and all along this line would be very considerable, and would be of great benefit to the Intercolonial. It would also save a great deal of distance in hauling passengers and freight, because if they are to be carried by the Intercolonial now they must go by way of Montreal and so to the United States. I am quite sure that the government, if they are willing to build branch lines in Prince Edward Island, will be prepared to consider the proposition I am making for this extension of the Intercolonial Railway. It is really an extension of the Intercolonial Railway, because it will connect with the branch to Nicolet, a large town on the St. Lawrence, at St. Leonard junction. This would be an extension passing through large towns and running to Dudswell junction, on the Quebec Central, where a connection would be made with the Maine Central going to the United States.

I cannot too strongly impress on the minister the importance of this branch line, and I hope he will see his way clear to at least make an examination of that part of the country and that he will appropriate the necessary money for the building of the railway as a branch of the Intercolonial Railway. It is a railway which ought certainly to be built. It would be an advantage to the chief town of the county, Arthabaskaville, and the whole district. Arthabaskaville is the town of the Prime Minister of Canada and the building of this railway would be a compliment to him. I see the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) laughing, but I am serious in speaking of this matter. Surely this will be granted to me, especially when the hon. member for Queens, P.E.I. (Mr. A. Martin) has some idea of getting money for his island. My case is perhaps stronger because St.Leonard and the counties of Drummond and Arthabaska, and Wolfe vote straight for the government and I think if anything is to be given I should have it before the hon. gentleman.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). My hon. friend from Queens (Mr. A. Martin) was perfectly right in his statement as to the reasons which induced the late government to introduce the resolution which they introduced in 1896. An inquiry was made into the financial position of Prince Edward Island and a comparison made with that of New Brunswick when that province entered confederation and the consensus of opinion on both sides, at any rate the conclusion which influenced the government, was that Prince Edward Island had got the worst of the bargain by about $100,000 or $150,000 per year. To recoup Prince Edward Island for that lost income these resolutions were introduced in reference to the branch lines. My friend from Prince Edward Island says that the resolution was that 'to-morrow' they will move the House into committee. That is the form of all resolutions ; owing, however, to the unfortunate state of affairs which occurred in 1896 we could not carry any resolutions nor even move them, but I can assure the hon. gentleman that when a Conservative government introduce resolutions

and makes pre-election pledges to the people they in all cases carry them out. Nothing could be worse than for a government to introduce such a resolution as was introduced in 1896 and, having been successful at the polls, completely ignore the resolution and not carry them into effect.

The Minister of Railways says that all of the provinces parted with a good deal in entering confederation. None of us stood for our extreme rights; we parted with some of the rights which we had for the purpose of forming confederation, if it could be done. Unfortunately in reference to financial affairs, the maritime provinces never thought that the matter had ever been settled; they have introduced resolutions in reference to the terms on which Nova Scotia and New Brunswick entered into confederation and immediately before the holding of elections in these different provinces the amounts were readjusted, larger sums being given to these provinces in consideration of a mistake having been made in their financial arrangements at the time they entered confederation. It was perfectly natural that the Prince Edward islanders should complain of the arrangement that was made in their case. I went into the financial position thoroughly at the time and my conclusion was that Prince Edward Island in entering confederation, made a worse bargain by between $100,000 and $150,000 a year than Nova Scotia or New Brunswick did. It was to remedy that to that extent that this arrangement in reference to building branch lines in Prince Edward Island was proposed.

As to the expenditure on the Hillsboro bridge, as I remember, the proposition first brought down to the House was that the bridge was to be built for about $600,000. This afterwards increased owing to some changes in the plans made in order to utilize the old Miramichi bridge iron. The piers were too far apart, having been designed, in the original plan, for a new bridge. The Miramichi bridge which was used was perfectly good for the traffic that it would have to carry, but its use increased the expenditure on the structure to an extent larger than I think is justifiable. When the plans and specifications were brought down by the Railway Department the estimate was too inaccurate; there should have been a closer estimate and when an estimate of the increased expenditure was brought down it should have been sufficient to cover the whole work. Unfortunately this was not done and the occurrence of such a thing in the department should not be lightly passed over by the House.

I am convinced that if the Conservative government had been returned in 1897 they would have carried out their election pledges. Nothing could be more disgraceful or dishonest than for a government to propose resolutions to grant money to a particular part of the country immediately before an election and having been returned to power to refuse to carry out their pledge. So far as I am concerned, I can assure my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island that if I had been continued at the head of the department I would have seen that at least my promise to the people of Prince Edward Island was carried out.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, previous to six o'clock we had a pretty full discussion of this question. I paid particular attention to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) and although he has not stood exactly by his report he was not generous enough to acknowledge that his figures were incorrect. I would like, as he has undertaken the duties of this position, to put this matter in a strong light so that next year, when he issues his report, we will find no such statement as the statement I quoted on page 127. To disabuse his mind and the minds of hon. members present I wish him to turn to the Public Accounts of 1873 where this question in regard to the expenditure of Prince Edward Island on its railways is fully settled. In the public accounts for the year 1873, when my province came into confederation, you will find in part IV, page 14, this statement:

> By amount province entitled to upon entering into union as per imperial order in council, $4,701,050.

That is the debt that the province was allowed on entering confederation. I have not the minister's attention, I see, and I am afraid he will repeat some of the mistakes in his report next year but he will note what I say about this capital which was placed to the credit of the province. I want to call to his attention that he can read on the other side of the account the amounts that were charged against the province for this railway construction which was not completed until 1876 and the statement is as follows: I have quoted the account showing that there was $4,701,050 to our credit. In 1876, when the account was closed, all we had to our credit was $831 out of that $4,701,050. How do you account for that? You account for that by the fact that $3,144,000 is charged against the province for its railway construction. The debt of the province at that time was only $754,000. Add these sums together and deduct the total from our capital and you will see that in place of our getting interest on this large sum of money we only drew interest on less than $1,000,000. We lost the interest on $3,144,000 since the day of confederation, of our union with Canada to the present day. I want the minister to understand what

that means. What is the yearly interest on $3,144,000? The interest is $157,000 a year. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) said that he came to the conclusion in 1896 that the province was not fairly treated and that what the province lost in interest—$157,000 a year—should be made up in some way or other and he concluded that the best way to make it up was to equip the province with the branch lines which it proposed to build before it entered into confederation at all. I am going to remind the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals of something else. The minister made a statement which somewhat surprised me. He is now in his position, I do not think that he is very well acquainted with his department yet, he is not acquainted with the details of the railway report and he is not acquainted with the working of the Prince Edward Island Railway. If he were he would not make the statement that he made to this House this afternoon. He said that the branches that had been built had not diminished the deficit of the Prince Edward Island Railway. If he turns up the report of the Prince Edward Island Railway he will find since these branches were built the deficit has decreased from year to year. I asked him the other day to give me a separate statement of the earnings of the last branch that was built. I knew that this was a good feeder to the main line and I knew it was decreasing the deficit of the main line. He did not give it. Yet the minister made the statement that the building of these branch lines had not diminished the deficit of the Prince Edward Island Railway. I want to made another statement and I would like to have his attention. I do not wish to share his attention with the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston). The system of making up accounts on the Intercolonial Railway is a system that is not carried out by any other railway either in Canada or in any part of the world. I make the statement deliberately that the system adopted by the government in making up the accounts in regard to the Intercolonial Railway does not hold in regard to any other railways in Canada. Why do I say that? If you desire to find out what the Intercolonial Railway is doing, what is the first thing you have to do? The first thing you have to do and which every other railway does is to charge the interest on the capital expenditure. Do you have your accounts made up in that way? All you do is to place your revenue on one side of the account and the expenditure on the other. But where is there any record of the capital which the country has invested in the road? You do not know anything about that. How does that operate against my province? If you charged interest on the expenditure of the Intercolonial you would have to charge interest on the whole of it. But, when you come down to my province you cannot charge the interest on the whole expenditure because the province paid for this railway and in accounting for the revenue and expenditure of the Prince Edward Island Railway there is $157,000 a year which you would have to give the province credit for. I say deliberately to the minister that if he kept the accounts the same as every other railway in Canada does and charged interest on expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway the Prince Edward Island Railway would stand in a far better position than the Intercolonial Railway.

The minister added that there were deficits on that road amounting to $2,000,000. But he should have stated that the people of the province paid to this government as interest on this expenditure $157,000 a year amounting in all since confederation to $5,549,000. So that if $2,000,000, as he said, was sunk in railways in Prince Edward Island, the province has $3,000,000 to its credit. I want the minister to think that over. I know it is very hard for him, having been brought up in narrow gauge politics, to understand these matters in a more extended sphere. The minister says I did not give the government credit for what they had done. I am not here as a defender of either party in regard to branch lines in Prince Edward Island. I am here only to represent the people and their views and expectations. But I will give the government credit for this, that they carried out to some extent the policy of their predecessors by building sixty miles of railway on one of the branches which I advocated here in 1896, and which the late government at that time proposed to build. But what did they do? They ran that road here and there, as the Liberal politicians wanted them to do, with the result that it does not to-day serve the country as it was expected to do, and they did not complete the branch they began. The scheme at that time was to connect the Murray Harbour line with Montague and extend it west into the heart of Belfast, the hon. member for Kings knows that, and unless he advocates the completion of that scheme, and advocates it strongly, he will be in danger of losing his seat. I believe the hon. gentleman said in my absence to-day that I wanted to make political capital out of this matter. He is the gentleman who has been making political capital out of these branch lines ever since he has been in politics. I understand that in his last election, wherever he appeared he said that unless he secured a branch line to be built to Elmira or somewhere else within a year, he would resign his seat.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I must say to my hon. friend that he has made an incorrect statement—that I made no promise of having a railway built in the way he states.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). I guess you are a little afraid of making it.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. If my hon. friend wants to act honourably, he had better withdraw that statement.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman got up to say something, and never said it, at least I did not hear him.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I stated that the hon. member for Queens had made a statement which is incorrect so far as I am concerned, and he goes on and repeats it. If he wishes to act fairly in the matter, he should withdraw the statement.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Of course, Mr, Speaker, I will accept the hon. gentleman's denial, but I got the statement from his own constituents who were at the meetings. I never attacked the hon. gentleman, and if he made an unkind attack on me in my absence, it compels me to retaliate. Of course, the hon. Minister of Railways is not responsible for the over-expenditure on the few miles of railway the government built in Prince Edward Island a few years ago, but I wish to tell him that the work is not complete. The hon. member for Kings will, I think, bear me out in that. The branch line from Montague to the main line and to Eldon is not complete as a feeder to the main line. Not having been here when the hon. member for Kings spoke, I do not know whether he said a word about that or not ; but I think he will bear me out in saying that the line then built is not a complete line. So far as this government have built that line I give them credit. I remember standing up in this House to advocate it for four years. I do not wish to prolong this discussion, but I wish to emphasize the statement which I made in the early part of the debate, which the Minister of Railways has not contradicted, that his report is fallacious and misleading, and places an argument in the mouth of every hon. gentleman in this House who is opposed to the construction of railroads in Prince Edward Island. The Minister of Railways, in the first part of his speech, spoke as if he were going to do something. I hope it will be something more than was done in 1904, when the government made a few surveys, and afterwards went back on them. We have not tested the present Minister of Railways very much, but if I am to judge him by his predecessors, I would not expect very much of him. But I have some great hopes of the Premier of this country. I know that he is surrounded by some colleagues who are of no great assistance to him, and he finds it very hard to maintain the position he would like to maintain. I have great respect for him, though he has not shown the prudence of Sir John Macdonald in surrounding himself with wise and good men on whom he could rely ; but I hope the Minister of Railways is a great improvement on his predecessors. I believe in the Prime Minister's sense of justice to my province, and I hope that the Minister of Railways will see that the misleading statements in his report are corrected. I do not wish to trespass any longer on the time of the House, and I thank hon. gentlemen for their attention.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a short explanation ; I know I am not allowed to make a speech. I know that my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. A. Martin) wishes to be fair and correct in every statement he makes in this House. My hon. friend the other day made the statement that the Murray Harbour Railway had cost

---

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, the hon. member for Queens has the right to close the debate, and unless this is a matter of privilege——

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. It is an explanation of what I said this afternoon.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member's statement has been misunderstood, and he wishes to make an explanation, he may do so.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I wish to give my hon. friend an opportunity to place himself right before the House. He made the statement that the Murray Harbour Railway had cost $31,000 per mile. At that time I had not the papers——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that can hardly be permitted at this stage.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I only desired to give my hon. friend a chance to put himself right before the country, but if he objects I will not proceed.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I don't know what the hon. gentleman wants.

Motion agreed to.

SUBURBAN MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved :

That in the case of cities where a free mail delivery is established, such free mail delivery should be extended to all contiguous districts, which though situate outside the municipal limits proper, are immediately adjacent thereto, so as to render such delivery easy of execution ; and that it is particularly desirable to apply such a system, in the vicinity of Montreal, where a dense population and large industrial interests, situate outside the municipal limits, but in reality forming part of the city for all practical purposes, are entitled to such free delivery.

He said : This motion, sir, is one of very considerable interest to the outlying suburbs of Montreal. As hon. gentlemen are no doubt aware, Montreal, the most populous city in the Dominion, covers a relatively small area. It is surrounded by municipalities, the annexation of which to the city has been the policy of Montreal for several years past. These municipalities are identi-

fied with Montreal in every respect excepting as regards municipal administration, and although annexation must necessarily come about in time, even with the best intentions of all parties interested it may take some years to accomplish. The municipalities that immediately adjoin Montreal are extremely anxious that the system of free postal delivery which exists in the city should as far as possible be extended to them, and in many instances that can be done without any considerable increase of cost. There is no doubt that if done it would be greatly to the convenience of the people living in these adjoining municipalities and it would no doubt promote the development of industries. Some of our very large industrial establishments, either for the purpose of obtaining exemption, or diminution of taxation, have located in these outlying municipalities and it would be a great convenience to them if free mail delivery were extended outside of the strict, and in the postal sense imaginary, line of division which at present in many instances prevents that free delivery. I would not in the absence of the Postmaster General have taken up this subject had it not been that the principle has been already successfully applied to many of these outside municipalities, and what this motion asks for is merely its extension where it can be conveniently done without any very great additional expense. Take for instance the case of the town of Lachine, which for many years past has endeavoured to obtain free mail delivery. During the twelve years that I have represented my electoral district which is now partly within the limits of the city of Montreal, I have repeatedly tried to obtain this free delivery outside of the immediate limits of the city where it could be done conveniently and without too much expense. I saw in it not only advantage to my own constituents, but an advantage to the Post Office Department itself. I believe that the postal system as it is administered to-day in the city of Montreal could be improved. I have nothing whatever to say against the officials from the letter carriers up to the postmaster of the city, but I do believe the system requires improvement as I shall endeavour to show when the House is considering the appropriation for that service. I believe that if certain remedies were carried out the postal revenue of Montreal would increase by twenty-five per cent within a very short time. The fact is that although the city of Montreal is the largest centre in the Dominion its postal revenue is only $660,000 a year as compared with a revenue in the city of Toronto which is nearly $300,000 greater. Of course a closer examination of the figures might show that the municipalities immediately surrounding Montreal go to increase considerably the revenue from the city. However with all that, it would fall below the postal revenue of Toronto. I believe that if we had in the city of Montreal and vicinity that administration of the postal service which they have in the larger English and American cities, the postal revenues would be doubled before long and everybody would be better accommodated. Returning to the case of Lachine, I wish to give the House a few figures, and I shall include in my statement the town of Lachine proper, that part of the town which is called Lachine Locks, and where there are very large industrial establishments ; Blue Bonnets which immediately adjoins Lachine, Montreal West adjoining that again, and Summerlea which for postal purposes is practically identified with Lachine. The revenue of these five post offices is as follows :

Lachine	$1,845 41
Lachine Locks	2,453 88
Blue Bonnets	938 98
Montreal West	349 65
Summerlea	82 80
Total revenue	$5,670 72

The expenses of these post offices is :

Lachine	$ 556 50
Lachine Locks	516 00
Blue Bonnets	330 30
Montreal West	121 50
Summerlea	22 50
Total	$1,545 80

To this must be added some trifling expenditure for heating and other minor details which I have not calculated. But let us look at the amount of business done in money orders at these post offices and we find it exceeds that of most of the larger cities of the province of Quebec outside of Montreal, Quebec, and at most one or two others :

	Money orders.
Lachine	$11,319 42
Lachine Locks	23,489 52
Blue Bonnets	12,771 55
Montreal West	784 56
Total	$48,365 05

This shows that in the town of Lachine and in the circumscription or locality to which my remarks have been confined, there is a revenue now of $6,000, and a revenue increasing yearly at a very great rate. And the amount of money orders is $48,365.05, exceeding that of nearly all the cities in the province of Quebec, outside of Montreal and Quebec. It exceeds the revenues respectively of Three Rivers, St. Hyacinthe, if I mistake not, and every town of like proportion. In view of this very considerable volume of business, the town of Lachine about a year ago petitioned the government for a free delivery system such as exists in Montreal and other adjoining municipalities. I have said that the principle of free delivery system has been established outside the limits of Montreal and I am bound to say that, in that respect, the present Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux)

has proved more liberal than his predecessor, because in every instance which I formerly presented, Sir William Mulock and his officials objected that if free delivery were established outside the limits of the city there would be no limit to its extension. By this motion I merely claim that the principle which the Postmaster General has already sanctioned should be extended where it can be established without any great additional expense and with very great convenience to the ratepayers. The principle has been extended to Mile End, a town outlying the city of Montreal. Mile End has a revenue much smaller than the locality I have referred to. Its revenue is only $3,140.61; its money order business amounts to only $14,789, yet the free delivery system has been extended to that town and to Maisonneuve and other towns outside Montreal, where the revenue is $3,595.41, and where the money order business only amounts to $10,434.16. That was done at the instance of my late lamented friend Mr. Prefontaine, who stood in a better position towards the government than I do.

Mr. GALLIHER. What is the population of Maisonneuve?

Mr. MONK. The population of Lachine and the immediate locality in its vicinity, which I have comprised in one district, is about 12,000 or 13,000 souls; the town of Lachine proper has some 10,000 souls, and there are 3,000 at least in its neighbouring locality. I do not know what the population of Mile End is exactly, but I think it would amount to about 12,000 and the population of Maisonneuve is considerably less.

Mr. GALLIHER. In view of a case of my own which I have presented to the government I wanted to know what the population was.

Mr. MONK. Perhaps my hon. friend may not have travelled very extensively through the electoral district to which I have referred, but I do not think there is any city in his constituency approaching the size of Montreal.

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not wish to be understood as criticising my hon. friend at all. What I am anxious to know is why my request was refused for the town of Nelson, if the population of these places my hon. friend has mentioned is below that of Nelson and the revenue much below as well.

Mr. MONK. I cannot say why my hon. friend's request was refused. I would presume that it was unjustly refused as mine was. It is possible that although he may have the required population, perhaps he has not the pull, or perhaps Nelson is not situated, as these towns are, in the immediate vicinity of a very large city where the machinery is provided for free delivery. Sir William Mulock always objected that if he granted free delivery to one town of 15,000 inhabitants he would have to grant it in every other town of like size. My answer to that was that in the case I put he would be simply extending free delivery from Montreal into its suburbs, from which it is separated merely for municipal purposes, and that for postal purposes it should be considered as one and the same locality. The principle has been further extended to the town of Westmount, which does not give a very much larger revenue than the localities which, for the purpose of my argument, I have grouped under one head. The revenue in Westmount, where there is a population of 20,000, is only $6,223.03. I am quoting from the last departmental report. The money order business of Westmount is but $19,498.94, whereas there is a very large postal and money order business in the localities to which I am now referring.

It may be said that Lachine is more distant from the city of Montreal than these localities to which I have referred for the purposes of comparison. But that distance is not a real distance. The gap of vacant land between Lachine proper and Montreal is very small and is rapidly filling up. Farm land there is changing hands every day, and there is every prospect that, with the immense industrial development that is going on in that locality, in a wonderfully short time the whole gap will be filled up, and Lachine will, for postal purposes, form part of the city of Montreal. Moreover, this improvement, if it can be carried out without great additional expense, will largely contribute—and the government should use its best endeavours in that direction—to hasten the development which must necessarily bring with it a very large increase of postal revenue. I mentioned that the matter had been taken up by the town of Lachine. On May 1, 1907, the town council passed a resolution, which I will read in support of this motion. The resolution is in French as follows :

Extrait des Minutes des Délibérations de Conseil de ville de Lachine.
Lachine, 1er mai 1907.

Lecture est donnée d'une requête signée par un grand nombre de citoyens de cette ville, ainsi que d'une requête des membres de la société dite " Sons of England Benefit Society," priant le conseil de ville de Lachine de faire des instances auprès du gouvernement du Canada pour obtenir la nomination de facteurs pour la distribution des lettres et toutes matières postales à domicile dans cette ville,—exposant que cette chose est devenue d'une grande nécessité en cette ville vu l'augmentation rapide de sa population, et que d'autres villes de moindre importance que Lachine ont déjà été favorisées de cette amélioration.

Il est alors proposé par l'échevin A. Emile Sarra-Bournet, appuyé par l'échevin Octave Saint-Germain, qu'il soit résolu : que ce conseil concourt entièrement dans l'opinion des susdite pétitionnaires et qu'il prie l'honorable

ministre des Postes de bien vouloir accorder la nomination de facteurs pour la distribution des lettres et matières postales à domicile dans la ville de Lachine ; et que copie de la présente résolution soit transmise à l'honorable Rodolphe Lemieux, directeur général des Postes, pour favorable considération, ainsi qu'à monsieur Louis Alphonse Boyer, de Montréal, en priant ce dernier d'appuyer cette requête auprès du département.

Adopté.

Certifiée pour vraie copie.

Lachine, 6 février 1908.

(Signé) H. ROBERT,
Sec.-trésorier de la ville de Lachine.

I may mention that the M. Boyer mentioned here was the candidate on the government side in the division at the last general election. Now, I may be asked: How can this reform be accomplished? It is a very easy matter. If the department really put in execution the principle which the motion invokes in this instance—the constituency which I represent goes all around the city of Montreal, and to-day a portion of it is included in the city, and there are other instances, though I have taken the strongest one—it can do so with a very trifling expense. It could, I presume—though I am not a technical adviser on that point—proceed by suppressing the present post offices and keeping the post office in Lachine as a centre of distribution. This government has built large post offices in different parts of the city of Montreal and outside the city of Montreal, at Mile End, to serve as centres of distribution. It has in the town of Lachine a building amply sufficient for all such purposes. The department would economize the salaries of all the other post offices which I have just mentioned. It would have to establish, in the localities covered by this redistribution, two deliveries a day and two collections a day, a certain number of postal boxes, as in the towns of Westmount, Mile End and Maisonneuve. Three or, at the most, four letter carriers with the chief in charge of the central distribution office would do the work and save the salary of an assistant. The expenses at present amount to some $1,500 or $1,800. I really believe that, if the matter were well looked after and entrusted to a careful man, the whole reform could be carried out admirably with an expenditure of $2,000. The revenue, no doubt, would at once increase. The development of the locality would be assisted and the ratepayers would be satisfied. I would like to mention in this connection that the population of the town of Lachine is a very rapidly growing factor. Between Montreal and Lachine, and in the town of Lachine, a large number of very important industrial establishments are growing up. We have the Dominion Bridge Company and the Dominion Wire Company. A locomotive works company has just purchased a large tract of land, and contemplates erecting the largest industrial establishment of that kind in Canada. There are other establishments which it is needless for me to mention. Viewing the growth of industry in the town of Lachine by the value of products, we find that in 1901 the output was of the value of $2,909,847, and five years later, in the year 1906, it had risen to $4,309,749, an increase of $1,399,912. The head of the very important canal navigation, the Lachine canal, is there at Lachine ; it is the stopping place of many steamers coming down the lakes. And there is, back of the river front proper, a very large garden produce development. The large increase of the city of Montreal has induced many of the farmers there to go into the development of truck gardening, and that represents a marvellously increasing traffic. Under these circumstances, I believe that this extension recommends itself to the government and to the attention of the Postmaster General, and I hope that hon. gentleman will give it his very earnest consideration in the very near future. I believe that possibly there are objections to rural mail delivery as ordinarily understood. It has been advocated during the present session, and I voted for the measure because it has been tried in progressive countries, and I do not see why we should not try it here.

In the meantime, it seems to me of the utmost importance that where we do give free delivery in the large centres which are daily developing, we should at least extend that system as much as possible, and not differentiate between one electoral division and another. It should not be the misfortune of the electors of Jacques Cartier that they have not elected a supporter of the government. If in the representations that I have just made to the House and that I have made time and again to the Post Office Department my claims are well founded, it seems to me on the contrary that in the interests of the revenue of the department itself as well as the city and whole island of Montreal, the government should, irrespective of politics, extend the principle, which is a good principle, as far as possible.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, the constituency of South York, which I have the honour to represent, is situated very similarly to Jacques Cartier ; it surrounds the city of Toronto just as Jacques Cartier surrounds the city of Montreal. Some time ago the town of North Toronto, the town of East Toronto, and portions of Deer Park and other places contiguous to Toronto applied for free delivery and the government has seen fit to extend the system to some of those places. West Toronto now has an excellent free delivery system and is the largest suburb contiguous to the city. The system has also been extended to East Toronto, a town contiguous to the city at the east end. A similar system was a few days ago instituted in Todmorden and Doncaster, contiguous to the city, but

up to the present no free delivery has been established in North Toronto. North Toronto is not quite contiguous to the city as there is another small suburb between it and the city, but that suburb is now passing into the city and North Toronto will then be contiguous to Toronto and therefore entitled to this free delivery. I have here a copy of a resolution which has been forwarded to me from the council of North Toronto exactly on that line, asking that a free delivery system be extended to that town. All of these places are surrounding Toronto, and the greater portion of South York are of this suburban character; they are largely occupied, as Jacques Cartier is, by market gardeners, milkmen, all in active business, and large manufacturing concerns so that they are, as a matter of fact, an integral portion of the city of Toronto. The business of these places is connected with the city, the people who live in the suburbs are in active business in the city and if there is to be, as there is, free delivery in connection with the cities, the surrounding suburbs of the cities which are integral portions of them, ought to have free delivery in the widest sense. The government have fairly met the views of some suburbs and I think the Postmaster General, when he looks further into it, will see the justice of the claim of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and of the claim I am now making for a wider enforcement of this principle. I believe the department is now working on the principle that metropolitan postal districts ought to be created in connection with large cities, especially Montreal and Toronto, and that all these suburban districts should be in charge for delivery purposes of the postmaster of the city; that he should take charge of the suburban delivery and the collection of the mails in those suburban districts. When this is done, not only will the convenience to the public be increased but I agree with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in saying that the revenue of the Post Office Department will be greatly augmented. The additional cost will be comparatively small. It requires in some places only two or three carriers as the other organization necessary is now in existence in the city. I believe the official who has charge of the city postal free delivery is in favour of it, and that all he wants is a little more encouragement in the way of an appropriation for this purpose. If it is done, as I think it ought to be done, it will greatly benefit the business of these places and will cost the government very little.

To pass from that, I would make the suggestion to the government, in connection with the rural mail delivery which has been mentioned by my hon. friend, that there are mail routes in South York where from $400 to $500 a year is paid to a courier to carry the mail bags to three small post offices. I believe the people in those localities would be prepared to supplement that $400 or $500 provided by the government with $400 or $500 of their own, making $1,000. That $1,000 would pay a courier to maintain a horse and rig of his own and he would on every week day not only carry the mail to these small post offices but he would become a rural mail carrier, and for that $1,000 he could give a very much better house delivery service than is now given; he could give as good service as is given in the cities. Undoubtedly in these places where the people would be willing to supplement the government grant for the courier, a very much improved system of mail delivery could be established without any great increased cost to the government.

I trust, with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), that the Postmaster General will take up this matter of extending the rural mail delivery around the cities of Toronto and Montreal at least, and if there are any other cities similarly situated that they will be treated in the same way, because municipal bounds do not necessarily limit the business that is concentrated at our cities. The city is always larger than its municipal bounds, especially now that factories requiring large areas for their works, and that large bodies of workingmen are gathered around these factories. These districts ought to be provided with the same postal facilities that are enjoyed by the people of the city proper.

Mr. WILLIAM GALLIHER (Kootenay). Mr. Speaker I do not wish to be understood as at all objecting to the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) although for purposes of my own case, I may have to express a different view on one point. Shortly before the new year, I made application for a free mail delivery system for the city of Nelson, and I was informed by the department that the standard that had been adopted as the requirement for the establishment of a free mail delivery system was that the population should be at least 12,000 and the postal revenue of the city $20,000. In one respect we fill the bill; the postal revenue of Nelson has reached the $20,000 mark. Our population has not yet quite reached the 12,000 mark, but, I take this view of the matter, Mr. Speaker, that the reason for fixing a standard to be guided by in granting applications of this kind is to provide against the very large expense of conducting or operating free mail delivery. A city which produces a large revenue, although it cannot come up to the standard of population, is entitled to a great deal of consideration, because any extra expense which may be incurred by free mail delivery would be provided for by the greatly increased revenue. Take some of the places which have been mentioned by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), such as Westmount, Maisonneuve and Mile

End ; I noticed that in some of these places, although the population was up to the requirement, the revenue was far below it. I do not take the same view that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, or the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) does, that simply because these places are situated in proximity to a large city they are therefore entitled to consideration in that regard. I think that where the revenue of a city comes up to the standard of $20,000 —I am speaking now of the revenue outside of post office orders, and in the city of Nelson post office orders will amount to a very large sum during the year—even if the population chances to be somewhat below the requirements that city certainly is entitled to equal, if not much greater, consideration than a place with a larger population but with very much less revenue. Where the revenue is $20,000 in a city and the population is a little less than the number required there should be a free mail delivery, or where there is a population of 12,000 or more that surely ought to ensure revenue enough to warrant them in getting it even supposing at the present time they are a little below the $20,000 mark. Although you say that they shall have 12,000 of a population and $20,000 of a revenue, if 7,000 or 8,000 of a population can produce a revenue of $20,000 I think such a city is just as much entitled to free mail delivery as if it had a population of 12,000, for the simple reason that the people there are producing additional revenue to pay for the cost of free delivery.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. How would the postmen get up the mountain at Nelson ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Well, we are pretty good mountain climbers in that section of the country. However, if the department have adopted a hard and fast rule fixing the standard at 12,000 for population and $20,000 for revenue, while I do not agree with that proposition, yet I think it should be impartially observed in regard to all. There is not the same excuse for refusing my request as for refusing that of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. I cannot say that mine has been refused because I am not a supporter of the government. If a place with a revenue of $6,000 is granted a free mail delivery, although the population may be greater than that of Nelson, I cannot see why, when we produce the full revenue of $20,000 required, the city of Nelson, even though it may have less than 12,000 population should not have free mail delivery. The only reason that can be given to my mind is the one urged by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and the hon. member for South York that they are in close proximity to large cities. That is all very well. But all towns cannot be in close proximity to large cities, and if the enterprise in those towns produces the revenue required I would say that they are entitled to every consideration and that there should be no discrimination in regard to them. If you give it to one you should give it to all others. Where a place comes up to the standard of $20,000, as far as revenue is concerned, even though it falls below a few thousand in population you should give it free delivery. That is a fair proposition and it is on that ground I would like to see my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) take the matter into consideration. Our revenue in Nelson has been growing steadily from year to year ; it has not all come up in a minute ; it has been growing from $10,000 to $12,000 to $15,000 until it has reached $20,000, and I ask the earnest consideration of the Postmaster General in that regard. It may be that since the Postmaster General has assumed office no place that has not reached the standard both as to population and revenue has been considered. If that is the case I have no reason to complain because then all places must have been treated alike. But, if every one has not been treated alike I claim that where a city has reached one of the standards, whether it be that of population or revenue, it is entitled to the same consideration that any other city similarly situated receives.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, I have to express my regret that my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) is not in his seat to give my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) the answer to which he is entitled. I know that the question of improvements in the distribution of mail matter is in the hands of the Postmaster General and that he has contemplated some changes in that direction. If he were here I do not know how far he would take exception to or agree with the resolution of my hon. friend, but I think that he would not be disposed to take any very serious objection to it because, I think, the resolution of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier expresses what is already the practice of the Post Office Department. The resolution of my hon. friend reads as follows :

> That in the case of cities where a free mail delivery is established, such free mail delivery should be extended to all contiguous districts, which though situate outside the municipal limits proper, are immediately adjacent thereto, so as to render such delivery easy of execution.

In so far as I understand the argument of my hon. friend the very principle which he now advances is already in practice in the Post Office Department. My hon. friend recited as instances the towns of Lachine, Mile End and Maisonneuve. But, my hon. friend must admit that there is no parity whatever between the cases of Lachine, Maisonneuve and Mile End. The towns of Maisonneuve and Mile End are both contiguous, in the terms of the motion, to the city of Montreal. The line of division be-

tween Mile End and Montreal is not visible to the naked eye. This house is in Maisonneuve and the next house is in Montreal. The same thing is true of Mile End and as was stated a moment ago by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) in these modern days the limits of cities always extend beyond the municipal boundaries. It is the case with Maisonneuve and it is the case with Mile End also. If you take Notre Dame street you will walk from Montreal to Maisonneuve and you will never know when you have passed from one municipality into the other. If you take what was formerly St. Lawrence Main but what is now called the Boulevard St. Laurent you will walk from Montreal into Mile End and never know where you crossed from one municipality into another. But, that is not the case with Lachine at all. There is a distance of seven miles between the limits of Montreal and the limits of Lachine and if I am correctly informed there are one or two towns between the city of Montreal and Lachine. St. Paul I think is one, and I think Côte de Grace is another.

Mr. MONK. There is only one municipality between the city of Montreal and the town of Montreal West which is the first mentioned by me.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The town of Montreal West may have been annexed recently, but until then it was another municipality between Montreal and Lachine. Now, I do not at all speak with the idea of controverting the position taken by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) on this matter, and I merely wish to explain that what has been done in Maisonneuve and Hochelaga could not have been done under the present arrangements in the case of Lachine. It is not because the county of Jacques Cartier made the mistake of electing my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) against Mr. Boyer that the town of Lachine did not get a free mail delivery. With all due respect to my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), may I be permitted to say that the town of Lachine has been already punished enough for that mistake, and it would not be fair to punish it any further. But the merits of the Lachine case were not the same as those of Mile End and Maisonneuve. If a free mail delivery has been given to Maisonneuve and Mile End it was because they were contiguous to the city of Montreal and are practically part and parcel of the city where a free mail delivery exists.

Mr. GALLIHER. What about Nelson?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, Nelson is somewhat distant from the city of Montreal and if you were to establish a free mail delivery in Nelson you would have to establish it from the very commencement, whereas in the case of Maisonneuve and Mile End you have only to extend the delivery from the city of Montreal. However, before the session is over, the Postmaster General will, I think, submit a new policy to the attention of parliament, and by means of which he intends to improve the postal facilities which now exist. I suppose under such circumstances my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will have no objection that I should move the adjournment of the debate?

Mr. MONK. I accept the suggestion of my right hon. friend with the prospect that if the principle is adopted by the government it will do its best endeavour to extend the free mail delivery system to the places I have named. I have been asking for this reform for about twelve years, and at my time of life an adjournment of the debate might be serious.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will deal with it without regard to the political proclivities of Lachine.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

TECHNICAL STUDENTS ON GOVERNMENT WORKS.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved :

That in the execution of public works requiring some technical knowledge, the government should, as far as possible, utilize the services of young men engaged in the pursuit of technical studies in our Canadian institutions, so as to permit of their applying with profit, during their vacations, the knowledge acquired by them during the period of tuition.

He said : This is a motion which I did not expect would be called to-day and although I have not been able to give such time as I would have liked to preparing the argument in its favour, I think it better to submit it to the House now as it is a question of importance, and as it is merely a suggestion which I hope will be adopted by the government. I trust it will be possible for the government to put the suggestion into effect during the coming year, when, so far as I can see from the estimates brought down, there will be a much larger expenditure of public funds than we have hitherto had any example of. I think the suggestion in my motion will commend itself to the favourable consideration of this parliament. We have a country of immense natural resources which are being discovered every day, and the magnitude of which at the present time astonishes the world. To develop these resources we have a great scarcity in Canada of men who are well up in technical science, and with the small capital at our own disposal, and with the very large capital which is coming into the country from abroad, we are obliged to witness the painful spectacle in mining and milling and construction works generally of foreign technical experts being im-

ported to superintend them. This is no doubt the reason why the subject of technical education has within the last few years invited such a large share of attention from the people of this country, and that we are all so anxious to see its extension and development. I am not able to submit to the House any special statistics as to the state of technical education in the other provinces of the Dominion, but I know that in the province of Quebec the subject is engaging our most serious attention. Until within the past twenty years that branch of education did not receive in our province the attention it had received in other countries. Thanks to the munificence of some public-spirited citizens in Montreal we have seen in late years very great development in the science branch of McGill University, which has been equipped, I am told, in a manner unsurpassed in any part of the world. A recent disastrous fire has destroyed the science building, but the energy which has characterized that institution and its supporters in the past has enabled the McGill University to place its science branch on a footing equal to if not superior to that which it had attained before the fire. In Laval University, in which I have been for many years interested, we have been obliged to proceed a little more modestly and slowly, but we have made most praiseworthy efforts to develop, in a very rich soil indeed, the study of technical science, so that we may be able to meet the constantly increasing requirements of the country in that regard. We have a polytechnique school attached to the university in which there are a number of students under very devoted and excellent teachers, qualifying for a technical career. The question raised by this motion is whether the government which expends such a very large sum of money on public works can do anything for the encouragement of scientific study and for the help of the students. If it can do anything it is clearly the duty of the government to do it. It is a moot question in my mind as to whether the Dominion government cannot itself do something for technical education, but that is a very large question which it is not necessary to discuss in connection with this very modest motion of mine.

But it is a question. There is no doubt that in the scheme of confederation what it was intended to give exclusively to the provinces was that kind of education that was then contemplated—elementary education, to which I might add superior intellectual education in a general sense. But could we not, for instance, do something to help the cause of agricultural education ? I see no reason why we should not. We have jurisdiction in agricultural matters, and it seems to follow logically that we could help that special branch of technical education. Other examples might be given ; and, as we seem to have been given, in the distribution of powers, the control of industry and commerce, it is worthy of consideration whether we could not legitimately, and acting within the bounds of our constitutional powers, do something for technical education. If we established for instance, here in the city of Ottawa, or anywhere else, a great institution of technology, such as exists in various parts of the United States, where they produce wonderfully beneficial results, we would be doing an excellent work; and I have no doubt, that with a small percentage of the moneys that are utterly wasted in our administration of the public revenue, so far as I have been able to observe that administration since I have been in public life, we could do an immense good to the country. But here again I am going beyond the purposes of this motion. What do we do in that part of the administration of the public funds which consists of building wharfs, canals, railways, public buildings, dams and other works, the supervision of which is presumably confided to a superintendent or a foreman ? As a rule, the money used in that connection, so far as my observation goes, has been up to the present used for the purpose of rewarding political followers. The superintendent of construction of a public work is—I do not say invariably, but generally—a political heeler, and he does very little work, scarcely ever goes upon the work, draws a salary of two or three dollars a day, which he seldom or ever earns, and his supervision amounts to practically nothing at all. If you open the Auditor General's Report, you find that some important public works has beeen superintended in its construction by a man who has some local political importance, and has perhaps once or twice or three times during the course of his supervision gone down of an afternoon and smoked a cigar on the work. He has made no report to the government ; he has drawn his salary, and that is about all. I say that in this as in many other respects, we can, without spending an additional dollar reform a very great abuse and render a great service to the cause of technical education—how ? These works are generally executed during the summer months. Most of these young students are capable, talented fellows, who are very often prevented from continuing their studies through lack of funds. If they had the means during their holidays of earning a little money, they would turn that money to excellent account. It would enable then to continue and terminate their studies to qualify them for the career they desired to enter, and moreover it would check the abuse to which I have referred, and which ought to be stamped out. It would enable the government to obtain from these young men already under training and qualified to a certain extent, valuable reports as to the progress of the works being executed ; and probably we would see fewer buildings

tumbling down and fewer wharfs tumbling into the water than we have seen in recent years. By adopting the suggestion contained in this motion, we would be serving very useful and patriotic purposes. In order to effect that, all that these important spending departments of the government would have to do would be to place themselves in communication with the head masters of these schools. There are two in Montreal. I have referred particularly to the condition of affairs as it is in that city, where I live, and in the institutions with which I am connected. But I have no doubt, as a university man, and a man connected with education, that similar conditions exist in every other province. If the public work were executed within the province, the government would probably receive the recommendations of the principals or head men of these technical schools, so that a certain number of lucrative positions during the summer would be placed at the disposal of these students, who would thereby acquire practical experience in their work, and a small proportion would be enabled to earn a little money to help them continue their studies. I know of no small way—small in a certain sense—in which the government could be of greater use to the great cause of technical education than by carrying out this suggestion. That suggestion has been adopted in many other countries. I have not the statistics at hand; but it is well known that in many of the states of the union, in some of the federal departments of the United States, in Switzerland, I believe in France, in Italy and in other European countries the services of technical students are utilized in the manner I have indicated, and surely, if that is done in other countries, where the natural resources are less extensive and where the works to be executed are of less importance, I venture to say that this country, which is a young country, should grasp the opportunity of carrying out this suggestion.

But it would have to be done absolutely regardless of politics. It would have to be undertaken as a serious, earnest effort for the advancement of the great cause of education. If into the carrying out of that suggestion the government were to import the miserable system of patronage, which is the bane and curse of this country at present, it would be better to abstain from the experiment altogether. They have got rid in Britain of that tremendous inconvenience of political patronage, and they are getting rid of it in the United States. In the United States, in department after department, the system is being improved and the old system of spoils for office is being abolished. Are we going to take a similar step in that direction or are we going to apply that principle of patronage to the case now before the House for consideration? I trust not. I trust that in the distribution of these small positions of employment for the advancement of education and the help of students the government will not for an instant consider political leanings. That would be a great disaster and a retrograde movement. I regret that I have not some statistics to show with what success the system I advocate has been adopted in some foreign countries, but I hope that the government will nevertheless give to it its earnest consideration and make an effort to carry it into practice.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). I did not know that this resolution was coming on this evening, but I wish to say a few words in its favour. I think the suggestion of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) a good one. We have at Queen's College at Kingston, and in fact in all these colleges, young students who would be very glad indeed to have assistance of this kind during their summer vacations, and I am quite satisfied that their services would be of great advantage to our public works. In my own constituency we have a work under the charge of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. On that work there is no doubt technical knowledge required. We have there the acetylene gas works, and I do not believe that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has a man of experience engaged on that plant. At all events, I do not know of any one around these works who knows anything about acetylene gas or ever made it a study. And I am quite satisfied that if the minister would employ some of these students who have studied up that subject on these works that would be of great advantage. But what is the practice to-day? Whenever any of these acetylene gas propositions are before the minister some young man is placed in charge who has never had any experience whatever in the working of acetylene gas. We have had several disasters resulting from that practice. I remember one at Kingston, where the steamer 'Scout' was blown up and several men killed, and these acetylene gas buoys are all prepared in the town of Prescott. Another was sent to Owen Sound, and a man given charge who had no experience. As a consequence, one of these buoys was blown up, another steamer sent to the bottom and one or two people killed. There was another blown up at Port Arthur and one or two men killed, and another at Halifax. If the minister had employed some young man who had taken a course of study in one of these colleges, that student would be of great assistance in a plant of that kind. But whenever there is a vacancy he applies to the Liberal executive committee, and will employ any man who has the endorsement of that committee, even if he has never seen a gas buoy in his life. This is a most important matter for the Department of Ma d Fisheries.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Would you recommend a student of a university to be put in charge of an acetylene gas plant?

Mr. J. D. REID. I would prefer such a man rather than take some young man who had never seen a gas buoy in his life, and had practically never been inside of any mechanical establishment or a college of any kind, and who never had any training to fit him for such work. Before a man is placed in such a responsible position he certainly should have some technical education. That is not the case to-day. The man appointed to-day in the establishment at Prescott is simply the nominee of the Liberal executive of that town. While I am on that point, I might say that the predecessor of the present minister acted differently. He had men sent there from other parts of the Dominion, who, I think, had some technical education. But since the present Minister of Marine took charge the Liberal executive there have appointed one of their own number who is practically in charge of these works in Prescott.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will my hon. friend tell me who that man is?

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister will have no difficulty in ascertaining his name. He is practically in charge of the works. He took part in a pubic meeting.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) must know the name of the man to whom he alludes.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the minister cannot find out the name I will tell him at a future time. This man instead of looking after the acetylene gas business is looking after the political end of that organization. The whole thing is now turned into a political machine, and this, as I understand it, by direct instructions of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I myself saw this man, at the last municipal election, march the whole lot of men down to vote simply as he directed.

Mr. BRODEUR. What is his name?

Mr. J. D. REID. If the minister cannot find out his name I will tell him at a future time.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. There is no such man as he refers to in charge of the works at Prescott.

Mr. J. D. REID. Well, he has all to say there so far as the department is concerned. The commissioner who had charge previous to the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries taking office did manage to appoint men from different parts who looked after the work properly. But since the present minister took charge this man to whom I have referred carries on the whole affair simply as a political machine. You can see him in elections, municipal, provincial or Dominion, marching the whole gang of 100 or 125 men down to vote as he directs. If they had young men there who would attend to the acetylene gas business and let politics alone it would be better for the country and would save the lives of men who otherwise may be blown up by the explosion of these gas buoys. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he thinks it right that this man should be there nominally to carry on this work for the department, but really to manage these men as a political machine.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. member (Mr. J. D. Reid) think that this is pertinent to the motion?

Mr. J. D. REID. If it is not, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw it. I was simply illustrating how much better it would be to have young men of some technical education than men of the class of this man to whom I have referred. All along the St. Lawrence, we have not only the canal system, but public works in the shape of wharfs and other things. In my county they have appointed men as inspectors of masonry, as inspectors of timber work and as assistant engineers who have never been inside a college.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Does the hon. member (Mr. J. D. Reid) think that students should be appointed for that work?

Mr. J. D. REID. Certainly, it would be better to appoint a man of some education than a man who can hardly write his name and has had no experience in the work he is supposed to do. I can name instances of men appointed as inspectors of timber work and cribwork who never in their lives saw anything of that kind done. I can give instances of men appointed as inspectors of masonry who never saw masonry work done. On the other hand, I know young men in my county who have been attending Queen's College and who have had enough technical education to do this work much better than the men who have been appointed.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I am at a loss to understand why the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid), on a motion of such importance as this, proposed by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), should make an attack upon the appointments of my department in the town of Prescott. It seems to me he does not bring to the support of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier the best arguments that he might have brought. If the hon. gentleman will look at the records of the department he will find many instances of students being appointed to positions which enable them

to earn money during the summer months. We have some, for instance, on the hydrographic survey. Every summer on that survey we have students who are anxious to earn something for their education and at the same time get the benefit of the training and experience which the hydrographic survey gives. Others are employed on our dredges; our biological station also employs some of these young men and gives them an opportunity to study the life history of fish to greater advantage than under other circumstances. So my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) does not render justice to the department in this matter. He has seen fit also to refer to some man whose name he has not been willing to disclose, leaving me at a loss as to the man referred to. There is no new man in charge of the service at Prescott, unless he refers to Mr. Stewart who came last year from Halifax. I do not know whether he is the man to whom my hon. friend refers. He is connected with the buoy service and has most to do with it. I am exceedingly surprised if it is to him my hon. friend refers, but if he does not refer to that man I do not know——

Mr. J. D. REID. It is a man who has lived in Prescott all his life and occupies one of the most prominent positions there, a member of the Liberal executive——

Mr. BRODEUR. What is his name——

Mr. J. D. REID—and one of the highest men there. The Minister of Railways knows to whom I refer.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know at all. I know a man named Stewart.

Mr. J. D. REID. He is not the man.

Mr. BRODEUR. He is I think in charge of the buoy service. He has a great deal to do with that branch, he is not the head of the administration there. The man in charge of the lighthouse depot at Prescott is a graduate of the university of Toronto, Mr. J. F. Fraser, and his assistant is Mr. W. H. Noble, who, I think, is an engineer also, and if I mistake not he is not a friend of the government, while Mr. Fraser was appointed by the late government. These are the charges my hon. friend is making against the department——

Mr. J. D. REID. They have nothing to say now.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, they are in charge of the lighthouse depot there. There is also a young man who came from England, Mr. Boyle, the accountant, who has a great deal to do with the administration and practically, when Mr. Fraser and Mr. Noble are not there, makes the reports to the government. I do not know to whom my hon. friend is referring. I am afraid he does not know himself, and only wants to have a grudge against the department.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Minister of Railways and Canals knows.

Mr. BRODEUR. In every instance where it has been possible for us to use the services of young students in the hydrographic survey, or in dredging on the ship channel we have done it, we have endeavoured to help them. We cannot get students to take charge the year around of the buoy system, and besides I do not know that they would have sufficient experience to take charge of such an important work. Of course accidents have happened, but if my hon. friend consults the record and looks into the facts he will see that the accidents are not due to any lack of knowledge but, to a certain extent, to negligence or to failure to observe some of the instructions in connection with the handling of the buoy system, so that all of my hon. friend's criticism in that regard falls absolutely to the ground.

My hon. friend seems much scandalized because the lighthouse keeper at Prescott has taken part in municipal elections. What great crime is there in any public officer taking part in municipal elections——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that is——

Mr. BRODEUR. I am simply answering what the hon. gentleman has said.

Mr. SPEAKER. Still I think the hon. member travelled beyond the scope of the motion and I made the suggestion to him——

Mr. BRODEUR. I wished simply to refer to the case of the collector of customs in Montreal who has taken part in municipal elections. No one raised a fuss about that.

Mr. MONK. If a student is well recommended by his principal, is poor and is well qualified and there is a vacancy for him as superintendent or some such work will the government give it to him ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly. I will give him some work if there is work available, and that is what I am doing. My hon. friend knows Mr. Balète, the principal of the Polytechnic School in Montreal. I have consulted Mr. Balète very frequently to secure the names of young men, poor and deserving students, in order to give them work in the vacation when I could.

Mr. MONK. Irrespective of politics ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Irrespective of politics.

Mr. MONK. That is right.

Mr. BRODEUR. And I know as a fact that some young students have been employed in the service in that way who are not of the same political faith as the govern-

ment. This should show my hon. friend that our effort was to help the poor students, and the government will always be ready to do that on every occasion that presents itself.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). I think the question raised by the resolution of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is one that deserves consideration; but it has its difficulties as I can see. It is not easy to use students for a short time in the summer after a public work has commenced especially as they have to go back to college before the completion of the work in the fall. In other words their services would be available for only a part of the time for which they would be required. I think it is best to attempt first to give employment to those who are fully equipped. We know to our sorrow that a great many young men who graduate from our technical schools find places in New Zealand, Mexico and the United States; in fact, many of the best equipped of our young men are enticed to these countries by larger salaries and better prospects and you cannot very well find fault with them for going. It seems to me that we should do whatever we can to encourage the acquirement of technical knowledge and so far as possible give employment to the man who is fully equipped. I know personally that quite a number of students have been assisted to positions by the government in the different departments and they have done creditable service, but it seems to me that we should seek to give employment to our young men after they are equipped, after they have come out of our colleges. It is well known that Canadian boys who came out of our technical schools stand high in other countries, that they are sought after and many are offered positions even before they graduate, so that in many cases we lose the services of our fully equipped young men. I do not think it would be wise, for instance, to put a student who has no practical knowledge of any public work, in charge of a public work or over men who are carrying out that public work; they ought to be attached to the staff of a man who has practical knowledge. What the student wants outside of his college, is practical instruction, he gets the theory in his college, and if he is put on a public work without previous experience he will be a failure; he should be attached to the staff of a man who has practical knowledge. In this way it is possible to assist young men.

This question has been raised in the Ontario legislature within the last day or two, whether or not it would be possible for the federal authorities to assist in technical education throughout the provinces. I do not profess to be in a position to suggest anything of that kind, but it seems to me that some system might be adopted by which we could encourage the acquirement of this class of knowledge throughout our country. We know that the professions are over-full and we lack men of that technical knowledge which the development of this country is calling for every day. It seems to me that this is a question that ought to be dealt with on a broad basis and in a technical way, to bring about the best results.

Mr. MONK. I do not think my hon. friend entirely understood the gist of this motion. I did not contemplate placing students in positions of responsibility in charge of public works, but where you employ a political heeler to stand around and smoke cigars and see a wharf being built, I suggest you might allow a student to get the privilege of superintending that work. He has had as much experience as that heeler ; it would be of service to him and of greater service to the country.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). Mr. Speaker, from the speeches which they have delivered it appears to me that neither the hon. mover of the resolution (Mr. Monk) nor my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) thoroughly understands the gist of it. As to the resolution, it seems to me there can be no objection whatever, but when my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) proceeded to argue that students in their first, second or third year at colleges or universities, who have not passed through these colleges, regardless altogether of what their studies may be, should be placed in charge of construction of wharfs, masonry, acetylene gas plants and all these mechanical works carried on under the Department of Public Works and the Department of Marine and Fisheries, he took a position which was preposterous and extreme. The resolution indicates exactly what some departments of the government that can employ technical students have been doing for a number of years. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) may not know it, but it a fact that in the Geological Survey some thirty students are annually drawn from the principal universities of the country, nominated by the presidents of these universities, not known to the minister nor the director in charge of the Geological Survey, and these students go out with the parties, assist in carrying out the surveys throughout the country, spend the summer vacation and receive a salary—I do not know what it is, but it is sufficient to enable them to carry on their studies for the balance of the year. That work has been going on for a number of years. We have extended that recently, and for the last two years the presidents of Toronto University, Queen's University and McGill, have nominated a certain number of students in technical science, geology, mining, engineering and studies of that kind, for employment on the Geological Survey during the summer

season. We employed about thirty students last summer, we will employ the same number this summer and they will all be nominated by the presidents regardless of their politics, because we do not know what the politics of the boys or of their fathers are. That has been going on for many years, and it has worked out satisfactorily. We are trying to help the students, we are trying at least to educate young men in geological science and mining engineering, so that when the government may require men of standing in those departments of science it will know where to get them. It has happened that we have already put on the survey a number of young men who have obtained their education in geological science at Toronto and Montreal. I think the resolution, as I said before, is quite acceptable to all departments of the government, but if the resolution is taken to mean that students are to be put in charge of masonry, acetylene gas plants and all those mechanical works, I repeat it is preposterous and extreme.

Mr. MONK. I would like to state to my hon. friend that while I am very glad to hear what he has just stated to the House, I was not aware that the number of schools that I referred to as polytechnic schools have ever had an opportunity of nominating any pupils for such work as students can do. I know several students who last year failed to obtain any kind of work during the vacation, although they were quite qualified for it.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There are more applications than vacancies.

Motion agreed to.

ABOLITION OF TOLL GATES UPON ISLAND OF MONTREAL.

On the motion :

That it is the duty of the government to enter into negotiations with the government of the province of Quebec, with a view to removing all obstacles to the abolition of toll gates upon the roads of the Island of Montreal.—Mr. Monk.

Mr. MONK. I would be ready to proceed with this resolution as well as the following one, but it seems to me in the absence of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) it would perhaps be better to let it stand until he is here to give an answer on behalf of the government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Stands.

Motion allowed to stand.

IMMIGRATION BONUSES.

House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Cockshutt :

That in consideration of the great congestion that at present prevails in the labour market in many of the industrial centres throughout the country, it is highly expedient that assisted immigration, excepting only the agricultural and domestic servant classes, should immediately cease, and that no further bonuses shall be paid to individual agents or companies for sending or bringing in such immigrants. Further, that the time has come for the strict enforcement of the law that requires that only the financially, morally and physically fit shall be allowed to enter this Dominion as settlers, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Johnston.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox). Mr. Speaker, in rising to continue the debate on this question, I desire to say that while I am in favour of the motion it would better meet my views if it went a little farther than this one does. The House will be aware, I am sure, that I have been opposed to the bonusing of immigrants for a long time. I do not think it is necessary or in the interests of the country that we should bonus immigrants to come to this country, because instead of getting a better class of immigrants, we are liable to get a poorer class as the slick-tongued agent can go to a weak or worthless man and induce him to change his mind as to the place where he intended to go. People who are susceptible to such influences are the kind that we do not want in this country. The orders in council that have been passed lately look to me as if they pointed to some influence that the North Atlantic Trading Company still have with the government. On the 30th November, 1906, the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company was cancelled, and from that time until the 19th February, 1907, there were no bonuses whatever paid, in so far as I can learn on European immigrants. On the 19th February, 1907, there was an order in council passed, of which I have a copy, giving a bonus of 10 shillings upon adults, 5 shillings upon children between the ages of 1 and 18, and 10 shillings upon female domestics. The rates under this order in council, as applied to all the different classes of people, are about the same as those covered by the contract of the North Atlantic Trading Company. This went on until the 6th January, 1908, and why the bonus should have been raised at this season of the year under the circumstances which exist in Canada at the present time, when the market is glutted with those who are living on the charity of our own people, is something that I cannot understand, and the action is one which cannot be justified by this government or anybody else. On the 6th January, 1908, I find that the bonus on European immigration was changed from 10 shillings for adults to £1, from 5 shillings upon children from 1 to 18 to 10 shillings, and from 10 shillings for female domestics to £1. In view of the number of immigrants that we have in this country who are in a serious position—because I do not think you could put it much milder than that—it was simply outrageous to

pass this order in council holding out larger inducements for agents to persuade people to come to this country, where we have no employment to give them and when the country has no need for them. But that is not all. The government was not quite satisfied with the encouragement given to immigrants, and on the 8th of January, 1908, they passed an order in council saying that any person coming to Canada before the 15th day of February must be possessed of $50, and after the 15th of February until the 1st of April he must be possessed of $25. Why offer an extra inducement to bring people here and then place this barrier in the way of their coming in? And even that was not all, because they seemed to be right in the business at the time, and so they passed another order in council giving the Minister of the Interior power to prohibit people coming into this country if he saw fit, and that order in council said :

Immigrants may be prohibited from landing or coming into Canada unless they come from the country of their birth or citizenship by a continuous journey and on through tickets purchased before leaving the country of their birth or citizenship.

These immigration regulations seem to be a heterogeneous mass. In the first place the government increase the bonus to encourage people to come to this country, which I think was entirely unnecessary ; then they say the immigrant must not come to the country unless he has $50 in his pocket if he lands before the 15th of February and $25 if he lands between that and the 1st of April ; and then they say the immigrant must come direct from the land of his birth or citizenship. They also say in one of these orders in council that immigrants must come direct to a Canadian port except in winter time when they may come to the port of Portland, United States. Now we will suppose that a party of these immigrants to whom such great inducements are held out, decide to come to Canada, and half of them come to Portland, and the other half to New York, and the people that come via New York cannot enter Canada. Is there any sense in that ? I thought the government said we wanted immigrants in this country. I cannot see why if a Scotchman, or an Englishman, or an Irishman should decide to come to this country whether by way of Portland or by way of New York, or whether he lives in the United States, it makes the slightest difference what way he comes ; because what we want is men who will make good reliable citizens and not such as a great many of those who have been brought here in the past.

This government has been lavish in its expenditure on immigration. For the nine months ending the 31st of March 1907 they have spent in bonuses to steamship agents, selected by themselves, $92,614.69. Any person who has seen these immigrants will I think say that there are quite a large number of them who are not desirable and are not such people as would make good citizens and help to raise the standard of our citizenship. When we come to consider what this government has done in the way of spending money on immigration since it has come to power, it is simply astonishing. The Public Accounts show us that from 1897 to 1907 both years inclusive, this government has expended $5,832,573.63 on immigration and in the estimates for this year they have $920,000 for the same service, which is quite a considerable sum considering the state of the finances of the country and the large expenditures during the past two or three years. Therefore, if the money voted is spent next year the government will have expended on immigration $6,752,573.63. So far as I have been able to speak with the people, and I have been speaking to them on this question, I find that irrespective of politics the people in my section of the country are opposed to the bonus system and believe we are spending entirely too much money on immigration. I believe the feeling to-day is that we had better hold our hand until we can see what we can do with the people we have already here. In my section of the country the difficulty is this ; the farmer wants a man in the summer season for six or seven months or eight months at the utmost ; the farms in that section run from 100 to 200 acres and so the farmers have no work for a hired man in the winter time and they cannot afford to pay him anything like a reasonable salary then. I do not think farm labourers can make enough in the seven or eight months working time to keep them comfortably through the winter, and so I think it is a great shame that the government should hold out to these people the inducements they do. Only to-day it came to my ears that a man was working for a farmer out in the country from my town and he is very much dissatisfied because he was told before coming to Canada that there would be nothing to prevent him getting steady work at least $20 a month and board and lodging. He finds a very different state of things now. When this question was being discussed in the House the other day, the Minister of the Interior instead of discussing the question fairly read a lot of letters, and he seemed to be trying to justify as well as he could the extension of the bonus system to others than farmers and farm labourers, because he has extended it to gardeners, to stable men, to navvies, and to miners and perhaps to others. In my judgment the only reason why he has not extended it to mechanics is because of the trade unions, and the unions amongst railway men in this country, and the government are afraid to do so, but they come as near to covering every class

of the community as they possibly dare. It is only because the labouring men and the carters and the gardeners have not unions that the government is giving bonuses on these classes of immigrants. The government pretends to be opposed to the Manufacturers' Association and they are trying to create that impression on the public generally, but why did the Minister of the Interior read these letters from friends of the Manufacturers' Association and why did he censure my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) because he inclosed a letter to the department from a gentleman who wanted to know where he could get help ? I think the government is doing in this matter what the Hon. George W. Ross of Ontario was accused of doing in the past—and a good many believe the accusation is true—Mr. Ross used to put a law on the statute-book and then he would give a wink to the officials not to enforce it too rigidly. You can find very strong evidence of that in the license law of Ontario. Many of the people think that since Mr. Whitney came to power he has passed an entirely new liquor law, when the fact is that practically he is only enforcing the provisions of the old law. To illustrate this I heard in my own town this morning two gentlemen who are very respectable people and who thought they could get a drink on the Sabbath day if anybody could, and they just thought they would test the thing, and they said they went to every hotel in the town but one and were absolutely refused. Why was that ? It is because the law is being enforced and because under Mr. Whitney the liquor sellers are not given a tip that they may sell liquor and there will be nothing done about it. Now, to my mind this immigration business is a very serious matter, for I believe that a large number of people are brought to this country whom we do not want here. I have in my hand a hospital report from Winnipeg, which was sent to me by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture in reply to a request for information, and I will read it :

Patients treated in the wards of the hospital who have been resident in the province less than three years, and were unable to pay for treatment: resident less than three months, 229, 4,803 days treatment in the hospital; less than six months and over three, 175 persons, treated 5,465 days; less than one year, 223, treated 5,405 days; less than two years, 254, treated 7,806 days; less than three years, 187, treated 5,569 days. Total number treated, 1,068, treated 29,048 days. Their nationalities were as follows: English, 349; Irish, 29; Scotch, 83; United States, 30; others, 577; total, 1,068.

In the newspapers we read of places like 'Shacktown' in Toronto, where 3,000 people who have lately come to this country are suffering severely for the common necessaries of life, and we have a report that in the city of Toronto alone 100 infants have died of starvation. Whether these statements are true or not, they are in the public prints of the country. If they are not true, they ought to be contradicted ; and if they are true, they indicate a deplorable state of things in this country, which this government ought to take into their serious consideration, instead of doubling the bonuses to people in foreign countries and sending twenty-two special agents to Great Britain and Ireland to try by every possible means to induce people to come to this country by telling them of the great things they can accomplish if they come here. We have a country quite as good as any other country in the world ; but we cannot accomplish impossibilities, and we ought to be content with a little slower progress rather than to rush things at such a rate as to cause so much suffering and public expense. When the Doukhobors were brought at great expense to this country, we paid $5 a head for every man, woman and child of the whole outfit ; and they came in such a destitute state that this country had to provide $20,000 to keep them over the first winter. We were told time and again in the Committee on Agriculture by the then deputy minister that we had a lien on their land, and that that money would all come back. In this connection I may say that I do not know what the matter is this year —we have not had any meeting of the Committee on Agriculture, except one to appoint a chariman ; although last year we talked the matter over and came to an understanding that at another session we would meet earlier, before the other committees met, and would do a great deal of our business before the other committees got busy ; but, for some reason unknown to me, we have had only one meeting of that committee, although we have a farmer for Minister of Agriculture and I believe a farmer as chairman of the committee ; and still the interest of the farmers seems to be totally neglected. There was an interview with the present Minister of the Interior, in April, 1907, or 1906, by Mr. Reiban on behalf of the Doukhobors. He said :

Before the Doukhobors came to Canada the government of this country knew very distinctly the Doukhobors had desire to live in villages and to cultivate all their lands in common, and the government agreed to it; and they hold original letters from government officials to this effect; and we are surprised why government was expecting that Doukhobors will live individually after they have been informed that they exist in common, and if Doukhobors had known the conditions which they are proposing to them now, they would not have come at all.

If the government had been honest with them and told them the conditions, we would not have had them in this country at all, and we would not only have saved our

money, but got rid of an element that is to my mind very undesirable. I have had occasion two or three times to express my views on this matter and therefore it is not necessary to go very far now. Another gentleman who addresses the Minister of the Interior says :

So far as we know, all conditions which were promised by the government to the Doukhobors were changed altogether. We have a letter from the Minister of the Interior written to the Doukhobors in which he explained the conditions under which the Doukhobors have been accepted in Canada. In this letter he explained very clearly the Doukhobors may live in villages if they desire, and instead of cultivating each homestead separately, they can do it in one large block near the village.

Whether that is the case or not I do not know, but it does appear that that was the impression made upon the minds of the Doukhobors, and for that reason they came to Canada, as I fear a good many others have come, through misrepresentation. They utterly refuse to take out their patents for their lands, because they refuse to become citizens of this country and to live on separate farms. They want to live in communities. I have here an extract from the report of Mr. McDougall, who is the commissioner in the Northwest to settle the business. He says :

For instance, the following is a typical conversation between your commission and the community Doukhobors: How long have you lived in Canada? Perhaps eight years almost. Is this a good country? Oh, yes, a very good country. What do you think of our government? The government never did us any harm. Is our government better than that in Russia? Oh, yes, very much better. Have you had peace and freedom here? Oh, yes, the government never do us any harm. Why have you not joined this government? Oh, we cannot join any government in this world; God is our king. You have been more than seven years in this country; have you taken out any patents for these lands you are living on? Oh, no, we cannot get patents. Why? If we got patents, we would be subject to the government; we cannot do that. Why are you afraid to be subject to this government? Oh, they would make us fight, and we cannot do that. Do you know that unless you naturalize and become citizens of this country, you cannot secure patents for these homesteads you have entered for? Yes, we know that, but we cannot become subject to the government; God is our king.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that shows a very strong reason why we should not have brought these people to this country—because when they came to this country first, we gave them special privileges—we agreed that we would not make them fight. I am opposed to giving any special privileges to any foreigners. I believe Canada should be a country where all men will be treated alike, and I may say that I believe the legislation passed in this House should be for the whole of Canada not for any particular province of Canada. Now, I want to read a few extracts from a book called 'Russia's Strength and Her Weakness' by Wolff Brand Shelburne, which was published in 1904. It says .

Its population is by no means homogeneous. One-third of the whole does not even speak Russian, and both religious and race strife are rampant.

While neighbouring Protestant or Catholic countries have only from 58 to 65 non-labour days in the year, orthodox Russia enjoins on her peasantry 94 of them.

And these are the people we are paying $5 a head for to our immigration agents —$5 per head for every man and woman and 5 shillings per head for every child. I go a little further and find this passage :

It is stated that on an average the Russian peasants to-day do not labour 150 days out of the year.

Surely that is not the kind of people we want in Canada. If a man wants to make a good living in Canada he will have to work more than 150 days in the year. All the people I know, who have been in any way successful in this country, have worked a good many more days than that. I once heard a wholesale merchant in Toronto say that he never knew a man to succeed who did not work more than ten hours a day, and I think he was pretty nearly right. Most men who start early in life have to work long hours and have to be careful as well if they want to succeed. I have had some experience in that line.

In many districts the drawbacks of this description amount to a veritable curse. In the district of Ouglitch, province Yaroslav, that is in the very centre of the empire, the average portion of each peasant is to-day cut into thirty-six separate strips. In twelve per cent of the rural communities these narrow strips are of a width as low as three and one-half feet.

As I understand it, these people live in villages and have to go long distances to farm strips of that kind. Can any one understand why the government should pay $5 a head to bring farmers of that class to this country? Why they would not be looked upon here as farmers at all or as anything better than common gardeners. How a man can make anything at all out of these strips I cannot understand.

Between 1875 and 1895 this process proceeded at a particularly rapid rate. Within those twenty years according to the statements of M. Polenoff, Moscow, 1901, there was a loss of land per head of peasant population of twenty per cent in the central provinces, twenty-three per cent in the eastern, and twenty-four per cent in the southern districts.

Those must be pretty small farms, unless the farms were very large before, and judging by the strips into which they are cut, they could not be very large at the best. But I think I can show that these people have even worse characteristics:

No saint's day, no communal celebration of any kind, no social diversion, without delights of the bottle.

The real consumption, relying on these figures of vodka, beer, wine and other liquors sold by government monopoly is probably about three to four gallons per head. In a peasant family composed of seven adult male members the outlay on liquor is, of course, much larger, amounting to one-fifth or one-quarter of the total earnings of the family.

Would not that be a nice kind of an immigrant to bring to this country—a man who would spend one-quarter of his earnings in buying liquor. Instead of paying $5 a head to get these people we ought not to let them come in at all.

The Russian peasant has never been taught to work properly. He labours in a half-hearted way, lacks steadiness and persistence, he does not like to work for several days in succession, and never has ideas or purposes taking into account, conditions weeks or months hence.

He must be just a hand to mouth sort of man, and we have too many of that kind as it is.

The census of 1897 shows that in St. Petersburg out of 1,242,815 Russian subjects, 469,720 did not know their letters, or 37·4 of the total population. Of the 290,000 recruits yearly joining the army, forty-five per cent are ignorant of reading or writing. Among the older peasants scarcely five in a hundred can read a line. The female sex is hardly taught at all. The Russian periodical 'Nedya' (the 'Week') makes the statement that not more than one peasant girl out of every seven has even a slight knowledge of reading. In many villages there is not a single woman or girl able to read or write.

These are pretty hard statements if true, and I have no reason to doubt their truth because the man I am quoting from is a reliable authority who has published a book which can be seen by every one who desires to read it.

The great mass of the peasantry (and we must never forget that the peasantry practically mean the whole Russian nation) have not even to-day any general conception of state and government, not even the dimmest All things political in their minds embody themselves in Czar and Church, and blindly follow the lead of these two powers.

In Russia there are 44,000,000 Russians and 86,000,000 composed of 200 different tribes or non-Russians who speak 200 different languages and dialects.

It does seem to me that this class of people at least should be taken out of the list by order in council to-morrow or the next day, and we should discourage by every means possible their coming. The very fact that they are on the list leads me to suspect that the North Atlantic Trading Company has a finger in this pie. I cannot account for the right hon. the First Minister refusing to let the names of the members of that company be known. Is it because they are such criminals that they are afraid to face the courts? They have threatened suicide rather than have the names made published. And the right hon. gentleman is shielding those criminals. I would like to know what would be done with a man who helped a convict in a penitentiary to escape? Yet we find this government, when Mr. Preston refused to answer, calling on their followers to vote down a proposition that Mr. Preston be compelled to give the names of these people. The First Minister stood up in his place, called on his followers to vote the resolution down, and they followed him like sheep. It is hardly credible that you should find such unanimity in preventing the light being thrown on these transactions and the parties to them unless there be some other reason than a desire to do justice. We have not all the figures we would like to have with reference to immigration.

I sometimes look at the returns from the United States, and I find that they contain much information of value. I will not go into them very fully, but I may point out that they show the law of that country provides that, if a steamship brings to the United States a person with a dangerous, contagious disease, the existence of which might have been discovered at the port of embarkation, the owners of the steamship are liable to a fine of $100 for every such case, besides being obliged to carry the diseased person back to the country from which he came. In the year 1907, the steamship companies plying between other countries and the United States rejected no less than 65,000 people. If we had a similar law in this country, it would be of great help. Besides, their system of inspection is very different from ours. In these immigration reports of the United States, you will find that every immigrant must go through an individual examination by a medical officer and then go through another examination by an immigration agent. But how is it in our country? Dr. Bryce says that the immigrants are sometimes examined in batches of 1,000. Some days 7,000 are turned in upon him, so what can he do? On Ellis island, they have great facilities for handling immigrants. The average arrivals of immigrants have been 93,000 a month, but, notwithstanding this, the authorities will not allow more than 5,000 immigrants to be examined in any one day simply because they have not the facilities to efficiently examine more. We ought to be all the more particular in our examination, because we

have no examination at the port of embarkation. I notice that Lord Strathcona states that he tried to have a clause added to the law passed last year authorizing the examination of immigrants before they went aboard ship, but he did not succeed. He also states in his report that magistrates in England will refrain from passing sentence on criminals if they will agree to go to Canada. Is not that a nice state of affairs, Mr. Speaker?—a man is brought before a magistrate charged with a crime, but, if he will consent to leave the country and come to Canada, sentence will not be pronounced on him, I think it is time to put an end to that sort of thing; and, if we are going to take people from other countries—as we are—we should be particular to see to it that they are the kind of people we desire to have in this country, and not any kind of riffraff that they may desire to send us. Now, here is the statement made with regard to the United States showing that of immigrants from Canada to the United States 2,773 debarred. What has become of them?

The report speaks of

The unusual increase in the number of aliens who, originally giving Canadian destinations, proceeded to the United States within one year from date of arrival in Canada. From 9,724 during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1906, this class has increased to 15,677 for the year just closed. This remarkable increase is partially explained by the fact that while less than ·60 per cent of those manifested to the United States at time of embarkation are excluded, more than 10·06 per cent of the 'one year in Canada' class find it impossible to meet the requirements of our laws when examined.

Now, I do not know whether that means that these 15,677 are left with us or not, but that is the way it reads—I have read all there is to it.

The average monthly arrivals at Ellis Island were 93,654. This monthly number equals the total annual arrivals in some of the past years, and when it is considered that each alien is given a separate and individual medical inspection, as well as an individual inspection by the immigrant inspectors, 9,293 of them were detained in hospital for treatment, 64,510 for special inquiry by boards appointed to conduct special examinations, and 121,737 to be called for by relatives, it will be realized that it has been a task requiring unremitting attention to ensure its proper accomplishment.

And when you consider that there were 1,285,949 immigrants entering in the United States last year, and that only 13,064 were deported, after the rigid examination of which I have spoken, it must be conceded that the class of immgrants that come to the United States is better than the class coming to Canada. I was a little curious, a couple of years ago to know whether the United States had ever been in the habit of appointing agents to work for immigrants to come to their country. I received an answer from the acting commissioner of immigration of the United States as follows:

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 8th instant, which has been referred to the bureau for attention. So far as I am informed, the United States never solicited immigrants, although no restrictive measures were enacted until 1875, prior to which time foreigners came to the United States at their pleasure.

You see we are going much further than the United States ever went, and, I think, without any very good reason. Our country is well advertised; we are giving 160 acres of as good land as lies out of doors to any man who will settle on it and work it. It does seem to me that this is quite inducement enough without paying a bonus, or, as the 'Globe' says, 'hiring people to come to Canada.' The Toronto 'Globe' is an organ of the government and one of its ablest, I think, and it has opposed this bonusing of immigrants for years. I have a number of extracts here, which, however, I will not take time to read. But there are some things I would like to put on 'Hansard.' The commissioner of immigration in the United States has issued a circular in which he sets out the undesirability of having people come to the United States who are liable to become charges on the public. I think his views are sound. I wish to give some statistics taken from 'The Immigration Problem' by Thomas Darlington, M.D., president of the Board of Health of New York.

Inspection of school children in New York city.

They are subject to a rigid physical examination. During the first three months of 1906, 23,733 children were examined and 17,362 were found to be suffering from some physical abnormality. Of this number of defectives, 12,170, or 70·1 per cent were of foreign birth. It is safe to assume that a large proportion of the remainder were of foreign parentage, for their names give satisfactory evidence of foreign extraction.

In 1905 the 88 children in one truant school in Manhattan were examined. Of these 77 were found to be physically defective; 74 or 96·1 per cent of these latter being of foreign birth. In 1900 about 40 per cent of the school children in the city of New York were foreign-born.

In 1902, taking the deaths from tuberculosis in the city of New York, between the ages of 15 and 44 years, native-born population, 2,167,-122; deaths during the year from tuberculosis, native maternal parentage, 637. Foreign born population, 1,270.080; deaths during the year from tuberculosis, foreign maternal parentage, 5,087.

These statistics show, I think, that if our immigrants are any thing like those going

to the United States we are suffering and are likely to suffer a great deal more than any one has any idea of from the diseased class, and I shall show further on how this costs the people of the United States and how, in like manner, it must cost us if we are to continue our present system.

An investigation of 500 consecutive deaths of infants from diarrhœal diseases in New York city, shows that 120 or 25 per cent were of native parentage, while 325, or 75 per cent were of foreign parentage. These conditions exist although 63·5 per cent of the total population of New York are natives of the city.

There are in charitable and penal institutions of the country, including those maintained for the detention and treatment of the insane, 3,049,825 inmates. Of these, 11 per cent are aliens and 17 per cent naturalized foreign-born persons, making a total of 28 per cent, although the number of foreign-born persons in the United States is only 14 per cent.

Practically 33 per cent of the insane in the United States are of foreign birth. The New York State Lunacy Commission in 1904, reported that 60 per cent of the insane patients in New York city were foreign-born.

From 1885 to 1894 the total admissions to the hospitals for adults of New York city were 282,928; of these 63·7 per cent were of foreign birth.

During 1905 there were admitted to seven of the largest hospitals of the city 26,839 patients ; of these, 12,550 or 46·6 per cent were native-born, and 14,289 or 53·4 per cent were foreign-born.

The hospitals wholly supported by the city present even a greater problem, for the money is contributed wholly from city funds. In 1905, Bellevue and its allied hospitals treated a total of 35,199 patients; of these, 19,146 or 54·4 per cent were foreign-born. The appropriation for these hospitals for the year amounted to $648,480.76, so that $352,773.54 of the sum was directly spent for the care of sick persons of foreign birth. The maintenance of the cases of contagious diseases transferred from Ellis Island direct to the Kingston avenue hospital of the Department of Health of New York city, cost the government of the United States, during the year 1906, up to December, $84,340. This amount was nearly one-third of the total required for the expenses of the hospital.

This shows that with all the care exercised by the United States government in the admission of immigrants to their country, with their inspection on the steamboats and after landing, this enormous number of diseased and criminal immigrants and immigrants who subsequently go insane, enter that country. These facts are well worth the consideration of this House and of this country.

Cases treated in tuberculosis clinic, July 1 to December 31, 1905.

Number of cases pulmonary tuberculosis treated, 767.

(1) Native-born 236 or 30·8 per cent.

(2) Foreign-born, 531 or 69·2 per cent.

Foreign-born (a) disease contracted before arrival in United States, 27 or 5·1 per cent.

(b) disease contracted within one year after arriving in the United States, 23 or 4·3 per cent.

(c) disease contracted from one to five years after arrival in United States, 147 or 26·7 per cent.

From the standpoint of physical fitness we are in danger of becoming a degenerate nation.

Undesirable aliens.

(a) The illiterates.

(b) The alien of poor physique.

(c) Those suffering from minor physical defects.

I have here an extract from the report of Mr. Robert Watchorn, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York, one of the experts in the service of the United States. I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Watchorn two or three times in Montreal and I was greatly pleased with his manner of doing things. The United States find that the immigrants do not go to the new parts of the country in many cases, just as we find in our country. The number of arrivals at ocean ports in Canada in nine months was 90,008. Of these, general labourers, their wives and children numbered 26,807, and mechanics, their wives and children, 24,414, a total of these two classes of 51,221.

Of farmers, farm labourers, their wives and children there were 18,193, and of more general labourers and mechanics, 33,028. How were these people distributed ? We find in the maritime provinces, 6,491 ; in Quebec, 18,063 ; in Ontario, 32,265 ; in Manitoba, 17,036 ; in Saskatchewan 4,257 ; in Alberta, 3,474 ; in British Columbia, 8,406 and in the Yukon, 16, or a total of 33,189. The balance stayed in the older provinces and I suppose a great many of them that we paid bonuses for and who did come to the country are to be found around the towns and cities looking for work and, I do not say, hoping that they will not find it. In the United States the same thing happens. Instead of the newcomers going to the newer districts, 386,244, or over thirty per cent, stayed in New York ; 230,906, or over seventeen per cent stayed in Pennsylvania ; 83,583, or seven per cent, stayed in Massachusetts and 70,665, or five per cent, stayed in New Jersey.

I want to read a little extract from the Toronto 'Globe' of 22nd November, 1905. That is quite a long time ago.

Canada cannot afford to lose her good name by rewarding her agents for practising deception, neither can she afford to longer appear before the world as forced to pay people to come and live within the boundaries, while the United States can force them to pay for the privilege of entering.

The United States charged $2 per head for every person who entered that country, but they raised it to $4 per head so that any person entering the United States now as an immigrant has to pay $4. I think the 'Globe' is quite right in its view in reference to our paying for getting people into this country.

During the year ending June 30, 1904, our government paid $102,663 in per capita bonuses to the agents and companies inducing people to enter the Dominion. Of this amount, $14,428 was paid on settlers from the United States. The list shows that one agent made no less than $3,107 by persuading people to cross the American boundary.

That is from the Toronto 'Globe.' I suppose hon. gentlemen will take that as gospel.

While the British immigrant costs $2 each with $3 and $4.86 for domestic servants, Icelanders cost us $4.86 each with children half price. . . . . The government should make a radical change and eliminate the bonus or commission system before more serious abuses develop.

I was looking up the other day the views of the Trades and Labour Council and I found that as far back as 1893, 1894, 1895 and 1896 they were passing resolutions strongly condemning the system of granting assistance to induce people to emigrate. I will read one of the resolutions and that will do for the whole. This one was passed in 1893:

Resolved, that the expenditure of any public money, directly or indirectly for the purpose of assisting, bonusing, encouraging or decoying emigrants of either or both the classes mentioned, adult or juvenile, from abroad to Canada is unnecessary and unjustifiable.

A resolution to that effect was really passed every year, and I fancy they are doing it yet although I have not looked into the matter for a number of years past. I think that has been the history of this organization.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that increased bonuses are not necessary on account of any falling off in immigration. I find on page 8 of the report of the Department of the Interior, immigration branch, that during the nine months to the 31st March, 1907, the increase of immigrants over the previous nine months was 34,104. That would seem to show that there was no great necessity for the payment of an increased bonus. There has been a rather strained feeling in reference to the way in which this government have dealt with the British people. I had occasion a few years ago to point out that the government gave seven shillings for a British adult and three shillings and sixpence for a child, while they were paying the North Atlantic Trading Company one pound for every man, woman and child of the classes described, and the deputy minister of the Interior in the committee said that even if the child were born on the passage they were entitled to the pound. I find in the last report of the Auditor General, page L—24, that a bonus was paid of seven shillings for adults and three shillings and sixpence for children. At page L—25 you will find that they paid a bonus of twelve shillings for adults and six shillings for children and on the same page you will find that they also paid one pound for adults and ten shillings for children. Why all these changes should be made by a government which claims to be so stable is something that I do not know. I have some figures in reference to the cost of this service and I find that the government have been very lavish in their goodness to their agents. I find that in Montreal every year they give them uniforms of one kind or another. For instance, here is J. Hoolihan, agent in Montreal; he has a salary of $1,200 and in 1904 he got a uniform worth $27, an overcoat worth $27, trousers worth $7 and a cap worth $5.50; in 1905, uniform $27, trousers $7, and cap $15; 1906, two uniforms $54, overcoat $27, cap $5.50, and in 1907 uniform $27, cap $4.50. Here is James Doyle, clerk, in 1904 he got a uniform worth $25, an overcoat $25, trousers $7, cap $4.50; in 1905 uniform $25, trousers $7, cap $12.50; in 1906 two uniforms $50, overcoat $25, cap $4.50; in 1907 uniform $25, cap $4.50, and so on. This is how they treat their agents in the district of Montreal. The agent in Quebec, in 1905, got a uniform worth $25, an overcoat worth $30 and a cap worth $7; in 1906, two uniforms worth $70, an overcoat worth $30 and a cap worth $10; in 1907 an overcoat $30 and a cap $11.50. It is not necessary to go any further. I now wish to move an amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) as follows: I beg to move seconded by Mr. Blain:

That all the words after the word 'thereof' in the said amendment be left out and the following inserted instead thereof:

The House is of opinion that Canada's policy with respect to immigration should include a more careful selection of the sources from which immigration shall be sought, a more rigid inspection of immigrants and the abolition of the bonus system except under very special circumstances and for the purpose of obtaining particularly desirable classes of settlers.

Mr. E. L. CASH (Mackenzie). I did not intend to speak on this question but when we find hon. gentlemen such as the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) and the hon. member for Lennox and Addington (Mr. Wilson) speaking on the subject of immigration without being familiar with the exact conditions in the west, and making statements which perhaps may lead to a wrong impres-

sion, it is difficult for one to remain silent. The statements of some of these hon. gentlemen with respect to immigration matters in the west are somewhat on a par with the venture of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) who seems to think he possesses a knowledge of everything that goes on in that western country although it is said he has only made on trip there. As this subject will require considerable discussion and as the hour is late I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Public Bills and orders will be taken to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. I understand that by agreement they will be taken instead of government orders.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 18, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ST. CLAIR AND ERIE SHIP CANAL COMPANY.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel) moved :

That Bill (No. 98) respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company be read the first time and be placed on the Order Paper for second reading on Friday next.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That Mr. Turcotte, of Nicolet, be appointed a member of the Committee on Railways and Canals, the Committee on Private Bills and the Committee on Agriculture; that Mr. Lovell, of Stanstead, be appointed a member of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Standing Orders; that Mr. McLean, of South Huron, be appointed a member of the Committee on Railways and Canals, on Private Bills and on Debates.

Motion agreed to.

IRRIGATION ACT—AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 99) to amend the Irrigation Act.

Mr. CASH.

Mr. SPROULE. Explain.

Mr. OLIVER. This Bill as now introduced is to replace one that has been already under discussion by the House. As the result of further consideration of the amendments then placed before the House on information received from parties interested in irrigation it was decided to make certain amendments or additions to the Bill as it then stood. There are only two changes that are of importance; one of these introduces the authority of the Railway Commission to decide all points of dispute which may arise between the irrigation companies and the municipal or provincial authorities; the other is to make provision which will facilitate the provincial governments in carrying on drainage works. The work of drainage is essentially the work of the provincial governments. Under the Irrigation Act all authority in regard to all water is taken by the Dominion government and in order that the provincial government may be in a position to carry on necessary drainage work it is required that the Dominion shall give permission under the terms of the Irrigation Act, and provision is made for that permission.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 100) to amend the Railway Act.—Mr. M. Martin.

LAND GRANTS TO SOUTH AFRICAN VOLUNTEERS.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved that on Thursday next the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution :

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant two adjoining quarter-sections of Dominion lands available for homestead entry to every volunteer who at the time of his enlistment for military service in South Africa under Her late Majesty Queen Victoria, in 1899, 1901, or 1902, was resident or domiciled in Manitoba, or in the provisional district of Assiniboia, Saskatchewan or Alberta, or in the Yukon Territory.

2. Resolved, that every such grant shall be subject to the conditions that the grantee, or his duly qualified substitute, shall select and enter for the said two quarter-sections in the Dominion Lands Office for the land district in which they are situated on or before December 31, 1910; that he shall perfect his entry by commencing actually to reside upon and cultivate the land within six months after the said day; and that he shall thereafter reside upon and cultivate the land for the period, and in accordance with the terms and conditions, prescribed by the homestead provisions of the Dominion Lands Act.

3. Resolved, that any person entitled, under the foregoing provisions, to select and enter

for, either by himself or by his substitute, land as a homestead, may, in lieu thereof, if he or his substitute so choose, receive scrip for $160, which shall be received from the bearer at its face value in payment of any Dominion lands open for sale; provided that any person choosing to take scrip shall notify the Minister of the Interior of his choice on or before December 31, 1909.

4. Resolved, that every such grant of land or scrip shall be made by the Minister of the Interior, upon a warrant issued in favour of the volunteer entitled thereto, by the Minister of Militia and Defence, which shall be recorded in the Department of the Interior, under section 94 of the Dominion Lands Act; and all such scrip shall be subject in all respects to the provisions of sections 94, 96, 97, and 98 of the Dominion Lands Act

5. Resolved, that the entries made and the patents issued under the foregoing provisions shall be exempt from all fees and charges exacted in the case of an ordinary homestead entry.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask my right hon. friend the First Minister whether the report of the Civil Service Commission has been made? If so, how long since? And when will it be brought down?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). We have not received it. A short time ago I was told that we might soon expect it, but I shall have to make further inquiries.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND ELECTIONS.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. I would like to ask the minister for that interesting information concerning matters on the Intercolonial Railway which I brought to his attention yesterday.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I have made some inquiries and have not been able to ascertain if the two gentlemen named have taken any part in the election. I cannot give the definite answer my hon. friend would like in that respect, but have not let the matter drop and am making further inquiries.

HARLAKA JUNCTION RAILWAY CONNECTION.

Mr. J. B. MORIN (Dorchester). I would like to ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) whether he has had any success in obtaining a change in the time-table at Lévis between the Quebec Central Railway and the Intercolonial Railway so as to give passengers going west a chance to connect from one train to the other?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I have no further information to give my hon. friend. The deputy minister has taken the matter up with the Quebec Central Railway, and so far they have not come to any definite conclusion.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to call the attention of several ministers to delays in bringing down returns. I have done this several times already and have waited with a good deal of patience for some of them. I have not yet received the return ordered on December 8th with reference to accounting expenditure made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, nor the return with reference to the Marconi stations ordered on December 18, nor with reference to the expenses of provisioning government steamers ordered on the 20th, nor with reference to the travelling expenses at the Imperial Conference, nor with reference to the travelling expenses of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and his private secretary from 1904 to 1907 ordered on March 22nd, nor with reference to the Pringle papers and the Yukon papers asked for on January 13th. It seems almost unaccountable that the accounting returns are not in, because the minister told me on two occasions they had been copied and were here. I certainly expected them before this. We must have them before we get through with the minister's first estimates.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I have brought down several returns the last few days. I think that some of these my hon. friend has mentioned have been brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. I went over all the returns in the Record Department, and none I have mentioned is brought down.

Mr. BRODEUR. I had given formal instructions to have the reports prepared as expeditiously as possible. The other day we engaged some more employees in order to facilitate the work. Some of those reports are very voluminous.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the date of the motion for the Pringle papers?

Mr. FOSTER. January 13. The same as for the other papers in connection with Mr. Congdon.

Mr. BOYCE. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) when we may expect the return ordered on the 18th December respecting certain timber berths ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot reply at the moment, but I brought down a large bunch of returns to-day, and possibly the one my hon. friend is inquiring about may be included in that.

Mr. H. B. AMES. How soon may we expect the return moved for on the 16th December with reference to the purchase of the site of the new Montreal examining warehouse ordered three months ago?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It will be brought down to-morrow.

Mr. HERRON. When may we expect the return ordered with reference to certain government coal mining lands obtained by the firm of Hough, Campbell & Ferguson?

Mr. OLIVER. I beg to assure the hon. gentleman and other members that all the returns ordered are in the course of preparation and the work is being pushed on as fast as possible, but as such a large number have been ordered it is absolutely impossible to produce them in a short time. They have been under preparation for a considerable period, and in a very few days I hope to be able to satisfy the demands of all those now under preparation.

FLOOD IN BELLEVILLE.

Mr. E. G. PORTER (West Hastings). I wish to call the attention of the right hon. the Prime Minister to a matter of very urgent importance in connection with the flood existing in the city of Belleville.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot do more than ask a question.

Mr. PORTER. That is all I want to do. I do not know if the First Minister is aware of the facts, and I shall make my statement as short as possible.

Mr. SPEAKER. It can only be put in the form of a question.

Mr. PORTER. I wish to ask the First Minister of he will see that an engineer of the Department of Public Works, or some expert in that department, is sent to Belleville as soon as possible to make investigation into the flood now occurring there in the River Moira? The necessity for that is very great, as a number of business houses along the banks of the Moira river are flooded out now——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Porter) will see that that is a matter of discussion and is out of order.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). A few days ago I asked the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in the absence of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), concerning returns brought down in answer to motions relating to dredging in Quebec. These notices appeared first as questions, but the Minister of Public Works asked that they should be put as motions, and they were changed. But the returns have not yet been brought down. They are only small returns and I would like to have them. The Prime Minister will find the matter referred to at page 710 of the unrevised 'Hansard.'

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I move that order No. 15 of Public Bills and orders be now called.

Motion agreed to and order called.

Second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act—Mr. Maclean (South York).

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act. He said: I desire in the first place to thank the government for giving me this opportunity to bring up a Bill that I regard as of considerable moment to the country. I beg to assure the House that, in consideration of this privilege, I will take as little time as possible in dealing with the question. If I deal in a general way with the Railway Act, it is not to expand the discussion but rather to condense it and make clear the changes in this Act that I propose. The Railway Act is, to my mind, one of the most important laws on our statute book. And it is growing in importance. The people take more interest in the Railway Act than they do in almost any other legislation. This is largely for the reason that it concerns every one of us. It concerns every industry in this country and every province of which the country is composed; and so far-reaching is it that I believe it will receive more attention hereafter than it has received in the past. It is a measure worthy the fullest attention of this House and of its committees, and of every one connected with the administration of the law. This law was passed several years ago. It was passed as a government measure, and is called 'The Railway Act.' But it deals, or now proposes to deal, with a number of corporations other than railway corporations. It deals with express companies; it deals—or shortly will deal—with sleeping car companies; it deals with telephone companies. It is in fact, and ought to be in name, a Public Utilities Act. The description of the Act in the statute book is very scant; it is not what I think it ought to be. In the United States they make a very accurate description of their laws so that the public can at once see what the object of the law of this kind is. For instance, in the state of New York, where they have one of the best railway laws in the world, I believe—and it only went into force last year—their law is described in these terms:

An Act to establish the public service commissions and prescribing their powers and duties, and to provide for the regulation and control of certain public service corporations and making an appropriation therefor.

It is apparent at a glance that that law not only gives powers but prescribes duties to these corporations. And it is this prescription of duties to railway corporations, which is so greatly lacking in our law, which it is the object of my amendment to effect. I would like to see the description of our Act recast somewhat along the lines of that of the New York state law or the Interstate Commerce law of the United States so as to set out what it has in view. I would thus describe our law, if it were made what I should desire to see it :

An Act to provide transportation facilities for the people of Canada; to regulate railway corporations and other public service corporations; to create a public service commission; to fix the charges of such companies, and to make provision for the enforcement of this law.

Now, the Interstate Commerce law of the United States establishes a commission, defines the duties of that commission, and prescribes what the railways should do in relation to the public. It also makes provision for the enforcement of the law, and makes an appropriation for that purpose and imposes on specified officers the duty of carrying the law into effect. In Canada, we have nothing of that kind under our Railway Act. Then, in this New York law, they have made provision which we ought to make for the protection of the public. They have two commissions in the state of New York :

Each commission shall appoint as counsel to the commission an attorney and counsellor-at-law of the state of New York, who shall hold office during the pleasure of the commission. Each counsel to the commission shall, subject to the approval of the commission, have power to appoint and at pleasure remove, attorneys and counsellors-at-law, to assist him in the performance of his duties and also to employ and remove stenographers and process-servers.

Then, the duties of the counsel are as follows :

It shall be the duty of counsel to a commission to represent and appear for the people of the state of New York and the commission in all actions and proceedings involving any question under this Act, or under or in reference to any act or order of the commission, and, if directed to do so by the commission, to intervene, if possible, in any action or proceeding in which any such question is involved; to commence and prosecute all actions and proceedings directed or authorized by the commission, and to expedite in every way possible final determination of all such actions and proceedings; to advise the commission and each commissioner, when so requested, in regard to all matters in connection with the powers and duties of the commission and of the members thereof, and generally to perform all duties and services as attorney and counsel to the commission which the commission may reasonably require of him.

To-day, in Canada, if any one wishes to vindicate public rights in connection with the Railway Act, it is largely a matter of his own initiative. He has no assistance from the state in vindicating the law, that the state enacted for the defense of the public. We can well afford to recast our law to make it somewhat similar to the law in the United States. Our general Railway Act for the introduction of which some years ago I give the then Minister of Railways and the government credit, does not define a common carrier in its application to that Bill. At the time I asked the then Minister of Justice and the then Minister of Railways to do this, and yet it was not done. Recently I found that the reason for its not being defined was that the government were afraid to define a common carrier because it would include other companies than railways and they supposed it would be wisdom or prudence in the first instance to apply only to railway corporations proper. As a matter of fact, our Railway Act to-day does not define a common carrier.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. member think that this is pertinent to the Bill ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I wish to show that the railway companies of Canada are not giving the public the service in the way of cars and other shipping facilities they ought to give, and I think I am within my rights and my logic in making this point. In the United States Act a common carrier is defined in the very first clause; the defintion includes express companies and sleeping car companies, and they also define a telephone company and all other companies supplying public services. I think the government when they introduce their own amendments to the railway law, should define a common carrier and make the law applicable not only to railway, express, and sleeping car companies, but to every individual or corporation engaged in any way as a common carrier, except where the traffic is absolutely by water.

If I may be allowed a digression, in the very first chapter of our statute-book it is declared that the interpretation of every law shall be more or less on the lines of the preamble, and it is because we have no preamble in our general railway Act that, in my opinion, a large measure of the injustice which has been done by the railways of this country to the people has arisen. In other words, the railway companies have never yet risen to the conception that while great franchises have been given to them a cor-

responding duty to the public has been imposed on them. That is very patent throughout the Railway Act. There is no declaration in our Railway Act that while the companies are incorporated and given these franchises, and in many cases great grants of money and land, corresponding obligations, complimentary to their powers and franchises are imposed on them to give a proper service to the public. In other words the Railway Act ought to set out that when the franchise is given to a railway there is a duty to the public to be performed by that railway, that the railway must give a suitable and adequate service to the public when it has obtained a franchise.

The necessity of such a preamble, is recognized in the charters of individual railway companies. For instance in the Grand Trunk charter the preamble sets out:

Whereas it would greatly tend to promote the welfare of the province——

—the railway is enfranchised. In the Canadian Pacific Railway charter it is set out that:

For the development of the Northwest Territory——

—the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was created and given all these great powers and franchises.

The Grand Trunk Pacific is created

For the purpose of affording transportation facilities for such territories and for other reasons.

But in the General Railway Act there is no duty imposed on the railways to give the public a proper service. This same absence of any declaration of duty characterizes the Banking and Insurance Acts. The granting of a charter to a bank is supposed to be for the purpose of having banking facilities afforded to the public; but I have known the general manager of a bank to say that they were not in any way obliged to provide banking facilities for the public. I do not mean, of course, that the banks should be called on to discount any man's note but I assert that there is a duty imposed to provide banking facilities. The same thing applies to insurance companies which should be required to encourage thrift and to look after the savings of the people, which come under their charge. But these obligations are not set out in any of these general Acts and as a consequence the railways especially, the banks, and sometimes the insurance companies have never risen to the conception that when they were given great franchises they were also charged to perform duties to the public. If these companies do not perform the duties to the public for the performance of which they were created—parliament must interfere, some one must interfere and compel them to render to the public the service for which they were enfranchised. It is hard for the public to get its rights when it has not the assistance of the government or of a department of the government—because these corporations have become so enormously wealthy and powerful. Some have behind them the interest on five hundred to a thousand millions of money, and this vast concentration of wealth and influence is arrayed against the individual, who cannot secure his rights unless they are clearly specified in the law. A duty rests on some one to aid him in securing his rights, whatever they may be.

I now come to the principle of the Bill which I have introduced. It has been pointed out by the critics of my measure that the word 'reciprocal demurrage' is a misnomer. Reciprocal demurrage, as understood by railway men, means that if a shipper agrees to pay demurrage after a certain number of days, he pays it; if a shipper unloads his car before the time agreed upon, then he should be allowed something on this account as against the other cases when he exceeds the time limit agreed on and has to pay demurrage. In that case the demurrage would be reciprocal.

But the term should be broadened, not very much, but broadened sufficiently so that if the railways can charge the public demurrage the public are entitled to take something from the railways in case they do not meet the requirements of the shippers as to the supply of cars or expedition in the transportation of freight. This lack of the railways to meet the requirements of the shippers of this country has to-day created a real grievance, and I will be able to show, by the letters that I have here, by my own experience and as a result of my own investigations, that the railways of Canada in past years have not accommodated the people with regard to the supply of cars and the transportation of freight. Moreover, I will be able to show, as every hon. member in this House knows, that industries have been ruined and that businesses have been almost wrecked because they could not get the railway accommodation that they required. Farmers have not been able to have their grain shipped and farmers and drovers have not been able to have their live stock shipped with the result that a genuine grievance in this regard exists all over the country. It exists not only in Canada, but in the United States and serious efforts are now being made throughout the United States by state legislatures at Washington and also in this country to have the law changed so that the public will get the service to which they are entitled. I want to tell the House something that is not quite a secret, but which it has taken me a good long while to find out, and that is that the two great railways that we have in this country—I refer now especially to the Grand

Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway and to that portion of their business which lies in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec—which were enfranchised, which were created and which were bonused by the money of the people and municipalities of this country, give a preference to traffic which originates in the United States and which pays a lower tariff than Canadian traffic pays. This is a serious charge to make and yet I know it is true. The Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec devote nearly all their best equipment, their best men, their best engines and their siding accommodation to the rushing forward of through traffic that originates in the United States, and they almost neglect the Ontario and Quebec traffic. Whether that is true in the Northwest I cannot say, but I do know that these two great railways which were primarily created to serve the people of Canada devote their best energies and equipment and the services of their best men to forwarding the traffic that originates in the United States, while ignoring, delaying and unjustly treating the traffic which originates in this country. I know instance after instance where this thing has happened, I have had letters from all over the country to the effect that shippers could not get accommodation while traffic which had originated in the United States was going through the country day after day. I want to point to another thing that I found out in connection with these railways in Canada, and that is that they have not all the equipment not only in the way of engines and rolling stock, but they have not the siding accommodation and terminal facilities which they should have. Such terminal facilities, rolling stock and siding accommodation as they have are largely devoted to the handling of this foreign traffic while they are ignoring Canadian traffic. This is something which should not be. Yet these railways were given enormous subsidies and important franchises by the people of Canada. They have had their rights looked after in this country if anybody has, and yet they have neglected to cultivate Canadian traffic. Of course, it is easy for the general manager of a Canadian railway to go to Chicago and make an arrangement for the handling of so many cars a month. Our Canadian railway managers do that time after time. They go to Chicago, they make large contracts for the handling of American traffic, they devote their energy and equipment to the handling of this American traffic, and as a consequence Canadian traffic is ignored. There is not a member of this House, and especially a member who comes from the provinces of Ontario or Quebec, who has not had experience of the neglect of Canadian traffic and who has not seen American traffic being rushed across the country at a rapid speed. That should not be, and if we have a Railway Commission, if we have a Railway Act and if we have a Railway Department, the law, the department and the commission ought to see to it that Canadian traffic is first accommodated and that Canadian freight and passengers are justly treated in this respect. Not only do they give this preference in the way of rushing American traffic through our country, but they are guilty of another thing against this country; they give a preference in rates to American traffic. The farmer of this country to-day has to encounter not only the competition of the American farmer in the English market, but he is placed at a further disadvantage by the fact that the American farmer has his produce carried through Canada from Chicago to the Canadian sea-board at lower rates than the Canadian farmer is called upon to pay. While the American farmer can have his produce rushed through Canada the Canadian farmer is often blocked. Although the Canadian farmer has created these railways, has given them their franchises and their bonuses he gets the worst of the bargain. It ought to be set out in our Railway Act that these roads were created to supply transportation facilities to the people of Canada and that it is the duty of the Railway Commission and of the Railway Department to see that fair treatment is given to our farmers in this respect. Just to show that there is a substantial grievance all over Canada in regard to railway transportation and the lack of sufficient railway facilities, I wish to read a few extracts from letters which I have received. For instance, here is a letter from the Winnipeg Jobbers and Shippers Association, dated December 18, 1907 :

Dear sir,—We notice in this morning's papers a despatch from Ottawa, dated December 17, respecting a deputation of Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway officials who waited on the Minister of Railways regarding the proposed legislation for this session, when these gentlemen presented their objections to the amendments to the Railway Act providing for reciprocal demurrage, proposed by your good self.

This is the first that we have heard of your proposed Bill in connection with reciprocal demurrage. We might say that when the Railway Commission held a sitting in Winnipeg in July last, this matter was urged on them strongly by our association, the Winnipeg Board of Trade and other interests. From time to time practically all the organized bodies in western Canada have advocated and urged upon the Railway Commission the necessity of providing for reciprocal demurrage, and we feel confident that if your proposed Bill embodies the principles which have been advocated so strenuously in the past the different organizations will support your Bill through their representatives on either side of the House

Here is a body in Winnipeg speaking largely for the west—and later on I can quote the declaration of the farmers living further west—who have joined with the jobbers in declaring that we should have legislation in this country compelling the railways to give a speedy service for the transportation of their traffic and to supply shippers with cars. Here is a letter I have received from a gentleman living at Mile End, Que.:

I trust you will pardon the liberty I am taking in writing, but having noticed in the papers that you were bringing before parliament a measure for reciprocal demurrage in connection with the Railway Act, I take this opportunity of wishing you every success in your endeavours to bring the same to a successful issue.

I, for one, have suffered great inconveniences and loss at the hands of the railways during the past year, and have been called upon to pay demurrage upon cars that the railways have had in their possession for weeks at a time, but could not get delivery of them.

Any number of shippers throughout Canada have had their freight delayed for weeks and for months; goods have been refused, shippers have had the goods sent back to them, shippers have had their drafts returned because the goods were not delivered. Men have been ruined in business. Only last year I purchased certain goods from a manufacturer within 150 miles of Toronto, the man had the goods but he could not deliver them for six weeks because the railway company would not give him cars. That man wrote me he would be driven out of business. The railways to-day have put small manufacturers and small dealers in various parts of this country out of business because they would not deliver their freight for them. And yet, day after day, miles of cars, and the best engines, and the best equipment of these two great roads, and all their siding accommodation have been centralized on the handling of American traffic to the detriment and delay of Canadian traffic. It is a serious charge I make, but still it will be verified by the business men almost anywhere in Canada. That condition of things should not continue. I have here a Calgary paper which, reflecting the condition of things out there, last August, writes:

Merchants and shippers throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion have based their hopes on Mr. W. F. Maclean's new reciprocal demurrage Bill as an ameliorative for the car shortage problem. For the past year they have clamoured loudly for some form of mutual responsibility in the handling of freight cars. Boards of trade passed resolutions, petitioned the Railway Commission and the Dominion government. Stories of months of waiting for cars appeared in the public press, and then, like a bolt from the blue, came the welcome news of the introduction into the federal House of a Bill which was to prove a panacea.

I do not know that this Bill is to be a panacea; the main thing I wish to get at before parliament and the country to-day is that parliament can in some way cure this grievance. Parliament can make an inquiry and if it finds that the railway companies of Canada have not a proper conception of their duty to the Canadian public—and I maintain they never have had the conception that their first duty is to the Canadian people—then parliament can bring them to a proper sense of their duty and order that if they wish to handle this American traffic, and I do not wish to deny them the right to do it, they shall only do it after they have made proper provision for the wants of the Canadian people. The same question is up in the United States, and I have here a copy of a Bill which has been introduced in Congress to deal with it as a federal principle. It goes on the line that the only way to bring the railways to time is to fine them when they fail to provide shippers with cars and deliver freight at its destination within a reasonable time, and correspondingly to fine the man who wants the car if he does not load and unload within the time. An effort is therefore being made in the United States to bring about this reciprocal demurrage. Here is a letter from that important body, the Dominion Millers' Association, which has its headquarters in the Board of Trade Building, Toronto. It was written to me on April the 10th last:

I was about to inaugurate an energetic campaign in support of your reciprocal demurrage Bill, but I am informed that on account of the lateness of the session and the absence of some of the ministers that there is no possibility of the Bill passing this session. Please wire me on receipt if this is not correct as there is a meeting of the council of the board of trade to-morrow, and if anything is to be done in support of your Bill, action should be taken at once.

I, however, do not want to start action which would be useless and prevent other parties giving their enthusiastic support later on when it might be of great assistance.

The Dominion Millers' Association which handles millions and millions of bushels of the grain of the west, declare that they are prepared to join in an active campaign to compel the railways of this country to afford sufficient shipping facilities to the people. That is a declaration from a most important body, and other bodies all over Canada are passing resolutions of the same kind. The Winnipeg Jobber's Association writes me:

For your information we inclose copies of letters that we have sent to the different pro-

minent members of the Grain Growers' Association in convention at Brandon to-day.

That was written on January the 16th of this year, and that convention of the Grain Growers Convention passed a resolution supporting this proposal, and requesting parliament to pass a law that would compel the railways doing business in the west to provide sufficient accommodation for the traffic of the west. Go where you will in this country, whether in the west or in the east, the railways are not supplying the accommodation to the Canadian people they ought to, and at the same time you will find they are giving a very good service to traffic that originates in the United States, and they are doing it at a less charge than they impose upon Canadian traffic. The situation is so serious that the duty devolves upon parliament of affording relief. Speaking of the west, I wish to hand in a document which I have received from the J. H. Ashdown Hardware Company of Winnipeg. I will only read an extract from a letter I received from the concern a few days ago. The letter says :

January 20, 1908.

W. F. Maclean, M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear sir,—Your reciprocal demurrage Bill, which has already received a first reading, is a real necessity at the present time and promises to be of greater necessity as time goes by, because the requirements of this country (owing to the short season of grain movement from the west and the necessity of bringing supplies forward during the season of lake navigation) must be met promptly. The railway companies require a reciprocal arrangement which involves them in a loss of revenue to emphasize this necessity. This fact has been recognized in several of the states of the Union, which have adopted reciprocal demurrage as a measure of relief for car shortage.

If, therefore, it would advantage the country to have a legal arrangement which would compel the movement of cars a certain mileage per day, the only question to consider is what mileage will prove acceptable, how many miles can the railways transport cars per day and how many miles per day is necessary to provide for the conditions which have and will prevail unless prevented.

Your Bill provides for 50 miles per day, which might be considered reasonable for branch line service but is inadequate, as will be perceived at a glance, for main line service, because the time consumed between Montreal and Winnipeg would be 28 days and between Montreal and Vancouver 58 days.

During the season of 1906 delays to freight were constant, involving the whole country in a great loss, and at that time the question of reciprocal demurrage was under advisement by the hon. Board of Railway Commissioners of Canada.

We furnished statements showing time occupied in transit from the eastern manufacturing districts to Winnipeg and feel that we cannot do better than send you a copy of our reports made then, as they show conclusively that railway companies can transport cars 100 miles per day even during unsatisfactory weather conditions, therefore, there should be no objection to inserting 100 miles in your Bill for main line service in place of 50 miles, as it reads at present.

It appears no provision has been made in the Bill either to compel railways to interchange cars promptly or to place them for unloading within a reasonable time after arrival at destination.

We think the provisions of the reciprocal demurrage Bill should extend to transfer railway companies who are employed in the interchanging of cars in transit, before the journey commences or at its termination; 24 hours should be considered sufficient time for this purpose, with 24 hours additional in which to place cars upon private sidings. In the case of cars for unloading upon regulation team delivery tracks, the 24 hours allowed for interchanging should be sufficient to also convey the cars to such team tracks.

Yours truly,
THE J. H. ASHDOWN HARDWARE COMPANY, LIMITED,
Per Denison.

They inclose a statement which shows delays that have actually occurred in important shipments of grain made from the west to the east. That statement is as follows :

STATEMENT of cars received via Owen Sound in 1907, showing number of miles per day travelled between shipping point and Owen Sound and between Fort William and Winnipeg.

Car.	From	Shipped.	Arrived Owen Sound.	Days en route.	Mileage.	Miles per day.
146368	Toronto	April 15	April 30	15	122	8
82514	"	May 1	May 14	13	122	9
77316	Montreal	April 27	" 16	19	353	18·5
22744	"	May 16	" 27	10	353	35
57722	Toronto	June 1	June 9	8	122	15
19672	London	" 1	" 13	12	196	16
147124	Toronto	July 2	July 3	1	122	122
45596	"	" 2	" 3	1	122	122

Average miles per car per day, Eastern Canada points to Owen Sound, 43·2.

Shipped from Fort William.	Arrived at Winnipeg.	Days en route.	Mileage.	Miles. per day.
May 4.....	May 7.....	3	427	142
" 18.....	" 20.....	2	427	213
" 20.....	" 23.....	3	427	142
June 1.....	June 3.....	2	427	213
" 13.....	" 18.....	5	427	85
" 17.....	" 20.....	3	427	142
July 6.....	July 9.....	3	427	142
" 6.....	" 9.....	3	427	142

Average mile per car per day, Fort William to Winnipeg, 153.

at anything like the proper speed. People will not buy goods if they cannot be delivered more promptly; and unless the traffic is handled better, people cannot do business, and we are going to lose traffic. The province of Ontario could do an immense business with the western provinces in the supply of fruit and other productions if a better and quicker service were provided, and I believe the maritime provinces could regularly send their fish and other products to the west. It is the duty of the railway companies to serve Canadians and to serve them with despatch; but I do not believe there is a railway manager in this country who accepts the responsibility of the duty imposed upon his company co-extensive with the

Car.	From.	Shipped.	Arrived at Winnipeg.	Days En-route.	Mileage.	Miles per day.
		1906.				
43,626	Hamilton	December 26....	January 2.....	7	1,328	190
9,686	Guelph	" 19...	" 5.....	17	1,343	79
142,226	Toronto	" 27...	" 6.....	10	1,288	129
		1907.				
146,408	Tilsonburg	January 27.....	February 6.....	10	1,400	140
54,196	St. Thomas	February 2.....	" 14.....	12	1,410	117
40,532	Hamilton	" 2.....	" 16.....	14	1,328	95
39,218	Montreal	" 16.....	March 1.....	13	1,422	109
13,364	"	" 14.....	" 2.....	16	1,422	89
50,830	Hamilton	" 22.....	" 2.....	8	1,328	166
53,982	Port Hope	" 13.....	April 2.....	19	1,410	74
144,672	Hamilton	" 23.....	" 6.....	13	1,328	102
4,144	London	" 16.....	" 9.....	23	1,412	61
146,870	Montreal	April 14	May 1	17	1,422	84
47,780	"	" 10.....	" 4.....	24	1,122	60
45,650	"	" 23.....	" 5.....	12	1,422	118

Average mileage per day all rail is 104 from Eastern Canada.

Average miles per car per day for all rail travel, 98.

Car.	Shipped Fort William	Arrived Winnipeg.	Days en route.	Mileage.	Miles per Day.
144,610	Dec. 28	Jan. 1	4	427	107
21,388	" 28	" 4	7	427	61
140,772	Jan. 2	" 4	2	427	213
27,762	Feb. 3	Feb. 5	1	427	213
14,462	" 7	" 11	2	427	107
23,550	" 10	" 12	2	427	213
144,442	" 25	" 29	3	427	142
146,258	Mar. 2	Mar. 4	2	427	213
34,728	" 5	" 7	2	427	213
144,736	" 29	Apr. 1	3	427	142
41,762	" 29	" 1	3	427	142
45,074	Apr. 4	" 6	2	427	213
144,386	" 26	" 30	4	427	107
45,688	" 28	May 1	3	427	142
16,198	May 5	" 7	2	427	213

Average mileage per day is 163.

This shows that these railways are not moving farm products of the west to market

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN.

franchise conferred upon them. All these railway managers think their whole duty is to their shareholders, for whom they think they ought to make some kind of a dividend. So they ought; but they have a duty also to perform to the public, and that duty is to give to the public a good service. If you went to Mr. Hays or Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, or to any of the men under them, and said to them, it is your duty to give me this service, they would laugh at you; they would say, my duty is to my shareholders and to my board of directors. But I say that their duty, under the common law, and under the Railway Act, as it is or as it ought to be, is co-extensive to the public, and they are bound to provide the necessary cars and equipment for the proper handling of Canadian traffic. Here is a letter from a farmer, in which he says :

From my experience, I know it is essential for such an Act to be in force.

This demand exists not only in Canada, but everywhere else. I am going to refer to what has been done in the United States.

This law regarding demurrage which I have dealt with is taken largely from an Act that was introduced into the legislature of Michigan some time ago. That legislature did not accept the law which I suggest here to-day, but passed the following provision :

Every railroad shall, when within its power so to do, and upon reasonable notice, furnish suitable cars to any and all persons who may apply therefor, for the transportation of any and all kinds of freight in carload lots. Every common carrier shall have sufficient cars and motive power to meet all requirements for the transportation of passengers and property which may reasonably be anticipated. In case of insufficiency of cars at any time to meet all requirements, such cars as are available shall be distributed among the several applicants therefor, without discrimination between shippers or between points of shipment, whether competitive or non-competitive: provided, preference may be given to shipments of live stock and perishable property. The commission shall have power to make and enforce and shall make and enforce reasonable regulations for the furnishing and distribution of freight cars to shippers and switching the same, and for the loading and unloading thereof, and for the weighing of the cars and the freight offered for shipment over any line of railroad, and shall fix reasonable per diem demurrage to be paid for the detention of cars by shippers or consignee, and for the failure or delay of the railroad to move the cars the number of miles per day as ordered by the commission: provided, that the upper peninsula be exempted from the provisions of section eight of this Act, in so far as they relate to the fixing of per diem demurrage charges.

This is the first time that a railway commission has been given power to impose fines upon the railway company and upon the consignee if they do not unload the cars within a reasonable time. I have here a letter from the Michigan Railroad Commission, which says :

In accordance with your request addressed to the Secretary of State, we are handing you herewith a copy of the Railroad Commission Act; in section 8 of which you will find the reciprocal demurrage law of this state. The commisison did not take office until October 1, 1907, and have not as yet been able to take up this subject and hence no regulations have been issued under the provisions of this section. We shall be glad to give you any further information possible upon request.

I have heard since from the commission that they have actually got to work on the question, and that they are framing rules with the purpose of imposing fines on the railways for not providing accommodation for the public. The same duty has in a measure been referred to the Public Service Commission of the state of New York. This commission was appointed only one year ago, and one can see, if he reads the newspapers of the day, especially the New York press, that it is dealing with the grievances of the people against the public service corporations of that state—not only the local traction companies and the electric light companies, but also the railway companies. During the year that commission has been in existence it has done an immense amount of public service, and it has issued one of the finest reports on the railway situation that I have seen, a report which is worthy of the perusal of every member of this House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What are its powers ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Its powers are wide, though not so wide as the powers given to our commission. The Public Service Commission and the Inter-State Commerce Commission can only see that the charges of the railways are reasonable, and the courts decide what is reasonable; but in Canada the charges can be made by the commission itself without the interference of any other court. Apart from that, the powers given to the New York commission are very wide; and the Act which is the basis of that commission is the best drafted railway Act that exists anywhere to-day. Mr. Hughes selected the best men he could find for the two commissions. A majority of them only can belong to one political party. They are young, active, energetic men, and they have issued this report. It is the most instructive report on the railway problems of the day. They set out that they have looked into these grievances, especially the grievance of the public not getting a sufficient number of cars, and that in a very short time they hope to draw up rules which will secure adequacy and efficiency on the part of the steam railway service in the United States. That is discussed on page 22 of this report. If any one wishes to get a copy, all he has to do is write to the secretary of the Public Service Commission of New York State at Albany.

The commissioners say first of all that they must ascertain all the facts and examine them and then find a way of compelling the railways to give efficient service. But the great thing I wish to insist on is that in the United States that task has been undertaken. A commission has been appointed to perform it. That commission has been given wide powers and above all a sufficient appropriation together with the power to employ all kinds of assistance. They have the right to appoint counsel and do appoint counsel to enforce the law. There is a very strong movement in favour of railway reform in the United States to-day. The machinations of those corporations which control the local tractions of New York, by means of which the local tractions were exploited for over $5,000,000 and that amount of watered securities put upon the investing public have all been brought out within the year by one section of the commission. The other section have taken up

those other grievances. They have the power and the determination—and I hope we have in this country the same power and determination—to bring about a complete reform.

I do not wish to do anything unfair to the railways of this country. I do not wish to see their dividends reduced. I would like to see them have reasonable dividends. I would like to see reasonable dividends paid on all investments in this country, but unless we follow the example of the United States, unless we impose upon the railway companies the duty of serving the public and appoint officers to enforce the law rather than leave its enforcement to the private shipper, nothing will be accomplished. Therefore it is incumbent on parliament and the Railway Department and the law officers of the Crown to provide a law that will be effective in removing these grievances. It is incumbent on parliament and the government to provide officers who will enforce the law, whatever it may be, and who will convince our railway corporations that their first duty is to provide the Canadian public with ample facilities for the moving of traffic both freight and passenger.

The railway companies have issued a pamphlet in reply to this proposal of mine. I am not going to read it or undertake to answer it. It begs the question throughout the whole of its argument. In other words, the corporations say that there is no necessity for any action by the Canadian parliament. That pamphlet has been circulated all over the country. But the answer to it is in the experience of every hon. member of this House and every business man in the country and every farmer and raiser of live stock. There is necessity for dealing with this question. The railways are not giving the public the accommodation to which the public is entitled, and as a consequence Canadian trade is not as prosperous as it should be. Our factories are not as busy as they might be because they cannot get railway accommodation, and in some cases because the railway companies see fit to give some of their shippers a preference over the smaller shippers. It is no doubt a substantial grievance that some of the largest shippers get something like car accommodation while the smaller cannot get the accommodation they require.

In order that I may be as short as possible, I shall, while discussing the general Act and the principles underlying it, discuss them in connection with the Bill which follows. I am inclined very much to look for some improvement in the law because of a statement made not long ago this session by the Prime Minister. He said that he was not quite a believer in public ownership, as applied to railways, but was a believer in the regulation of railway corporations. Well, the proposal I am making is on the line of

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN.

increased regulation of the companies. It is on the line of the regulative Acts passed in other countries; and if the right hon. gentleman accepts the principle—and it is a good principle, and the outcome of regulation may be ownership, as I think it will be—I hope that parliament will find a way of regulating these corporations.

I wish now to come to one or two of the other points on which I propose to regulate these railways. I may be trespassing somewhat on the measures which the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) proposes to introduce. He has been making promises throughout the country that he intends proposing something in the way of increased regulation of the railway. He has even gone so far as to say that he might extend the Intercolonial Railway, and he has certainly told the public that he has a Bill yet to come down from his department which will deal with these companies. I tried a couple of years ago to get express companies brought within the regulation Act and they have been brought in, and in a Bill which I have here I propose to include sleeper car companies.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is in another Bill.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It is a Bill that immediately follows, and if allowed to make my explanations now, that will save time later on. It has been said that, as a matter of fact, sleeping cars companies are covered by the Act, but I have seen a memo. from the Railway Department which says that sleeping car companies do not come within the Act. If there is any doubt about that it ought to be removed, and I have a Bill here which will apply the Act to sleeping car companies.

The next clause I come to—and it is one which calls for more support throughout the country than any other—is the clause providing for a uniform passenger rate of two cents a mile. That proposal was laughed at when first introduced in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is travelling outside his Bill. Unless with the consent of the House he is out of order.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. All I want is to facilitate business by discussing the two Bills at once and have them both referred to a committee. I shall only be a few moments. That proposal, while it was declared to be too sweeping, has vindicated itself. The two cent a mile proposition has been carried in legislature after legislature in the United States. The law has been enforced and wherever enforced, the revenue to the railway companies has increased.

The public have been accommodated, the rates have been reduced and the companies have made money. I have here letter after letter from municipalities in this country that have passed motions in favour of two cents a mile. In the state of Ohio, whose

conditions are very similar to those of Canada, they have passed a similar law, and I have here the report of the Railway Commission of that state which shows that the earnings of the railways have been increased and that the railways would not change the system even if they could. In the state of Michigan—a case that was quoted against me a year or two ago—where the Grand Trunk has a large business, the two-cent-a-mile system has justified itself and has been applied to the whole state. And here is the 'Railroad Gazette,' the organ of all of the railroads of the United States and the leading railroad paper of that country. I have here the issue of January 31, which contains an article on the experience of the two-cent-a-mile rate on the New York, New Haven and Hartford road, a company which dominates all the New England States. The opinion expressed in that article is fairly represented by these two lines which I quote from it :

With every allowance on the plus and minus side. the increased revenue from reduced and uniform rates is peculiarly impressive.

To sum it up: Here is the testimony of the railroad organ of the railroads themselves; here is the report of the railroad commission of Ohio; here is the experience in the State of Michigan; here is the experience even in the southern states where the railways opposed the two-cent rate, and, after appeal to the courts, compromised by making it 2½ cents, and afterwards admitted the two-cent rate in regard to 500 and 1,000-mile tickets.

Mr. BELAND. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) aware that only last month, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania voided a law prohibiting the lines in that state from charging more than two cents a mile?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am quite aware of that. The effect of that decision is that time must be given for investigation. Under the constitution of the United States, you cannot pass a law which would injure anybody's interest. But in Pennsylvania, it is only a postponement for the time to enable investigation to be had and an accounting to be made. Still, I venture to say, the two-cent-a-mile rate will prevail, as a matter of fact in Pennsylvania. For we know that, already, the Pennsylvania road runs its lines in Ohio on the basis of the two-cent-a-mile rate. It is not fighting the law seriously, and, in a short time, the two-cent rate will prevail all over Pennsylvania. It is already prevalent practically all over the state of New York, rather by custom than by law, as I have already pointed out in the House. But the great, the dominating fact is that wherever the two-cent-a-mile rate has been tried, it has succeeded—traffic has been stimulated, the people travel cheaply, and are able to 'route' themselves as the saying is, and the railways have larger receipts and consequently are in a better position to pay profits to their shareholders. That is the sum and substance of the two-cent-a-mile agitation as worked out in the United States.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think I shall have to rule that the hon. member (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is travelling outside the scope of the Bill. If he is permitted to do this, it can only produce a general discussion of railway matters.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I had about finished, Mr. Speaker. I have only two other points to deal with, but I will deal with them at another opportunity. I was trying, as I think is commendable in a member of the House who seldom takes up the time of the House, to cover the ground as speedily as possible and save the time of hon. members. I quite see the reason of your ruling—probably it would establish a bad precedent in the House.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, is evidently afraid of my long speech.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It may be so. To close the discussion on this first Bill, I desire to say that it is manifestly the duty of the House to take up this question and to regulate the railways by imposing upon them the duty of giving a better service than they have given to the Canadian people, and, as a necessary step to that end, to increase their equipment, to increase their siding accommodation, and, above all, to pay attention to Canadian traffic. Of course, they may urge that Canadian traffic is sometimes massed in some seasons, and falls off greatly at other seasons. That is true in a measure. But the great point is that, at the time when the cars are needed, they are not provided in sufficient numbers, and that there is not a sufficiency of terminals and sidings. This is where the breakdown in Canadian railways takes place—insufficiency of terminals and sidings and of equipment. And it is time for the Canadian parliament to insist that these deficiencies should be made up and that Canadian railways should devote their best energies to the handling of Canadian traffic.

Whether it is wise to seek reform in the direction proposed in this Bill or not, of course, I do not pretend to say with authority. Seeking to effect a reform, I am under the necessity of proposing some substantial measure to the House. My proposal is to enact a law expressly providing a penalty for a road which refuses to supply within a reasonable time the cars that a shipper may require, and providing a reciprocal fine on the shipper who does not take advantage of the cars supplied him. It may be better to attempt this reform in the way adopted in the state of Michigan, by giving the Railway Commission power to impose this fine.

My main object is to bring on a discussion of the case with a view to effecting the desired reform. But if we do impose this duty upon the Railway Commission, we must certainly enlarge that commission, for our Railway Commission now is overworked. It cannot deal with complete efficiency with the questions that have already been referred to it; and, if we are to turn over to the commission the control of every public utility in the country, it will have to be considerably enlarged. It may be necessary to re-arrange the commission in two divisions as has been done in the state of New York. But, in some way, this question must be dealt with, either by parliament or by the commission. If the commission is to deal with it, the commission must be given high-class assistance, not only in the way of legal advice, but in the way of expert railway advice—they must be able to call upon men who are learned in the movement of traffic and the requirements of the people in regard to shipping facilities. But, if we approach the question determined to find a solution, we shall certainly find it, and, finding it, we shall remove a substantial grievance under which the people now suffer. You hear of it every day. My main purpose is to have the matter discussed. I suppose that it should be sent to a committee. For my part, I should like to see a special committee deal with this question; but, of course that is a matter altogether in the hands of the government. But I do trust that parliament will take hold of the question and deal with it. There is nothing predatory, nothing revolutionary in such a proposal as this. But in some way the railway companies of this country have got it into their heads that if any one proposes to regulate them in parliament or suggests a law to regulate them he is to be treated as a pirate. I met a prominent railway man the other day, and he said: Hello pirate. I asked him what he meant and he said: You are attacking the railways and trying to do injustice to them. I said: All I am seeking to do is to compel the railways to do justice to the people of the country and to give them fair railway facilities at a fair price and in a speedy way; there is nothing unfair, there is nothing predatory in that, and I believe it is the view of parliament that something must be done and will be done to regulate this matter which is one of the substantial railway grievances of the people of this country.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington). Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) first introduced this Bill, I think in the month of December, I was inclined to think that there was some necessity for legislation of this kind in Canada, and that this matter was not perhaps completely covered by the legislation which we had on our statute-book. There is no doubt that, particularly during the last two or three years, there have been many complaints from shippers, from associations of shippers, from farmers' associations and others in regard to the scarcity of cars and the slow movement of freight. Many of these have come to my own knowledge; I have been consulted in reference to some of them. Since the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) introduced his Bill I have had occasion to look up the legislation which we already have on the statute-book in regard to this matter, and I have come to the conclusion that we do not require any further legislation, that we have now passed all the law that is necessary to give the relief which the hon. member seeks to accomplish by means of his Bill.

I wish to refer briefly to the sections of the Railway Act which I think fairly cover this whole question. The first of these sections is No. 284, which provides:

> The company shall, according to its powers . . . . (c) without delay and with due care and diligence, receive, carry and deliver all such traffic; and,
>
> (d) Furnish and use all proper appliances, accommodation and means necessary for receiving, loading, carrying, unloading and delivering such traffic.

Then subsection 6 of the same section provides:

> For the purpose of this section the board may order that specific works be constructed or carried out, or that property be acquired, or that specified tolls be charged, or that cars, motive power or other equipment be allotted, distributed, used or moved as specified by the board, or that any specified steps, systems or methods be taken or followed by any particular company or companies or by railway companies generally.

Then, by section 317, it is provided:

> All companies shall, according to their respective powers, afford to all persons and companies all reasonable and proper facilities for the receiving, forwarding and delivering of traffic upon and from their respective railways and for the return of rolling stock.

And by section 318, subsection 3, it is provided:

> For the purposes of the last preceding section, the board may order that specific works be constructed or carried out, or that property be acquired, or that specified tolls be charged or that cars, motive power or other equipment be allotted, distributed, used or moved as specified by the board, or that any specified steps, systems, or methods be taken or followed by any particular company or companies, or by railway companies generally.

By section 26 and 28 of the Railway Act the board is empowered to make either general or special orders in regard to all these matters, and by section 30, subsection 2, the board is empowered to penalize companies who disregard their orders in this respect up to the sum of $100 in each instance.

I submit that under these sections of the Railway Act, as it stands in the statute-book of Canada to-day, the Board of Railway Commissioners has full power and ample jurisdiction to carry out all that my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) seeks to have placed in the statute-book by the Bill he has now introduced. There is this further fact that the Board of Railway Commissioners has already dealt to some extent with this very question. The matter came before the board in regard to demurrage properly so called; that is, in regard to that charge which railway companies impose upon shippers or consignees of freight in regard to delay in loading or unloading cars which have been placed at their disposal. The matter came up because railway companies arbitrarily fixed their own rates of tolls for delay in unloading cars. Complaint was made and the board then fixed the rate and the time limit within which cars should be unloaded. When the matter was being considered the question of so-called reciprocal demurrage was also argued before the board. Many associations and many shippers had made complaints to the board, and in January, 1906, the Board of Railway Commissioners made a formal report upon the subject. In that report they state that:

> In some cases parties have asked that the allowance of the charge be made conditional upon a provision for what has been called 'reciprocal demurrage,' or some penalty or charge for delay by railway companies in supplying cars, or in receiving, transporting, or delivering traffic. This latter subject requires more investigation and consideration than the board has yet been able to give to it.

The commissioners in their report proceed to say that the board have decided to promulgate a set of rules applicable to car service and the movement of cars. These rules were promulgated in January, 1906, although the question of reciprocal demurrage has never been fully dealt with by the board. The charges that are made by railway companies to-day are made under the rules which came into force in January, 1906, and were passed under the authority of the Railway Act by the Board of Railway Commissioners. The other question, that of so-called reciprocal demurrage, is still pending before the board. I had occasion within the past two days to ask the secretary of the board whether or not the commissioners had dealt with that question, but I was informed that the question was still under consideration and that they were waiting to see what the result of the present car service rules would be, after these rules had had a fair opportunity of being tested.

There is no doubt that during the past two or three years very serious difficulty has arisen through the scarcity of cars in this country, but can it be fairly argued, as the hon. member for South York has attempted to argue, that the railway companies are really to blame for the scarcity of cars which has been experienced in Canada? My hon. friend from South York argues that Canadian railroads have been placing their best cars, their best motive power and their best equipment at the disposal of American shippers to the disadvantage of Canadian shippers, and at the same time he argues and he well knows that in all shipments of American freight passing through Canada the Canadian companies are met by what is called competitive rates, and, as the hon. member himself states, goods are carried through Canada on a through freight rate from American points at a lower rate than the local rate on Canadian goods. If they do so, Canadian railway companies are actually discriminating against themselves in accepting American freight at all these points at lower rates than can be procured in their own country where there is a tremendous demand for all the cars at the disposal of these companies at higher rates of freight. I believe that the railway managers are looking after their interests and looking well after their interests and that they would not permit such an anomalous condition of affairs to continue for a moment if they could prevent it.

As a matter of fact it is to the interest of every railway company to see that every car it has is not only in service the whole time but is moved at the highest speed that it is possible to move it. Within the past two or three years the railway companies of Canada have put forth tremendous efforts and have spent a tremendous amount of money in the improvement of transportation facilities, in terminals, in switches, in sidings, in the reduction of grades and curves and in the supply of motive power and cars. I do not think that the railways can be fairly blamed for the condition of affairs which has existed for the past two or three years. The real cause of the difficulty has been the rather abnormal trade condition which has existed in Canada for four or five years past. Trade has developed and the country has opened up to an enormous extent, to an extent which was not anticipated probably by anybody. The railway companies have put forth their best efforts to keep pace with the growing trade but they have not been able up to the present time to keep pace with it, although I see it stated in the newspapers, not only of Canada but of the United States, that in all human probability there will be no difficulty during the present year from car shortage or from slow freight movement. I have consulted a publication which I think came out this year for the first time in pamphlet form called 'Railway Statistics of the Dominion of Canada for the year ended June 30, 1907' by Mr. J. Lambert Payne, controller of Railway Statistics—a very useful and

a very able pamphlet which gives a great deal of interesting and valuable information. At page 20 of his report Mr. Payne says that the result of the new equipment provided by the railways of Canada

Is encouraging but puzzling. Comparing the returns for 1906 with those for 1907, the figures are as follows:

	1906.	1907.	Increase.
Locomotives	2,931	3,504	573
Freight cars	96,565	113,514	16,949
Passenger cars	3,319	3,642	323

This applies to all the railways of Canada. Then, it is interesting to note just what the increase in the number of cars has been during the past year:

In freight equipment the comparison by classes of cars yields the following result:

	Increase.
Box and stock	11,037
Flat	1,952
Coal	2,063
Refrigerator	262
Caboose	161
Other	1,474

The 'other' in the above list refers very largely to ballast, tool, tank, flanger and special cars.

There was a total increase last year of 16,949 freight cars over and above the number in existence during the preceding year and of these it is rather interesting to note, on page 22, that 13,352 have been constructed in Canada leaving 3,597 as having been imported into this country from other countries. There have also been constructed in Canada 397 passenger cars and 227 locomotives. Now, Mr. Payne goes on to point out in his report that every car and locomotive shop in Canada during the last year or two has been running overtime and to its full capacity.

Mr. TURRIFF. Does it give the number of cars that were put out of commission during the year?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Yes, it gives the percentage; I will come to that. Notwithstanding the fact that every car and locomotive shop has been running to its full capacity and notwithstanding the importation of 3,597 freight cars from other countries the railway companies have not been able, during the past two or three years, on account of the abnormal trade conditions, to keep pace with the demand for greater facilities for shipment. But, there are also pointed out in this report two causes which have operated against the railways in their efforts to supply sufficient cars—two causes which are given by Mr. A. F. Dillinger, who is described as the operating assistant to the traffic officer of the Board of Railway Commissioners. One of them has reference to the effect of the Lord's Day Act upon railway operations. Mr. Dillinger, in a report to the Railway Commissioners, states that:

The effect of the Lord's Day Act upon the handling of traffic by the company means a loss of 21 per cent of its capacity, leaving 79 per cent of the total capacity available.

Then Mr. Payne in his report, adds:

This estimate is sustained by the testimony of railway managers in common. Applying it directly, it may be said that the effect of this measure is the equivalent of putting 23,838 freight cars out of commission, since that number is 21 per cent of the total supply.

By the operation of the Lord's Day Act—an Act which received the very hearty, almost unanimous approval of this House—the operations of the railways are very seriously curtailed for one day in the week and, there being an absolute stoppage of a great deal of the railway traffic for one day in the week, it is difficult for the railways to keep up the continuous stream of traffic that they otherwise might if they were permitted to operate in all their branches during seven days of the week. The report further points out that:

The operations of the Manitoba Grain Act are also reported by Mr. Dillinger to have seriously hindered a satisfactory distribution of cars in the west, and the effect thereof has been sympathetically felt in the east.

Just a few words to show what the leading railways have done during the past year; I have not the figures for the year before, but I have them for the past year, and I propose to show what the Grand Trunk has done in the way of new equipment and in the extension of its line to enable it to better meet the requirements of the traffic of this country. Last year the Grand Trunk had in commission no less than 31,019 freight cars the list being made up as follows:

Freight equipment, December 31, 1906.	
Box cars	21,432
Furniture	434
Refrigerator	588
Stock	1,392
Coal	2,622
Flats	4,551
	31,019

From January 1 to October 31, 1907, the company has built in its shops and purchased from outside firms the following new freight equipment:

New freight equipment purchased January 1, 1907, to October 31, 1907.	
Box cars	1,250
Furniture	250
Refrigerators	400
Stock	500
Coal	1,000
Flats	1,550
	4,950

An average of twenty new freight cars for every working day of the period.

This represents an expenditure of about $3,796,000.

In addition to the above, 1,597 box cars and 719 flat cars were purchased by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company during the same period representing a further expenditure of $1,919,986; all these cars are in use as Grand Trunk equipment. The company has put into commission for the use of its traffic during ten months of the year, 7,258 freight cars, at an expenditure of $5,715,986

The Canadian Northern Railway has also made great progress in increasing its equipment; in fact its whole equipment dates back only one or two years. At page 85 the statistical summary will give you the figures as follows :

Canadian Northern.

Locomotives—	
Passenger	42
Freight	137
Switching	7
Total	186

The following freight cars have been put in commission within the last twenty-two months :

Box cars	5,186
Flat	984
Stock	121
Coal	48
Refrigerator	52
All other freight	160
Total	6,551

It has also an equipment of 6,551 freight cars of various kinds all put in commission within the past twenty-two months. Turning to the record of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I find that the Canadian Pacific Railway last year increased its locomotives by the number of 185; tourist, colonist and baggage cars 194, freight and cattle cars (all told) 6,255. Taking the record of the Canadian Pacific Railway from 1901 to the present time we find that in the seven years they have increased their motive power by 588 modern engines and their equipment by 20,322 additional cars. This has been done at a cost of approximately about $35,000,000, and it does not include the vast sums which have been expended in providing additional sidings, reducing grades and curves; all done for the purpose of securing the more speedy movement of freight throughout their lines in this country. Under all these circumstances I do not think it can be fairly urged that the railway companies are very much to blame in regard to the scarcity of cars or the slow movement of freight. But if they are to blame, the proper remedy is not to be found in the Bill introduced by my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean). He proposes in his Bill that if a railway company does not place cars where it is asked to place them within 96 hours after receipt of the order, the railway company shall be penalized at the rate of one dollar per car per day it is in default. I am satisfied that the Bill as drawn is not the real intention of the hon. member; it is certainly very loosely put together, and as an example of this I would point out that there is no limitation as to the number of cars which a man may demand, so that if the railway company should be asked for 10,000 cars they would have to pay a dollar a day for each car they had not supplied within 96 hours. I am satisfied and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) has told us that his real object was to bring this question up for discussion in the House and he has probably achieved his aim in that respect. I submit that this House is not the proper place to deal with an intricate matter of railroad operation such as this. We have in the Board of Railway Commissioners three gentlemen very capable and very well experienced in these matters. They have the jurisdiction, and the whole case can be presented before them, the details inquired into, and expert opinion taken in such a way as cannot be done before a body such as this House of Commons which has neither the experience nor the organization to deal with this matter as well as the Board of Railway Commissioners. I submit that the proper tendency of legislation in regard to railroads is to increase rather than to curtail or limit the jurisdiction or authority of a board specially constituted for that purpose. I believe that while the discussion of the matter may be good, the proposal of my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) is not a good one and the proper course for the House to pursue is to leave the matter where it now lies, in the hands of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. KEMP. Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) tell me if the regulation whereby the railways are permitted to impose one dollar per day demurrage on the shippers is to be found in the Railway Act, or is it a regulation made by the Board of Railway Commissioners?

Mr. GUTHRIE. That was a regulation of the railways but it was objected to and then the Board of Railway Commissioners in January 1906, passed what are known as the car service rules, imposing that penalty of one dollar per day.

Mr. KEMP. It is not reciprocal.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth). I have not always been able to agree with my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) in his ideas regarding railway legislation, but on this occasion I heartily concur with the principle of his Bill. As I myself petitioned the Board of Railway Commissioners to put in effect this principle at their first meeting in Toronto in 1904, and it has since been urged by numerous influential bodies all over Canada. However, the Bill as we have it before us is rather loosely drawn and there are a great many things in the details of it with which I cannot agree, but with the general principle of it which we are now discussing I do agree. It cannot be

denied that the shippers throughout Canada labour under a great grievance at present. That has not been denied by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) who has been arguing the case against the Bill. There is first of all the grievance that a shipper of freight is unable to get a car sometimes for weeks and sometimes for months, and there is the second grievance that when he gets a car and it is loaded and starts on its journey it is often two or three times longer on the road than it ought to be under any proper business management of the railways. I have been shipping freight for the past twenty-five years and I purpose giving my own experience to show that such is the case. During the last ten years, in that part of each year when there is a great necessity for quick transportation of perishable goods we have been unable to get cars. In some years that has been felt to a greater extent than in others. Gradually growing worse, the past year has been the worst of all, and we have been unable to move perishable stuff to its destination before the frost came to destroy or damage, or deteriorate it very seriously. The reply of the railway companies as set forth in this pamphlet is that they are procuring cars as fast as they can, that every car in Canada is worked to its fullest capacity and that they are buying cars in the United States as rapidly as they can get them. That may or may not be so, but the fact remains that the companies have not got the cars, and the fact also seems to be plain that neither of the great companies operating in Canada is short of money. If they were serious about supplying cars to carry this traffic I maintain that they ought to have been able to secure them somehow or other. The statements in this very pamphlet condemn the efforts they have made in this direction. In the pamphlet there is a statement prepared by Mr. Chrysler on behalf of the railways of Canada showing the number of cars they have in service for every 10,000 tons of freight moved one mile. The period covered in this statement is four years and it shows the increase of the number of cars during that time. I find that during the four years the Canadian Pacific Railway has increased the ratio of the number of cars to 10,000 tons of freight carried per mile, eight per cent; the Grand Trunk 20 per cent; the Union Pacific 24 per cent; the Erie 25 per cent; the Baltimore and Ohio 50 per cent; the Alton, Topeka and Santa Fe 16 per cent; the Chicago and Northwestern 16 per cent; the Northern Pacific 14 per cent; the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific 14 per cent; the Illinois Central 20 per cent; the Chicago and Milwaukee and Central 23 per cent; the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy 30 per cent, and the Great Northern 18 per cent. It will be seen from this statement that the Canadian Pacific Railway has increased the ratio of its cars very much less than any of the other railways which are referred to except two which I have omitted, namely, the Southern Railway and the New York, New Hampshire and Hartford.

I submit that they have not done their duty even in respect of providing sufficient cars for the rapidly increasing traffic. I do not wish to refer to my own personal experiences; but during last autumn, for six straight weeks, from the 15th of October until the 30th of November, I asked the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for refrigerator cars to carry fruit, the most perishable thing which could be shipped, to the Northwest. I required about twenty-five cars in those six weeks; but in all that time I got only one car. The result was that I was obliged to haul all the fruit a distance of two miles to the Grand Trunk station, and ship it by American roads via Chicago, thus giving employment to Americans instead of Canadians, though I always prefer to ship by Canadian roads if I have the opportunity. What is the remedy for this? There must be some unjust and unfair distribution of the cars. There cannot be a proper system in the management of the railway, because my experience is only that of every other shipper in the district. The Canadian Pacific Railway had plenty of refrigerator cars somewhere during those six weeks, for they were carrying on business; and where was there a place in Canada where such cars were more urgently needed at that time of the year? The plea of the railway companies is: Oh, you ought to distribute your shipments over a longer time; we cannot possibly provide cars for a rush season of two or three months in the year. That plea is not good. Nobody else in the country works on that principle. That is something like a farmer saying, at the time his crop is ripe, I cannot afford to keep three or four binders, because I have not work for them all the year around; I will only keep one, and keep that working till the whole crop is reaped. Every business in this country is operated on the principle of providing for the maximum load. Suppose the manager of a canning factory should say to a fruit grower: We cannot provide two hundred hands to handle the fruit at this particular time; you must distribute your fruit over the season, so that we can keep going all the year around, in January and February as well as in October. A man who said that would be looked on as a fool; or what would be said of an electric power company which failed to provide sufficient current at the peak of the load between 4 and 6 o'clock, at which time the greatest amount of power is required, on the plea that they could not afford to do it because much less is required at other periods of the day, and yet that is what the railway companies say in regard to furnishing cars. But is it a fact that there is much greater traffic in the months of October and November? In this pamphlet,

prepared by Mr. Chrysler on behalf of the railway companies of Canada, the railway companies give a table showing the tonnage carried in all the months of the year, and that table absolutely contradicts their own theory. The highest tonnage was in October, being 1,917,000,000 tons; the next highest was in May, being 1,915,000,000 tons, practically the same as in October. Leaving out the two winter months, December and January, I find that the lowest figure for the ten months was 1,625,000,000 tons and the highest 1,917,000,000 tons, not a very great difference. The fact is that the tonnage of the highest month, October, is only 12½ per cent more than the average of the twelve months and only 7 per cent more than the average of the ten months, leaving out January and February, which are respectively 1,365,000,000 and 153,000,000, only about 20 per cent below the average of the year. What would the railways do with the traffic if we gave it to them during the winter months? They would say, we cannot handle it, because the roads are blocked with snow ; and yet they handle in those months only 20 per cent less than the average of the year. So that their plea that we want to crowd the traffic on them in two months of the fall is not justified by the facts which they themselves produce. It is the fault of the railways themselves if they have not enough cars. They have to-day all the cars necessary to carry the traffic if those cars were handled with the speed that a good business man would require. I want to give some absolute proof of that. I have in my hand a statement which I have prepared of all the shipments—not two or three picked out as unfavourable samples—which I made to Winnipeg during the autumn of 1906. There were fifteen or twenty cars, and the average time occupied by those cars in making the journey from the Niagara district to Winnipeg was over ten days. My hon. friend from South York provides in his Bill that a car must travel at the rate of fifty miles a day. That would be absolutely absurd. At that rate it would take twenty-eight days to go to Winnipeg and sixty days to go to Vancouver. In that respect I would expect the railway companies to snap up this Bill very quickly. There should be provision for different rates of speed for different classes of goods. Fruit, which is very perishable and deteriorates very rapidly, should be carried much more rapidly than other kinds of freight. I can give the numbers of these cars, the dates they left and the dates they arrived in Winnipeg, but I do not wish to detain the House, and I presume hon. members will take my word that this is the case. They ought to have made the journey in five days. The railway companies would probably say that this would be a tremendous rate of speed ; but it is only at the rate of eleven miles an hour. There should be one fast line running in each direction, carrying stuff at a reasonably rapid rate. All we ask is that a car should be attached to the first freight train moving out. If that were done, I venture to say that we would require only half the cars we have to-day to carry the traffic. In the autumn of 1905 the Dominion government offered to send a man to accompany five cars of fruit from the city of St. Catharines to the Northwest to make an experiment. The fruit growers selected a man, not to control the cars, but to watch the temperatures, and to try to get the fruit taken with the first train that moved out. Now, what are the facts? The first car, No. 41015, Grand Trunk Railway, left St. Catharines on October 4, 1905 ; it went by North Bay, as the previous ones did, which I have spoken about as all those did which left St. Catharines in charge of fruit growers ; it arrived in Winnipeg on October 9 ; the time occupied was five days and six hours, and it lost twenty-four hours en route waiting for connections.

The second car, the Hanrahan refrigerator, No. 1517, left St. Catharines the 6th October and arrived 11th October. This was also five days and six hours on the trip. The third car was a New York Central car, No. 40774. It left October 10th and arrived October 18. It was thus eight days on the trip. The fourth car, Canadian Pacific Railway refrigerator, No. 82400, left St. Catharines October 13th and arrived October 18th, exactly five days, notwithstanding delays in transit of considerable length. The fifth car, a Canadian Northern car, No. 16082, left St. Catharines October 18th and arrived October 24th, making five days and six hours on the trip. There were four cars that went through in five days and six hours and this gentleman who went through on them said they lost twenty-four hours on the road owing to unnecessary delays. But if they had gone through in one day less, that would be only the rate of speed at which the beef train goes all the time from Chicago to Montreal. And that train keeps to its regular time every day in the year. Our fruit from the district takes this train from Toronto to Montreal and goes through in thirty-six hours. At the same rate it would go to Winnipeg in five days or just the time the cars from St. Catharines took when a fruit grower was along to expedite the speed by seeing that the cars were not stalled at some junction point. What did this man do in order to get his car through with as little delay as possible? He went with the train, and when it reached Toronto I suppose he gave the conductor half a dollar and said : See that that car is put on the next train, and by means of that outlay of fifty cents he got his car on the first train that went out to Winnipeg. At North Bay

I suppose he gave another half dollar to have his car attached to the first train going to Winnipeg. He could not hurry the train, the train did not go any faster from Niagara to Winnipeg, but he could see that his car in every case got the first train, whereas the ordinary course is for cars to lose half to two-thirds of their time in transit by lying on side tracks or switches waiting for somebody to find them and send them on their journey. This is an outrageous condition whereby shippers are losing hundreds of thousands of dollars every year, and this might absolutely be prevented if the railways were conducted on sound business principles, and the cars moved along as they would be if some one was looking after them, and the railway companies would have plenty of cars to supply every shipper with all required promptly, without buying a car. Surely a remedy is required. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) says the remedy is in the Railway Commission. To a certain extent I agree with him. That was the argument put forth by Mr. Chrysler on behalf of the railways, namely, that the Railway Commission has absolute control and power, and will do what the shippers want done. Perhaps so, but they do not do it. I want to read a few extracts from the rulings of the Board of Commissioners to show that they do not do it, and do not intend doing it. They claim they have plenty to do without doing that, and that if we have any claims for damages against the railway companies we must fight them out in the courts. I do not pretend to say that the Commission are not going to make any regulations. They may do so. They have absolute power, under the Railway Act, to make rules and regulations and impose penalties. There are plenty of sections in the Act which give all the powers necessary but they take the position that they have nothing to do with past offences. It is their business to make rules and regulations and to arrange rates, but they have nothing to do with past offences. These must be taken to the courts. When some years ago there was a loud outcry for the appointment of a commission—an outcry from the boards of trade, the manufacturers and the farmers—what were the arguments used, and what did they want a Railway Commission for? The people wanted it for two things. One was to adjust the rates properly and the other to settle claims expeditiously and cheaply. If a shipper who has a claim against a railway company has to take that to the courts, he might as well quit. We have too many courts in this country. The farmer or shipper who has a claim against a company knows that if he wins in the first court, that is only the beginning of his trouble. His case is carried on to a second court and perhaps a third, and the poor man is worn out. Consequently, very few undertake to go into court against a railway company. That was one of the many reasons why the people wanted a Railway Commission. But the Commission absolutely divest themselves of the power to settle grievances of that sort. Let me give one or two cases in proof of what I say :

Re complaint Brown Brothers Company v. Canadian Northern Railway Company.

The complainants alleged that on May 2, 1906, they delivered to the Canadian Northern Railway Company at Warman, Alberta, two boxes of nursery stock, consigned to L. H. Daly, of Vegreville, Alberta, and that the shipment proved a total loss to them, occasioned by the neglect or refusal of the railway company to carry and deliver the traffic without delay.

It appeared from the answer filed on behalf of the railway company to this complaint that a period of fifteen days had elapsed from the time of receipt at Warman Junction until their arrival at Vegreville, a distance of 262 miles, and the railway company was advised that the board felt, under the circumstances, it should take into consideration the Brown Brothers Company's claim for damages, and that such steps should be taken as would prevent the recurrence of such delays.

Held, Chief Commissioner, March 12, 1907, that, under the Railway Act, the board has no power to award compensation to parties for delays in forwarding traffic, as the Act expressly provides that the remedy is to be had by action in the ordinary courts; that the function of the board is to require the furnishing or accommodation and the forwarding of traffic without delay, while the circumstances admit of the board interfering; but that, in case of a transaction which is closed, the board can only deal with it as showing the necessity for action to prevent such delays in the future.

Now, one of the main reasons for this Railway Commission is to deal with past transactions, but they absolutely denude themselves of that power.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does my hon. friend think that the Railway Board ought to have power to hear and decide a case of damages?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Yes ; the Interstate Commerce Commission has.

Mr. GRAHAM. Be careful.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I have here some reports of the Interstate Commission showing what they have actually done. This is the case of the American Fruit Union of Cincinnati, Ohio, against the Cincinnati, New Orleans and Texas Pacific Railway Company :

It is further ordered that said defendant be, and it is hereby notified and required to cancel its rates upon strawberries under refrigeration, or to establish and put in force on or before said 15th day of September, and apply to the transportation and refrigeration in transit of strawberries in car loads, over its line of railway from said shipping points to said Cincinnati, a rate which shall not exceed 22 cents per crate of twenty-four quarts,

with a minimum car load of 450 crates per car.

Mr. GRAHAM. That was too high a rate charged.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. It is a claim for damages because of the undue rates charged, and the ruling was this :

And it is further ordered that said defendant shall pay as reparation to injured shippers, upon shipments of strawberries that moved during the season of 1907, the difference between the unreasonable rate of 27 cents per crate and the rate of 22 cents per crate now declared to be reasonable and lawful.

That is one case. Here is another case, the case of E. W. Pressley versus the Gulf, Colorado and Santa Fe Railway Company, and St. Louis Southeastern Railway Company of Texas. The decision is :

Complainant is entitled to recover from the defendants the sum of $404.96 as reparation for unjust and unreasonable charges on specified shipments of cotton seed made under the rates complained of in the case.

Mr. LANCASTER. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. E. D. Smith) if these are penalties or are they of the nature of a decision of civil action for damages? Do they undertake to give the plaintiff a penalty against the railway company?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I think most of these are for unreasonable charges, but here is another complaint, a case in which a railway company shipped by the wrong route. They should have routed the freight in a certain way and they routed it in a different way. And the decision is :

It is ordered, that the defendant, the Northern Pacific Railway Company, be and is hereby directed and required, on or before the 1st day of January, 1908, to pay unto the complainant the Hennipin Paper Company, the sum of seventeen hundred and sixteen dollars and sixty-two cents ($1,716.62) as reparation for an excessive and unreasonable charge caused by misrouting six carloads of print paper.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. There is a case.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not wish to hamper my hon. friend (Mr. E. D. Smith) in his remarks, but to gain information. I have been studying the point, and I think he will see that there is a distinction there between imposing a penalty and compelling refund of an overcharge. This is a case where the freight was misrouted, and they charged the complainant too much. It is a case of overcharge and nothing else.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. The other cases I have are on the same line—unreasonable charges. But these are only a few that I happened to pick up. I do not know what the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission may be further than this. But if our Railway Commission has not this power, it ought to have it, otherwise what recourse is there for a shipper? Take that case of Brown Brothers to which I referred. They are turned down by the Railway Commission on the ground that the commission has no jurisdiction. They go to the courts with an action against the railway company. The first thing that confronts them is the Bill of lading declaring that the shipper takes all the risk, and this has been signed by themselves. The shipper signs—he must sign, unless he wants to pay 25 per cent additional—this Bill of lading declaring that the goods are carried at the owner's risk of deterioration. I had a case in which the railway company were twenty days carrying nursery stock from the Niagara district to Howick in the province of Quebec. When it got there, the farmers would not take it. They did not examine it, but it was away past the season and they concluded that it must be dead. So the shipment was a total loss. I appealed to the Railway Board, and their reply was that they had no jourisdiction. And, of course, the courts will give you no redress because you have signed a Bill of lading assuming all the risk. It seems to me that the Railway Commission ought to have power to deal with such a case. And if the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) does not provide for such a case, I trust that the government will soon introduce a Bill which will confer this power upon the Railway Commission and require them to exercise it. What would be the use of the Railway Commission making regulations with regard to the speed of trains if they have no power to impose a penalty? I submit that the object the people of this country had when they called for the appointment of a railway commission has been almost entirely frustrated if that commission has no power to award damages in such a case as that.

Mr. KEMP. Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. E. D. Smith) tell us what caused the delay of 20 days in the case of which he spoke ? What had the railway company done with the shipment meantime ?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I never learned that. There are other instances that I might give. Here is the case of a shipment made on May 22. One lot was shipped to Bowmanville, which is 150 miles from Winona. This was shipped with several others on car No. 300,478 for points east of Toronto. That car should have gone to Bowmanville which was the first stopping point It arrived in Bowmanville after fifteen days. All the parties for whom shipments were intended went to the station for five or six days and then gave it up. One man wrote that he had gone as late as May 13, the day before the shipment arrived, and refused to go any more.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the reason given by the company for that delay?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. They never gave us any reason. We never get any satisfaction from them. They put the whole thing upon the shipper, on the ground that he has signed the Bill of lading assuming the responsibility. We appeal to the railway company first—I appealed to the company in the case of the Howick shipment.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the risk—the risk of accident?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. No. they never claim that it is accident, but simply delay.

Mr. KEMP. How would a demurrage apply in case of less than a carload?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. My suggestion is that there should be a rate of speed for each class of freight, for carloads and for less than carloads; the higher the class of freight the faster it should go, and a carload should go faster than less than a carload. It would require considerable time and skill to work it out.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It would have to be adjusted.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Yes. It seems to me that the Railway Commission should have power to make rules and regulations providing for the rates of speed of different classes of freight and fixing the penalties; or else the board should have power to punish the companies for undue delay, the commissioners themselves being the judges as to whether there is undue delay or not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How could it be worked out? You might have a good many different rates of speed, but only a limited number of cars on a train. I appreciate the suggestion, but I do not see how it is to be worked out practically.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. It would do no harm if the lower class freight were carried at as rapid a rate as the best.

Mr. GRAHAM. That might be all right in the case of one car but not in others.

Mr. LENNOX. A great deal of the delay is due to leaving off the cars at stations.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Between such places as Toronto and Winnipeg, there ought to be a fast freight service. Every car of perishable stuff ought to go on that train. If there were not enough cars of this freight to make up a train, it would do no harm to put on cars with a lower grade of freight.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. They should not be allowed to drop a car wherever they like and leave it there.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Cockshutt) suggests: What if the locomotive would not be able to haul it? I do not think there is a sufficient quantity of perishable stuff going from Toronto to Winnipeg or on any other line to require more than one train at any time. If there were it would not be difficult to form a second train. I would not ask any unreasonable treatment of the railway companies; they should be given plenty of latitude, but at present there are undoubtedly grievances. For instance in the Winnipeg case that has been mentioned, when a man accompanied the shipment the cars went in five days six hours. We should not be compelled to lose the goods by having a car on the road an unreasonable length of time. I could give scores of cases where cars were on the road so long that it was a wonder that the goods did not rot. In one case they were out so long that the mice destroyed them. A car of sugar left Halifax on the 5th of February and arrived at Hamilton on the 18th of March. Two other cars left and arrived on the same day. For instance, five cases of jam left Winona September 19, had not arrived in Toronto November 2. Ten cases left Winona September 2, had not arrived in Toronto October 18. Forty-one cases left Winona September 30, had not arrived in Toronto November 2. Toronto is fifty miles from Winona. A box of nursery stock shipped from Winona April 18, arrived in Little York, a suburb of Toronto, April 30. Four or five days should have been sufficient. Thousands of cases like these can be mentioned. It seems to be absolutely unreasonable, and the remedy lies clearly and plainly in the imposition of penalties by the Railway Board. The railway companies say: It is all very well to talk about imposing penalties, but we are doing the best we can. I think I have shown that they were not doing the best they could. Does anybody suppose it should take 20 days for boxes of goods to go from Niagara to Howick in Quebec, or 15 days from Niagara to Bowmanville? I have cited a few cases were it has taken 10 and more days to go from Toronto to Hamilton, when the journey should be made in two hours. The fact is the average of shipments, car load and less carload, take from two to ten times as long en rotue as they would if they went on the first connecting train from each junctional point.

The railway companies urge in this pamphlet and their argument against the shippers is that they unduly waste cars by holding them longer than the 48 hours allowed for unloading, paying $1 a day for demurrage, because they find it cheaper to pay $1 a day for a car than to provide storage themselves. I for one would be very willing that the railway should be permitted to charge $2 or $3 per day for the detention of a car after a certain length of time. The 48 hours is long enough, and if the car is kept longer it would be quite right to charge more provided we have some reciprocity, provided the railway companies agree to give us cars within a reasonable time and to forward the freight at a reasonable rate of speed. The railway companies

sometimes seem to have no concern, however, about the useless detention of cars. I shall give an instance. Last fall I had two cars of sugar shipped from my hon. friend's factory at Wallaceburg to Niagara and after about a week's delay I wired him to know where they were. He traced them and found they were in Hamilton and had been there four days. I called up the railway agent at Hamilton and asked him where the cars where. He said : I do not know anything about them. I then called the agent of the connecting railway and he said: They are held here pending a little dispute with the other railway about rates. I asked the difference in the rate, thinking it might be worth my while to pay it rather than have the cars further delayed. He said the amount was 60 cents; he had held several cars of sugar there four days for a matter of 60 cents. They were evidently not hard up for cars, although that was right in the fall when every one wanted cars.

This question has become very widespread and some remedy must be provided. My hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) quoted resolutions from trade associations and boards of trade from all parts of the west asking for relief. I hold here a resolution adopted by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, one of the most powerful organizations in this country, was adopted in September, 1907. That resolution reads:

'Whereas the investigations which have been and are being made by the Railway Commission undoubtedly establish the fact that the railways have totally failed to supply sufficient equipment and adequate and proper facilities for the handling of the business of the country; and,

Whereas, the Railway Commission has authorized certain regulations, which provide for the charging of additional tolls to the shippers or consignees when cars are held under load or awaiting loads beyond the free time allowed; and,

Whereas, the car service rules, authorized by the board for certain exceptions, but in case of a dispute invariably cast the burden of proof upon the shipper or consignee, while the arbitrator is appointed by and under the control of the interested railways; be it

Resolved that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association now in convention, respectfully petition the honourable the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada to provide and put in effect without delay some plan for penalties against railway companies, for failure within a reasonable limit, first, to supply empty cars; second, to haul loaded cars to destination, or, third, to place cars for unloading after arrival at destination, so as to secure to the public a prompt and adequate service within the meaning of the Railway Act; shippers to be given the same protection by the board as is afforded to the railways; the arrangement to provide for an equitable adjustment of demurrage charges by an independent body.

This question has become almost a national one. Every shipper in this country feels that a frightful injustice is being perpetrated and that penalties must be imposed upon railways for failure to do their duty. As the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has said, I do not for a moment wish to be thought to have any animus whatever against the railways. We all know and agree that they are performing such a service to this country as no other corporations in the country can perform, but at the same time these corporations have charters from this parliament, they are the creatures of this parliament, they have received enormous subsidies and bonuses from the people, and their charters provide that they must serve the public and serve it properly. They are not in the same position as a private company ; there should be some reciprocity and while the shippers are penalized for failure to do certain things the railway companies should be penalized for failure to perform their part. I submit that is the only way in which we will ever get justice from any railroad. Practically every law on the statute-book provides a penalty for its infraction and the only way in which you can expect to get satisfaction in this regard from the railway companies is to impose a penalty for failure to do certain things. So long as the Board of Railway Commissioners go on making rules, and stopping at that, we will never get better satisfaction than we do to-day. What do they propose? That if a shipper has a grievance, if he has not cars, he shall apply to the Railway Commission; that the commission has power to order companies to supply cars. What would occur if every shipper did that ? Suppose that every shipper needed cars and knew that he could not get them within a month unless he did something desperate, and wired to the Railway Commission, what would be the consequence? The Railway Commission would require about 200 more clerks. The clerks would have to divide the cars among the 500 shippers applying, but this is something which the railways could do more efficiently and quickly than it could be done by a round-about method such as an application to the board. The proper people to distribute the cars are the railway companies and if they do not distribute them as rapidly and as fairly as they should there is some reason for their not doing it; they are the people who are responsible and who should be punished. A penalty should be imposed upon them by the Railway Board. I submit that a case has been made out. This matter must sooner or later be settled and the sooner it is settled by way of penalty the better it will be for the trade and commerce of this country because we are losing hundreds and thousands of dollars annually through the delays in the transportation of perishable goods.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the House and the country will feel that it is under a very considerable debt of gratitude to the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) for bringing up this question and also for the moderate and reasonable manner in which he has placed it before the House. I wish now just to say to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) and the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) also, that there is no question whatever but that the opinions which have been enunciated to-day by the hon. member for South York and by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) are opinions that are largely held by every class of people throughout the Dominion of Canada. The people are beginning to realize at last that the railway corporations have had and have to-day too much authority, that they are and have been conducting the carrying business of the country with too high a hand, that they have been paying no attention whatever to the shippers and the consignors or to anything but their own convenience. The instances that my hon. friend from South York gave are all true enough. We, in the west, know of many other cases and it is not only in the west but in other parts of the country that these cases arise. A year ago there was a case right here in Ottawa that came under my own personal observation. A shipper in Ottawa sent two cars of freight to Montreal. It only took two or three days for the cars to reach Montreal, the consignee was notified that the cars had arrived and in one case it was eighteen and in the second case it was twenty-one days after the cars arrived in Montreal before the railway company were able to or did place these cars on a siding where the consignee could unload them. If the consignee had been one or five days late he would have been charged demurrage and rightly so. I quite agree with the last speaker that if the consignee does not unload his freight in proper time he should be charged demurrage, and I think that if a higher demurrage were charged it would be a great deal better because then the consignee would take good care that the cars were not delayed. But, if you are going to charge the consignee demurrage because he does not unload a car as quickly as he should what about the railway company that keeps the consignee waiting from 10 to 20 or 30 days ? Should not the railway company be also made to pay the consignee for the loss that he has been put to ? I think that is only a fair arrangement. There is no doubt whatever but that that is coming, that it is coming in the very near future and the government will have to take the matter up and deal with it. I have not given the matter sufficient consideration to be able to say with any definiteness whether the proposition of the hon. member for South York is the very best proposition, but it is certainly along the right lines and something will have to be done in the very near future. Take, for instance, a shipment of wheat in the west; last fall we had unfortunately a light crop and in a great many cases there was not much of a demand for cars, but in any part of the country where there was a fair crop it was almost impossible to get cars. In the southern part of my district there was a very light crop and therefore the demand for cars existed only at a few points instead of at every station as would have been the case had we not had frost. But at one station in that southern country were over 40 orders for cars on the book at one time. These people were waiting for cars and were not able to get them. The way it works out is something like this: A farmer places his order for two or three cars. He has perhaps two, three, four or five cars of wheat on hand that he wishes to ship and it is probably a month before he gets his cars. Then he gets a car, loads it with wheat and sells the wheat for a certain delivery. What is the result? There are cases by the score, yes, by the hundreds, where, after a farmer had loaded his car and has got his bill of lading from the station agent the car is put in the siding and in many cases is not hauled out of that siding, for two, three and four weeks, standing there right on the siding at the station where it was loaded, or possibly being taken a station or two away and tied up for two, three or four weeks. He sells his wheat in time to make November delivery, the wheat is not taken down to Fort William or Winnipeg and therefore he cannot make his delivery. The result is that he suffers a loss of any fall in the price of wheat that may have taken place in the meantime. The same thing occurred in the shipment of cattle last year. I know of one particular case in which a friend of mine in Alberta had a bunch of fat steers that he wished to ship. He ordered the cars beforehand for a certain date. He drove these cattle into the market town and waited there for six weeks herding them around the station. He could not get a single car. The result was that he had to drive his cattle back to his ranch and last winter out of the 4,000 head of stock that he drove into the station and had to drive back again, because the railway company did not supply him with cars, three quarters of the number were lost because the winter, as we all know, was an exceptionally severe one in that country. That man lost about $2,000 or $3,000 in actual cash through no fault of his own but through the fault of the railway company in not supplying him with cars. These are instances that could be multiplied and these are instances which I am sure will show to the Minister of Railways and Canals that action and strong action is necessary in the very near future. If our Railway Commission has not power to deal with these matters at the present

time this government and this parliament must clothe them with the necessary power. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that if this work is handed over to the commission it will be necessary to very largely increase that commission, to increase the strength of it and to get the very best and ablest men in the country on that commission, to divide it up into several sections and to divide up the work so that it will be able to keep pace with the work. It may cost a few thousands of dollars, it may even cost $25,000 or $50,000, but, I do not care so much what the cost of the commission may be, because it would be a mere bagatelle as compared with the cost of the lack of a commission or some other authority to deal with these and kindred questions affecting the transportation of the country at the present time. I will venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that in the west, taking the wheat and cattle shipments alone for last season, there was more direct loss made by the farmers than would pay for the cost of a commission, or, for that matter, for the cost of ten, fifteen or twenty-five commissions. It is hard to figure out just what the loss was. In the early part of the season we had a big price for wheat and if the farmers had been enabled to get cars to send out their wheat the result would have been that they would have got from 30 to 40 cents a bushel for their wheat more than they eventually did get on account of their not being able to get shipping facilities at the time they needed them; so that, the question of the cost of the commission would be a very simple matter as compared with the cost of the lack of a commission or some other authority or power to deal with this question.

One of the great difficulties in the way of quick transportation in the west is not only lack of cars but more particularly lack of engines. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) read a list of the increases the railway companies have made to their rolling stock during the last few years, but I know that one of the high officials of one of the railway companies stated last year that while they were adding twenty-five new cars a day they were sending thirty old cars to the scrap heap. Of course last winter was exceptional, and the loss of rolling stock on the railways was greater than perhaps ever before, but nevertheless we should remember when we hear of these increases of rolling stock that it takes a great deal of new rolling stock to make up for that which has become useless and goes out of service. Every day on the branch lines in the west we can see old engines which are not able to carry heavy loads, trying to move the freight. Over and above all that there is a serious lack of facilities in the way of repair shops and siding space. Let me give an example. A car had been consigned to a certain Saskatchewan town and the owners of the freight were anxious to get it, but that car was lost for several months. The railway company had tracers out, but in the end it was found that it had been ninety-two days side tracked in the railway yards of the very town it was consigned to. For lack of proper siding accommodation the railway companies are not able to handle their cars to advantage.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

HAMILTON RADIAL ELECTRIC RAILWAY.

On the order,

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 25) an Act respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company (reported as amended) —Mr. Clarke.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I would like to bring to your attention for your ruling——

Mr. SPEAKER. I must leave the chair for the House to go into committee, and a point of order cannot now be raised.

House then went into committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose and reported progress.

On the question, when shall the report be received,

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a word in regard to the motion made yesterday, that the fifth report of the Railway Committee should be referred back, for the reason that it does not conform with rule No. 106 of the rules of the House of Commons, and I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, for a ruling upon the question as to whether or not the report is in order. The point I wish to lay before you is——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, is this in order ?

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no motion. The question is, when shall this report be received and the committee have leave to sit again ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I think the hon. member will have to give notice of his intention, and bring it up to-morrow on the order for motions.

Mr. LENNOX. The motion I made yesterday was not received, and the speaker announced that it should stand as a notice.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that, until the motion of the hon. member for South Simcoe comes up in the proper form, the objec-

tion which I understand the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) is about to raise cannot be entertained.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, the matter was spoken to yesterday in the committee, with the deputy speaker in the chair, and he announced that it would have to be referred to the Speaker of the House, and I desire to bring it before you.

Mr. FIELDING. The motion will come at a later stage, and then my hon. friend's objection might be properly taken.

Mr. LENNOX. I read the motion yesterday, but the Minister of Railways did not desire the matter to be proceeded with, owing particularly to the absence of the chairman of the committee, and in deference to his suggestion I did not insist on the motion being proceeded with, and the Speaker announced that the motion which I read should stand as a notice; and the understanding come to yesterday was that two or three days notice would be given by the Minister of Railways before this matter would be proceeded with in any way.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Am I right in understanding that the hon. gentleman's motion has not yet been made?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that is the position of the matter; and until that motion is received, the objection which the hon. member for South Wellington desires to raise cannot be entertained. It will have to remain in abeyance until the motion is formally made.

Mr. LENNOX. I think that my motion should have been received yesterday, but it was not.

Progress reported.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

House resumed consideration of motion of Mr. W. F. Maclean (South York) for second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. TURRIFF. Mr. Speaker, when you left the chair at six o'clock I was endeavouring to point out that one of the reasons for the difficulty in the west over the transportation problem was the lack of railway facilities. It is well known that all the railway companies in that country are very lacking in the necessary facilities for carrying on a large traffic. In some seasons of the year there is no difficulty; but during the winter it often happens that some little thing goes wrong with an engine, and it has to be taken two or three hundred miles to be repaired. The railway companies will have to be given to understand that they do not own and rule the whole country, but that as public carriers they have undertaken certain obligations, and will have to live up to them in the future a good deal better than they have done in the past. I am certain that the people will not tolerate very much longer the condition of things that we have had of late years. It is all very well for the railway companies to give reasons, in the pamphlet they have issued, why this reciprocal demurrage should not be enforced against them; but I cannot see that they have made out any kind of a case. I am well aware that they have a good deal to contend with owing to the rapid development of the country; but they have undertaken to do certain things, and they have not been doing them. If the railway companies—I speak more particularly of the west—would endeavour to thoroughly equip and maintain and operate the lines which they have instead of attempting to jockey each other for the sake of getting advantageous positions, it would be better for the country. Their efforts at the present time are expended, not so much in the interest of the settlers as in their own interests, one railway company trying to get ahead of another, such as building railways where there are railways already, for the purpose of cutting off traffic from a rival company. I could point out in my own part of the country a railway which was built for eighty miles paralleling another railway, while other parts of the country were suffering for the lack of railway facilities, and farmers were compelled to haul their wheat thirty or forty miles to market. I do not intend to take up that question to-night, but I intend to ventilate it before this session is over. That is one reason why the Railway Commission or the government should give these railway companies to understand that they will have to live up to the obligations which they have entered into, or else the government will know the reason why.

As to whether we have the necessary authority in the present Railway Act or not, I do not pretend to say. I do not believe we have. or if we have, the Railway Commission evidently does not think so, because the hon. gentleman who spoke just now (Mr. E. D. Smith) pointed out certain cases in which the Railway Commission decided that they had not the necessary authority to give justice and satisfaction. I believe it will be necessary for the government to give the commission additional powers, or, if they have these powers, make that thoroughly clear and see that the commission carry them out. I quite agree with the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) when he says that the initiative should not be left to every shipper or everybody who suffers an injustice to get up a case against a railway company, because the railway company can carry the case to the Privy Council and thereby tire out any ordinary man. For those reasons it would be necessary to give additional powers to

the commission and see that the commission is so increased in number and strength that it will be able to give thorough and prompt attention to all the different claims that come before it. I believe that the appointment of that Railway Commission was one of the best things done in the interests of the people for many years. The commission are doing good work but they are only human and are consequently unable to do all the work that comes before them now. And as every little while we put additional work on that commission, it will become necessary to increase its number and put it in a position to handle the work.

As to the best method of dealing with the railway companies, the only effective way is to fine them heavily every time they do not live up to their charters. Under their charters, they get large subsidies, so that this country has practically built our railways. Not one of these railways would be in existence, in all probability, had the government not given them valuable assistance both in land grants and guaranties and cash subsidies; and we have the right to insist that they live up to a certain degree at all events, to the obligataions they have undertaken. They have not done so in the past. The country has been too lenient, but is wakening up and will insist in the future on the railways acting differently. And the railways will do so without trouble if we simply let them know that we are in earnest. Let me draw attention to what occurred here last year. In the early part of last session, two of the big railway companies came to the commission and wanted it to confirm a four-cent per mile passenger rate in the province of Saskatchewan. The Railway Commission refused but offered to confirm a 3½-cent rate. On discussing the matter with the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre) and other members from the west, it was decided that we would take the matter up in the House, and my hon. friend from Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre) put a notice of motion on the Order Paper. The matter went on for a time, and then the railway companies came to the Prime Minister and wanted that notice of motion done away with. He said the motion would have to take its course and be discussed. What was the result? Rather than have a discussion over the railway rates, they agreed that in sixty days they would accept an order of the commission reducing the rates east of the Rocky Mountains to three cents a mile. And the result has been that in Alberta and Saskatchewan, on every mile travelled since then, we have had a three-cent rate per mile instead of the four-cent rate they wanted to charge. Not only that but throughout Ontario and Quebec, the rates were reduced one-quarter to one-half cent. All through the country the ordinary rates charged by the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and other railway companies were three cents, in one or two cases three and one-half cents and three and a third cents, and in one or two cases, on branch lines, four cents. All those rates have been reduced to three cents in consequence of the action taken in this House. That makes me certain that if the government tell the companies they may do certain things, they will do it. If they do not, punish them heavily by fine. That is the only way you can punish a railway company. When they are so ready to charge demurrage on a car, and rightly so, when a consignee does not unload it on time, the government should see that they are made to pay for delay, not only in furnishing a car, but in delivering it after it is loaded. We would not then have them leave a car of wheat standing three or four weeks on a siding after it has been loaded, so that the farmer, who has a bill of lading, is not able to draw a dollar on it, or sell that wheat, or if he has sold it, lose 10 cents to 20 cents a bushel, through the price having gone down and he not being able to deliver. It would be an easy matter to work out the suggestion that the railway companies should have to deliver certain classes of freight in a certain length of time. That can be easily worked out once the railway companies learn that they have to do it; but so long as you let them go on as you have been doing of late years, they will not try. They have not been punished and will not make any particular effort. That is an additional reason why this matter should be taken hold of. If we provide the necessary machinery to get after the companies, when they do not live up to their agreements, we shall have very few complaints in the future.

There is another matter to which I wish to refer. Just to show the high handed manner in which these corporations treat the public, let me point out that a couple of days ago I got from one of my constituents in the shipping business a copy of a circular letter from the London Flour Trade Association of London, England, in which that association pointed out that, under the present bills of lading, under which flour has to be shipped from this to the old country, it is practically impossible to build up a trade. This is more particularly a steamship matter and has only a side relation to the subject under discussion. But it goes to show that these shipping corporations think only of themselves and not at all of the trade or the convenience or good of those engaged in the trade. I hope that the government will take hold of this matter with a strong hand, and deal with it in a most thorough and far-reaching manner, so that in the future there may not be the same ground of complaint that we have hitherto had in the west and throughout the Dominion.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). I do not think there has been any question be-

fore parliament this session so important as the one we are now discussing or one more worthy of the patient attention of this House. Nor has there been a question under discussion this session which affects more individuals than this one does. Speaking particularly of my own section of the country, this is a matter that affects very seriously the shipping of grain. Had I not a great many letters and resolutions of important bodies relating to this matter, I should not speak on this motion. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) says that we already have all the law that is necessary on this question. All I have to say is that, if we have all the law that is necessary, it is about time that somebody put that law into action. A law that is a dead letter is of no practical service. Any person at all acquainted with the shipping of grain from the west knows what it may mean to the shipper to have his car delayed for a number of days. As we come near to the close of navigation, say the middle of November, if a farmer is able to secure a car for November delivery, it is of the utmost importance that that car should reach Port Arthur or Fort William before the end of the month. It makes a difference, very often, of from 8 cents to 14 cents a bushel on his wheat. I wish to read a letter I received the other day from a man who had three cars of wheat loaded on November 15. Now, certainly fifteen days was sufficient time to take a car of wheat from Glenora, which is on the Canadian Northern, to Port Arthur. There was time enough, even under the very low limit of 50 miles a day named in this Bill. And, in passing, I may say that I am very much surprised that the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) should think of providing that a railway should be allowed to carry freight at so slow a rate as fifty miles a day. It is about 500 miles from Glenora to Port Arthur. It should not take more than three days to make that trip. This question has been put before the House very clearly, and the instances given by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and also my hon. friend from South Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith), who is a practical man and has had great experience in shipping, are very important. But I desire to add another instance by reading this letter :

> But the moving of the cars after they were loaded was very slow. Three cars that I had to do with myself were loaded on the morning of November 15, and were taken out of Glenora station that morning. They did not get into store until the 9th, 11th and 14th December.

The wheat, in these cases, was sold for November delivery, and there was time enough for them to reach Port Arthur long before the end of November. And Mr. D. D. Campbell, a gentleman appointed by the government in the interest of the farmers did his utmost to find out where the cars were. Here is a letter written by Mr. Campbell to Mr. Wilson, the gentleman from whom I received the letter of which I have just spoken :

> It looks as though we are going to be beat to get these two cars to their destination in time for the November delivery. I have been in hopes that they had gone out by Emerson and that the returns would arrive here in time to be turned over. I have asked the car service agent several times to have them traced up and brought forward, but, up to the present, there is no word of them. We must insist on reciprocal demurrage.

That 'reciprocal demurrage' does not seem a very apt term there. However, I must say I am not very particular about terms. The point I want to see provided for is that the railways be bound to carry these cars to their destination within a reasonable time, and, certainly, a reasonable time from Glenora to Port Arthur is not thirty days, nor fifteen days—it should not exceed five or six days at the outside.

> —as that is nothing but just, and it is the first thing that will keep the old date cars moving. If the company had to pay yourself $10 each it would help in a small measure to make up your loss. But I think if it was in force your cars would have been at their destination long ago.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schaffner) say what was the loss to the shipper in that case?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. He does not state his loss, but it must have been considerable. When wheat is sold for November delivery, but not delivered, it may not be saleable until next spring. Now, had the case of which I speak occurred a year ago, I should not have stood up here to find fault, for I think that the railways then were up against a very hard proposition, and I think they deserve great credit for the manner in which they carried on their work under the difficulties of snow storms and cold that faced them. But there was no such excuse this year. We have had an exceedingly mild winter in the Northwest ; there has been very little snow, and the railway that will take three cars of wheat and occupy a month in carrying them from Glenora to Port Arthur, depriving the shipper of 13 cents or 14 cents a bushel, is not doing its duty to the shipper. I sometimes think it rather strange that so much is being turned over to this Railway Commission; it almost looks as if, very soon, there will be no need for parliament. But, certainly it is a splendid commission, and I am willing that this matter should be referred to them. I know the farmers throughout Manitoba are determined that something should be done to compel the railways to carry cars to their destination

in something like reasonable time. There does not seem to be much trouble this year in getting cars; the trouble is after they are loaded in getting them carried to their destination. As I have said, the farmers of Manitoba and the Northwest feel keenly on this subject. At a meeting of the grain growers of Manitoba, in the city of Brandon on January 15 last, the following resolution was passed :

Whereas farmers are charged demurrage when cars are not loaded promptly; therefore, it is resolved that railway companies should be charged demurrage when cars are not supplied within a week after being ordered, and also when they remain standing on track more than forty-eight hours after being loaded, and also when a car is taken out it shall proceed at an average of not less than 100 miles per day to destination. Provided, that this provision shall be waived in case of car shortage being declared by Railway Commission.

That is all I wished to say. The matter has been fully and ably placed before the House by the gentlemen who have spoken, and I merely wished to place myself on record as favouring this Bill, and read the letter and to place the resolution of the grain growers before the House and country.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I heartily support the principle of this Bill. It has been said that the Bill is loosely drawn; I shall not argue that question with gentlemen some of whom have had greater experience in the practical working of such matters than I have, but it would have occurred to me that the Bill had been drawn with a great deal of care. It deals with the question of reciprocal demurrage and there seems to have been an intention to secure reciprocal justice in its framing. The mover has said he did not wish the House to be committed to the wording of the Bill, what he and all of us who wish the Bill to receive a second reading, desire is that we should commit ourselves to the principle of the Bill and should seek to obtain, by some means, a remedy for a grievance which undoubtedly exists. It has been suggested that we have a railway board and that therefore we need do no more. I have great respect for the railway board and more particularly for the work they have done; I recognize that they have performed a great service, but I do not think we can ask the railway board to do everything for us. I endorse the statement of the hon. member for East Assiniboia that we must attach a penalty if we want to force the railways to live up to their obligations. We should not be unfair to them, but experience shows that we must have a strict rule, a stringent law, to compel their obedience, and the only way we can effectively appeal to a railway company is through their pockets; if we can so arrange matters that it will not pay them to do injustice to the shipper they will not do injustice, and I am quite sure that we have not taken all the steps that are necessary to secure full and complete justice to shippers.

There seems to be no dispute as to the principle of the Bill except on the part of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). I assume that as the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) has not spoken and acted as our counseller and guide in this matter, he is waiting until we express ourselves, and that he will concur in the majority opinion voiced by the House to-night. I assume that this matter will be referred either to a Committee of the Whole House, to a special committee or to the Railway Committee. While as a rule I approve of public Bills being discussed on the floor, in Committee of the Whole, as the principle here involved is to some extent a new one in our legislation, I recognize that it may be well to have it discussed in a committee other than in a Committee of the Whole, where all parties concerned, the merchant, the farmer, the actual shipper and the railways concerned, will all have an opportunity to place their views fully before the members, and all will be able to decide from their representations what is in the best interests of the country.

I was greatly impressed by the speech made by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) not simply because it was a very able speech, for his speeches in this House are always instructive. I know no man who has a more convincing manner or a more thorough grasp of any subject he discusses. I have no doubt that the instances of abuse he has brought before us have greatly impressed the House and have shown the absolute necessity of doing something more than has been done. He mentioned one case of freight being carried 216 miles in fifteen days or not quite fifteen miles a day, and another case of a shipment from Winona to Bowmanville, 150 miles in fifteen days, exactly ten miles a day. As the hon. member for West Assiniboia has said, it is often a case of jockeying between the railway companies rather than of endeavouring to serve the public. Mr. Smith spoke of the delay of a shipment of sugar at Hamilton for four or five days while the railway companies were jockeying over 60 cents, with probable loss to the shipper. I wish to see justice done to all concerned, and to have this matter fully discussed before some committee.

In the discussion so far we have had one discordant note, in the very able speech of my esteemed and learned friend, the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). He announced that he had looked carefully into this matter, and when he made that announcement I knew that we would have a large amount of information placed before us. I did not, however, quite anticipate that we would have the earnest

pleading on behalf of the railway companies which that speech contained. The hon. member said he had examined section 284, subsections (c) and (d) of the Railway Act. Well, he had not to go very far to look for it because it is set forth on page 6 of the 'Argument against the proposals as to penalties for delay in supply of cars,' contained in Bill (No. 6) by F. H. Chrysler, K.C., made on behalf of the railway companies. Then he proceeds—and I propose to follow exactly in the line that the hon. member for South Wellington took—to refer to section 317. I find that set out in the Bill of my hon. friend as a section which he proposes to amend, and when I turn to page 7 of the railway case I find it is also the next section mentioned there. Then he proceeds to discuss section 318; I turn to the case and I find again that this is recorded on page 7. He mentions sections 26 and 28 and I again turn to the case and find them recorded on page 7. He also mentions section 30 and I find it recorded on pages 7 and 8. Then the hon. gentleman tells us about the action of the railway board and that again is perfectly correct according to the railway case, because I find that all set out on pages 8 and 9 of the argument of the railway case. I was wishing all the time that I had been as industrious as the hon. member for South Wellington; I admired and envied him as he told us of the vast amount of increased equipment that had been secured by the railways and I wondered how one head of reasonable size could contain all this information. It was only when I turned accidentally to pages 14 and 15 of the railway case that I realized where that vast amount of information had been obtained. In a word, the hon. member for South Wellington is to be congratulated upon the faithfulness with which he has presented the railway case. Although we might go to the Railway Commission and have a full discussion there, I doubt if the question could be more strenuously argued than it was argued by the hon. member for South Wellington. One argument that was presented by the hon. gentleman deserves to be referred to. In his endeavour to show that the argument of my hon. friend from South York as to discrimination by our railway companies against Canadian freights and in favour of freights originating in the United States could not be well founded, he said: why the railways are carrying these freights upon lower terms than they are carrying freight originating in Canada. It is so, but they get large blocks of freight, vast quantities in a lump, they secure this freight in the United States and they prefer to have it and let the Canadian shippers suffer for the time being. The railway company seems to argue the matter out in this way: There is competition, perhaps, from the starting point in the United States: we have to secure this freight now or not at all; we will secure it now and let the Canadian freight wait until a more convenient season. So, there is an abundance of authority for the statement the hon. member for South Wellington made that the railway companies are looking after their own interests and that they propose to look after their own interests. Do not think for a moment that I do not recognize that the railway companies do a service to the people of Canada. They do but we must have them on the best terms that we can get. The hon. member for South Wellington has not to go farther than the city of Guelph and he has not to go beyond the first railway station in his own riding to realize that every person who has any considerable amount of shipping, aye, and the farmers who have only a little amount to ship, have suffered more or less in the way that has been referred to this afternoon. I have heard it everywhere. I heard it in my own riding. I know of men gathering cattle together at a certain point for shipment on the railway but when they get them to that point there are no cars waiting for them. They wait from day to day until they get tired and then they have to drive these cattle back again and wait for quite a while perhaps before they can get cars. These instances are occurring all over the country and we must do something in order that the people shall have reasonable facilities. We must adopt some method by which, whether through the railway board or otherwise, we shall be able to have a reciprocal duty and a reciprocal burden cast upon the shipper and the carrier. What I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, is, that we should have a general law throwing the obligation upon the railway company. Instead of saying that the farmer or the shipper shall have to apply in every case we should make a general law to control general cases and let sectional cases be provided for by the railway company taking the initiative and making a move to have them brought within the exceptional provisions. Section 30 of the Railway Act recognizes that principle but it is not often enough enunciated in that Act. The latter part of section 30 provides that:

> And the board may exempt any railway, or section of a railway from the operation of any such order or regulation, for such time or during such period as the board deems expedient.

You cannot make any law that may not require under certain circumstances to be subject to exception. Make a law which will cover the generality of cases and then leave the onus upon the railway company of applying to the railway board under any particular exceptional circumstances, The necessity of action in this direction is enunciated in a statement, referred

to by the hon. member for South Wellington, of the railway board as follows :

In some cases parties have asked that the allowance of the charge be made conditional upon a provision for what has been called 'reciprocal demurrage,' or some penalty or charge for delay by railway companies in supplying cars, or in receiving, transporting, or delivering traffic. This latter subject requires more investigation and consideration than the board has yet been able to give to it.

I think the hon. member for South York has, upon this occasion presented a matter to the House that involves the remedy of a very serious evil and the very great hardship that is felt by shippers throughout Canada, and I think it is also recognized that he has presented it in a very moderate and impartial way—impartial in the sense that he has not pushed the matter to the extreme but has endeavoured to present both sides of the case—the interests of the shipper and the interests of the transportation companies as well. I therefore have very great pleasure in supporting the principle of this Bill and I hope that it will receive not only now but during this session a very large measure of attention, so that the people of the country having occasion to use the railways shall not have the inconveniences that they have suffered in the past.

Mr. ROCH LANCTOT (Laprairie-Napierville). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words before this Bill is read for a second time.

I may say that last session, on the 12th April, I had the honour myself to introduce a Bill to amend the Railway Act precisely in the direction of what concerns this question of surcharge and asking that it be made reciprocal. This is a subject that has a lively interest for the farmers and traders of all Canada, and particularly those of the county which I have the honour to represent. But this was at the close of the session, and as the hon. the Prime Minister was obliged to be absent on account of his visit to England, the leader of the House, the hon. the Minister of Finance, asked me kindly to leave the Bill over until the next session, for the hon. the Prime Minister had promised that there would be no new legislation during his absence. Notwithstanding this, my Bill was given a first reading and then held over for the next session.

This year, at the very commencement of the session, the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) introduced a Bill that differed somewhat from mine as far as the first clause is concerned, but copied in substance from the one which I introduced last year. While I am in favour of the principle of this Bill, I cannot, however, support the first clause, which does not seem to me acceptable, because it is not practicable. In fact, any individual might demand from the railway company five cars at one station, five others at another station and make the same demand further on, and the company would be obliged within eighty-six hours to place all such cars at that person's disposal. I believe this is not practicable. I am not a lawyer, I am a farmer and trader, but this is what I would like to have embodied in the law. I believe that if we could obtain from the railway companies the supplying of cars in certain proportions—here, for example, is a station that gives about six or seven hundred freight cars per year, this would give a fair average of fifty cars per month for twelve months—it would suffice. If the companies were subject to a fine when they would not supply the estimated average, the effect would be a remedy for the present state of things.

I asked a railway agent why it was that we could not get cars, especially in October and November. Because, he replied, the companies sent the largest number possible westward so as to get the freight which pays better, created by the moving of the crops in that part of the country. This may be true, but, on the other hand, the older provinces should not be forgotten.

I am not jealous of the progress and prosperity of the west, nor of the advantages it possesses in this regard, but it seems to me that the population of the older provinces should not be neglected by the railways. It is important for us to be able to transport our goods at the suitable time in order to secure the best possible prices while the market is favourable. In Montreal we have a large market for our hay, and being near at hand that market is very advantageous. Moreover, Montreal being at the head of navigation, we could, by sending our hay there, have it forwarded to Europe and benefit by that trade. In May and June the freight rates to Europe are low, and that is just the best time for us to export, because hay being a product difficult of transportation it cannot be profitably forwarded when there is an abundance of other products to be transported, for the rates—on account of such abundance—are higher. I say that the railways should treat more justly the older provinces, which have bled themselves to help in the construction of those railways, and not send all their cars out west to the detriment of the east, as is done to-day. Remember, I am not at all jealous of the west, but I claim that in return for the sacrifices we have made the provinces of the east should be more fairly treated.

Now, I come to the question of the fine imposed on the exporter when he does not load the cars within the given delay. It often happens that cars asked for are not supplied until quite a while after. Frequently it happens that a car is asked from an agent when the weather is fine and it is possible to transport the products that are to make up the load ; but if the cars are not supplied until fifteen days or three weeks have elapsed, it is quite possible that

the weather may then be unfavourable, or that the roads have become so bad that it is impossible to load the car that has been placed at one's disposal. He may have to take two or three days more than the prescribed limit, and when the farmer has finally completed his loading and goes to the agent for a way bill the first news he gets is that two or three dollars more, as a surcharge on account of delays, are demanded of him—all on account of a delay for which he is in no way responsible.

This happens to us—we traders—to put in such like claims ; but often five or six months go past before such claims are regulated, and I may say that many farmers lose from two to three dollars in this way, because they are not forewarned in time. I say that if the railway companies have the right to charge from two to three dollars of surcharge for such like delays, I cannot see why the law does not oblige them to pay equally a surcharge tax when they hold back cars for ten or fifteen days and thereby make it impossible for the consignee to load them. The Bill I introduced last year contained a disposition to this effect, and for that reason I favour to-day the second reading of the Bill of the hon. member for South York. Still, I believe that in Committee of the Whole certain amendments should be made thereto.

In regard to the scarcity of cars many things have been said ; it has been said that there are not enough cars in the country. I believe that such scarcity is principally due to the fact that in the large centres sufficient facilities for the unloading of goods on the arrival of trains do not exist. I do a considerable hay trade with New York and Boston. I have visited these two cities several times. Each day about 150 carloads of hay come into the stations there ; that is to say, all they can unload in a day, and the other cars await their turn outside the city. Thus there is never any over-crowding. In the city of Montreal it is altogether different. Last year I myself forwarded two cars of hay from St. Constant on the 3rd January, and these two cars reached Montreal on the 14th February. Yet there is only a distance of twenty miles between the two points. It is evident that this system of delivery is very defective and often ruinous.

According to my hon. friend's Bill the railway companies shall be obliged to have their freight cars cover a distance of at least fifty miles per day. Well, then, what are we to think of my forwarding of last year of which I have just spoken, which, for a distance of twenty miles, took from the 3rd January to the 14th February? The clearest result was that I lost two dollars per ton on account of the fall in market prices. I cite this case, but I could mention hundreds of other like ones. It is the same for all products exported from my section, but the market fluctuations are felt more in the case of hay.

I do not wish to detain the House any longer, and, as I said a few moments ago, I intend to vote for the second reading of this Bill ; but I trustfully hope that certain changes will be made in the first clause before it is finally passed.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I do not rise in the hope that I can present any additional facts to the House in support of this measure, but because I believe that the general sentiment of the people in my section of the country and, indeed, throughout Canada, is in favour of some such Bill as this. Painful experience has taught them that a remedy is needed, and they look to parliament for that remedy. The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) is entitled to the gratitude of the people of this country for his strenuous effort to remove this grievance and for the Bill he has presented, which I venture to think will meet with the approval of a large majority of the members of this House. The Bill seeks to provide that when a shipper applies to a railway company for a car he shall be furnished with it within a time specified in the Bill, and in my judgment the time provided is reasonable. If, however, it is the opinion of the House that the time specified is not reasonable, it is the duty of the House to amend the Bill in that respect. It is said that a law without a penalty is of little avail, and so the Bill seeks to provide a penalty for non-compliance with its provisions. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) who by-the-by seemed to me to be what we call a corporation lawyer in this House pleading for the corporations as against the interests of the people—perhaps I am going a little too far in saying that, but the tenor of his remarks in connection with this Bill seemed to be but in one direction, and that was that we had law enough on the subject already, and that the Railway Commission had power to do all this. The hon. gentleman said we had plenty of law and I felt like replying that we had plenty of law but that we had not enough justice. Well, if the present law does not bring justice we want something behind the law which will enforce the law, or else we must amend the law so that the people may get justice. It may be that the provisions of the Railway Act if enforced would remedy some of these grievances, but there seems to be no one whose special duty it is to enforce the law and punish its violation. The Bill also provides that in the event of a shipper not loading a car within a reasonable time after he receives it, he also shall be penalized. I think that is correct. If you penalize a public carrier for not doing a certain act it is equally correct that you should provide a penalty for the shipper

who also neglects to do his duty. There is no injustice done to the railway company, there is no injustice done to the shipper if each is punished when he does not live up to the law. The Bill further provides that the railway company must forward a car of freight to its destination at a certain rate of speed, and deliver it within a reasonable time. It is provided that the railway shall carry freight at the rate of 50 miles a day, but in this age that movement is altogether too slow, and I assume that if the Bill ever goes through, the clause will be amended so as to make the railway company carry freight at the rate of at least 100 miles a day. I also agree with the provision of the Bill which provides for a demurrage charge if a car is not unloaded with due promptness after its delivery. When a shipper gets a car he ought to avail himself of the earliest opportunity to free it so that others may have the advantage of its use. There is a provision in the Bill also that the railway company shall place a freight car where it is convenient to load or unload. That is a good provision. I was told a few weeks ago by a gentleman who last year took settlers' effects to the west, that he was subject to great inconvenience because the railway company placed his cars in such a position that it was impossible to get any where near them with teams or unload his stock. He remained for two days trying to get that car properly placed so that he could unload it, and at last he was obliged to bribe an employee of the railway company whose duty it was to place that car in position. This gentleman told me he reasoned with them, he tried to show them the unfairness of it, but they were indifferent to his appeals and the car remained there until at last by coaxing and bribing them he succeeded in getting them to place the car in a position where his stocks and effects could be unloaded. Should that be the treatment accorded to a man who is going into that country, every moment of whose time is valuable and to whom every hour of delay causes loss? Why should it be that the railway company which takes a large charge out of him for the transportation of his effects should be indifferent to his wants and should subject him to that delay. When we give special rights to common carriers in this country it is implied that one of their duties is to give facilities to the public to carry on their business and if they fail in that duty they should be punished. We have numerous examples in this country of the hardships inflicted on the people by the railway. You could not take up a newspaper last fall without seeing that they were crying out for more cars, more cars in the west and more cars in the east, and that business people could not ship lumber, or cordwood, or stock, or grain, or merchandise because they could not get cars. This shows there is something radically wrong with the railway companies.

Surely they are building more lines of railway than they can properly operate. If so, it ought to be their duty to provide rolling stock sufficient for the lines they have in existence at the present time. During last fall and winter, in the part of Ontario where I live, there was a great demand for the frozen grain of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. I am within the mark when I say that hundreds of carloads of that grain could have been sold at a profitable figure if cars could have been got to bring it to Ontario. Application was made over and over again to the railway companies for cars and for information as to what it would cost to bring it down, but it was impossible to get information from the railway company or from its agents. They would not quote a rate nor promise to provide cars nor tell within one month or six months when a carload purchased in the west would reach Ontario. That frozen grain was demanded for feed, and in order that the farmers of the west should get the best price for it, it was necessary that it should be delivered in Ontario at the time it was needed; therefore every day's delay meant a reduced market and a lower price for the farmer of the west. Only one or two carloads reached the station in that district, where there should have been twenty-five or thirty or forty; and these carloads were shipped in the west weeks before they reached their destination. Any one who bought a carload of grain could not tell when it would arrive—in December, January, February, March, April or May. What was the use of trying to buy it? There was no use whatever, The people wanted it; their stock was famishing in many instances for want of it, but they could not get it. Is that the way the people are to be used by the railway corporations to whom we have given such large subsidies and so many rights and privileges? It may be said that they could not tell when the cars could be delivered. But there should be an obligation resting upon them, whenever they take up a car, to carry it on and on from day to day at a reasonable rate of speed until it reaches its destination. Sometimes a car is not hauled more than twenty miles before it is shunted to a siding, and some other car is taken in its place. I am told that the employees of the railway companies are bribed to leave off cars and take up others. I have been told by men who have found it very difficult to get their cars carried along, that they have watched these cars and that time after time they have had to bribe the employees to prevent their cars being shunted off. The train would start with a locomotive capable of carrying a certain number of cars, and at the end of a run, when a new locomotive was taken on, presumably one of equal power was taken.

It was not because the engine was not capable of hauling all the cars that some of them were shunted off; but, for some unknown reason, after they were carried twenty or thirty or forty or fifty miles, they were shunted off and other cars were taken on. Is that not an unjust discrimination against the shipper? It is, and every one who has been observant of the complaints made from every part of the country, from the west, the north and the south, within the last year or so, must have reached the conclusion that there should be some stringent law requiring the railway companies, when they take up a car of freight, to carry that car on and on day after day until it reaches its destination, and to carry it at a reasonable rate of speed. It may be said that unforeseen accidents will take place, which no company can provide against. But this Bill provides that in that event no injustice shall be done to the railway companies. The last clause says that when the removal of freight is suspended for unavoidable accidents, or the act of Providence, the time lost shall be added to the free time allowed to the railway company and shall not count. No shipper expects railway companies to do what is impossible. Every one understands that accidents will overtake railways as well as individuals, and is willing to allow for them. But it is because of unreasonable delays, which no accidents can account for, that the people desire some law to control the railway companies more fully than they are controlled to-day. It may be said that the railway companies cannot forward freight at a regular rate of speed? Can't they? The Grand Trunk Railway serves Armour and Company, of Chicago, the large meat shippers, so well that their train goes through almost at the same hour every day. If they can do that for the rich man of Chicago, surely they can do it as well for the Canadian, who has given them large subventions and greater support than the people of Chicago have given them. If they can do it for the people of Chicago, they can do it for the people of Canada. If they can, they should be compelled to do it. If they will not do it, punishment should be inflicted on them for non-fulfilment of their duty. These demands come from every class of the community. They come from the merchants all over the country who have lost the sale of goods because before the goods reached their shops they had become unseasonable. Some men have been put into bankruptcy by reason of the railway companies not supplying the goods of merchants at the proper time. The demand comes from the grain shippers, both in the east and in the west. The millers of the east have been clamouring all last fall and this winter for the grain of the west, but they cannot get it. A gentleman who ordered western grain about the 8th or 9th of November last fall told me that it had not reached our station two weeks ago when I was home. Will any one pretend to say that it required between three or four months to bring a car of grain from Manitoba down to Ontario? That is not shipping at all Instead of that one car being landed, there might have been a hundred cars and there ought to have been, and I have no doubt whatever that had they been landed and purchased at the price at which the grain could have been purchased in the west they could have been sold in Ontario at a considerable profit. The farmers who have to use the railways are clamouring for better service in the shipment of farm produce. That cry comes from the cattle shippers as well, in Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. I have known instances in which the railway companies have been notified days in advance that cars were required. The farmers were notified to bring in their cattle and the cattle stood in the yards two or three days waiting shipment. The shipper had to haul feed to them and was often obliged to bring the cattle home again or put them out with some farmers and keep them there for days until cars were forthcoming. In what condition would cattle be which were taken out of warm stables and compelled to tramp around fields in inclement weather? Their weight would be reduced and their market value seriously impaired, and the shipper and the farmer have to suffer the consequences. The appeal for a change comes as well from the settlers going out to the west. There is scarcely a man who takes out settlers' effects who does not complain seriously of the inconvenience to which he was subjected in loading and unloading these effects and the delays he was put to, which would not be the case if the cars were hauled forward at a reasonable rate. The complaints come from the fruit men and we have had the actual experience of these men given us this day by my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith). The loss does not fall upon the fruit grower alone but on every fruit trader, as well as every fruit raiser in the country and those who consume the fruit as well.

But, it is said, we have laws under which we can enforce damages. But there seems to be nobody to enforce these laws. That is not the duty of the Railway Commission. They are not public prosecutors. Neither a farmer nor a shipper is able to fight a railway company, so that there must be some stringent law enacted under which a heavy penalty will be enforced if railway service is not properly given. The lumbermen and the manufacturers are also complaining. They have sent numerous petitions to this House drawing attention to the losses they have sustained owing to the want of proper transportation for their products. All these great interests are suffering every day. What is a parliament for if it is not equal to the

occasion and able to provide a remedy? Parliament should provide a remedy and enact a law that will inflict severe punishment upon these corporations. For these reasons I am in favour of the principle of the Bill, and with proper amendments the clauses should prove satisfactory. They are calculated to meet a few of the grievances of the shippers and the sooner we provide a remedy, the better not only for the people who use the railways but for the railway companies themselves.

Mr. JOHN CRAWFORD (Portage la Prairie). This is not the first time this session that I have had something to say on this very important question—possibly the most important to the people of our western country at present. In the early part of the session, I took the position that the lack of proper transportation facilities caused us greater trouble and loss in different ways than anything else. Since then I have not changed my views because I am not aware that the situation has improved of late to any extent. My remarks in the early part of the session seem to have brought the situation more clearly home to our Railway Commission than it ever was before. To give you an idea of how it has been dealt with, I think it would not be out of place for me to put on 'Hansard' the action of the Railway Commission. Following up my remarks in the House at that time, the chairman of the commission wrote me on December 10, as follows :

I have been reading in 'Hansard' the report of the speech made by you in the House of Commons on Friday last, and am glad to learn that the situation in the west is so satisfactory.

That has reference to the condition of the farmers and not to the railways.

The particular reason for which I write you is to refer to the delays in transportation mentioned by you. Our operating assistant is at present in the Northwest for the purpose of getting full information as to the transportation conditions during the busy grain shipping season, and I would like very much to have him inquire into all instances spoken of by you, and ascertain, if possible, the reasons for such delays.

Would you kindly give me as definite particulars as you can—places, dates of shipment, and names of shippers? Where these are not known, the names of your informants or such other facts as will enable our official to trace up the cases? I would like specially to have him placed in a position to trace up the cases where cars have been left standing for a considerable time. We often hear statements of this kind, but have never yet got at the circumstances or located the real source of the delay.

In reply I practically repeated the statement which I had made in the House, with a few additions. I find that the investigation which took place, on account of the information I furnished at that time, fully bore out my statement, but I would like to call attention to the fact that the reasons given here so many times for the delays in transportation, do not altogether apply to the lack of power or the lack of motive power but to other reasons. The report is dated January 24 and is as follows. It is from Mr. Dillinger to the commission:

In accordance with instructions received from the board in connection with the complaint of Mr. John Crawford re car shortage and delays to cars, I went to Neepawa and Eden and secured the following check of cars in Neepawa yard from October 5, 1907, to January 1, 1908:—

Fifty-four out of 78 days in which time there were 13 Sundays and 2 holidays, making this check complete with exception of 9 days missed during the three months. No check taken on Sundays. The accumulation of cars started on October 25 when there were 26 loads on hand up to and including the 27th; 55 on 28th; 58 on 30th; 63 on the 31st, which was the highest reached until November 19.

I may say that one of these cars, loaded on October 26th, reached Winnipeg on November 29th, and the returns for that car of wheat arrived at Neepawa on January 4th, 1908—about seventy days between the loading at Neepawa and the return from the out-turn of the wheat at Fort William.

On November 2, this number was reduced, on the 6th to 35; and on the 7th to 28 loads; on the 9th increased to 52; reduced to 40 by the 11th; and still 40 on hand on the 12th. On the 14th increased to 70; reduced to 62 on the 16th; increased to 80 on the 17th.

Here I would draw your attention to this fact: at that time I was in communication with the Canadian Northern Railway management at Winnipeg; and in reply to a letter I wrote on the 15th, the traffic manager makes the statement on November 21st :

The grain shipping necessities of both points are being carefully looked after by our operating department, and I am advised that a supply of empties was delivered to the Neepawa section on the 19th inst. to ease up the situation.

And again, on November 22nd, he writes :

I am advised by our divisional superintendent at Dauphin, that the situation at Neepawa has been relieved.

The report goes on :

Ninety on the 19th; 92 on the 20th, and this number was reduced to 26 by the 23rd. There were 25 on hand on the 26th and 7 on the 27th. At no time after November 29th were there 28 loads of grain on hand at any one time, and this number was for only two days.

This check shows there were from 28 to 83 cars on hand for four days, from 70 to 92 cars for ten days, and this number was reduced from 6 to 28 cars, the latter number only on hand two days. This record can be relied on as I myself took it from their daily car check book.

Granted that no preference switching was done, and it is altogether likely that there

was none when the yard was so congested, there were at no time 60 cars in the Neepawa yard for over ten days; at the same time there may have been a car or two that remained for a much longer period.

The next sentence relates to a matter of which I complained very much some time ago. This particular car was one of my own :

For instance, C. N. 522 loaded by Mr. Crawford, remained there for 29 days before being moved, and agent was unable to give the cause other than that this car was shoved back on siding by trains putting other cars ahead of it and was allowed to remain there. As this is a reducing point, this could easily occur unless the man in charge of the station yard checking was especially vigilant; but there is no excuse or reason why this should happen in such a winter as they have had, there being no weather conditions to interfere with the movement.

There were 417 cars loaded with grain at nine different stations that passed through Neepawa, and were billed by the agent at Neepawa during the month of October, November and December, of which numbers 232 originated in Neepawa—72 in October, 124 in November and 36 in December. As there is only about one car per day made empty at Neepawa that can be used for grain, and none at any of the other small stations west and north of Neepawa, all cars loaded with grain had to be brought in from the east empty. There were at least 400 cars supplied for grain, not counting those supplied for brick and wood.

At Eden, one of the points complained of, there were 57 cars supplied for grain, practically all of which were taken in empty. During October, 31 cars were supplied, during November 11, and during December 13; and from the attached list, you will see the dates by whom they were loaded. There was a shortage of cars at this point, and no doubt more grain would have been shipped had cars been supplied; but at the time of my visit, January 9, no shipping was being done and all orders on the books were filled.

At all other points near Neepawa, the supply of cars for grain has been the best for years. There are very few complaints from farmers re supply of cars; but there are vigorous complaints from all parties interviewed as to the long time it takes to have the Canadian Northern Railway deliver cars to Port Arthur.

I need not read the whole report. Further on it states :

I also interviewed Mr. John Fraser, of Eden, who also claims there was a shortage of cars during the month of November, but as no one seemed anxious to ship, no one suffered much. He states that the cars were moved fairly well from Eden when loaded.

Here is part of the report which bears out the statement that at least some people suffered :

The two cars mentioned by Mr. Crawford as having been ordered November 13 were supplied December 24. That is, it is pretty near a month and a half after the cars were ordered when they were supplied.

Mr. CRAWFORD.

The Manitoba Milling Company, who have an elevator at Spring Hill, shipped from there this season 26 cars for farmers and 5 for themselves, and they have at present 6,000 bushels in the elevator which they do not want to ship. They closed down on December 20. Mr. Crawford put two cars in the Springhill elevator, starting November 20 and finishing November 28. He shipped from said elevator this season 6 cars, the last two being shipped December 20. There is no wheat in this elevator now for Mr. Crawford.

The other cars spoken of by Mr. Crawford as being at Spring Hill were shipped one from Franklin and one from Orrville. Mr. Davidson, manager of the Manitoba Milling Company, who furnished me this information, claims that on the whole the farmers were well satisfied with the supply of cars furnished, but he complains of the delay in transit. He also states that the siding at Halsboro was full of cars for some time.

I understand that the cars were pulled out of Neepawa for a distance of three or four miles and then shoved on another siding and held for weeks and weeks at a time.

This was a fact, and was caused by cars being taken there from Neepawa on account of the congestion at that place.

At Neepawa, I interviewed Mr. J. T. Yates, grain buyer, who up to January 8 had shipped 183,000 bushels of grain, shipping 16 cars from Spring Hill, 120 from Neepawa and 6 from Halsboro', and he claimed he had no difficulty in getting cars.

Everything goes to show that it was not a car trouble that we were up against in that part of the country.

In fact, the supply was much better than in former years and none of his cars were held over one week at any point of shipment after being filled, and he has no hesitation in saying that the supply of cars for all parties has been infinitely better this year than in previous years. But all shippers complained bitterly of the length of time it takes to bring cars to Port Arthur.

Delay in moving of the cars has been a greater cause of trouble than the shortage of cars.

Mr. Yates gave a list of 24 cars with the dates they were billed, and up to January 8 he had had no report of the out-turn at Port Arthur. I took this matter up with the manager of the Canadian Northern Railway, and I attach a list showing dates lifted and tracing of cars from Neepawa to Port Arthur, with dates unloaded into elevators. Out of these 27 cars, one car was destroyed east of Winnipeg, two cars were held at Winnipeg for repairs 19 days, and the remaining 24 cars took from 8 to 43 days to make a trip of 555 miles, Neepawa to Port Arthur. One car taking 8 days, one 43 days, 11 cars taking from 8 to 19 days and 13 cars taking from 20 to 43 days, or the whole shipment of 24 cars averaging 21½ days to make 555 miles, or 25·8 miles per day. Of these 24 cars, 5 were held 14 days, 6 held from 24 to 26 days at a point east of Winnipeg, one car 39 days at Winnipeg, and one car 29 days at Neepawa.

I also attach a list of cars given me by Mr. D. D. Campbell, of Winnipeg, the party referred to by Mr. Crawford in his letter, in which 7 cars took from 10 to 30 days from Neepawa to Winnipeg, a distance of 117 miles, or an average of 15 days per car for the 7 cars, or 7·8 miles per day per car; and 4 cars from Berton to Winnipeg, a distance of 94 miles, took from 13 to 21 days, or an average of 17 days per car, or 5½ miles per day.

From conversations I had with a number of people, I find there are many complaints re delay in transit to cars of grain, and I had quite enough evidence to convince me that there was a great delay in the movement of cars; and I have no hesitation in saying that this delay is directly chargeable to the want of system in the handling of cars by the Canadian Northern Railway as they have sufficient motive power to handle these cars if they are properly looked after.

You will note from statement attached, a delay of from two to six days at Port Arthur in unloading these 24 cars mentioned. This was caused by the large number of grades of wheat to be handled, thus making the handling much slower than it would have been with good grades of wheat; and I do not think this could have been improved upon under the circumstances.

After obtaining this information, I took the matter up with Mr. McLeod, the general manager of the Canadian Northern Railway, personally, pointing out the long delays in transit and the lack of system in handling the traffic. He at once arranged to appoint a man whose business it will be to systematize the handling of traffic, keep proper records, check same and report direct to the manager. With this arrangement there is no reason why these delays should occur in future.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) A. F. DILLINGER,

Operating system, Board of Railway Commissioners.

It will be noticed that Mr. Dillinger attributes the trouble not to lack of cars or engine power, but to the lack of management on the part of the railway company. This does not agree with the view that most of us have held, but Mr. Dillinger is positive in his statement. This report emphasizes the advantage which is being derived by the country by the operations of the Board of Railway Commissioners. It will be noted that when Mr. Dillinger took this matter up with the management of one of the railway companies, steps were immediately taken to improve the operating system. The whole question is a serious matter to Canada and it has agitated the minds of the people to an unusal degree.

As to the remedy to be applied, I am not prepared now to say that it should take the form of this specific piece of legislation, or that we can, through special legislation, remedy the evils which now exist. There is no doubt that the railway companies should be compelled to afford proper service and that by their charters that duty is laid upon them. For instance, I find in the charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway it is provided that after they get the road in operation:

The company shall thereafter and forever efficiently maintain, work and run the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The construction that must be placed on the wording of that clause is that they must properly work and operate the road and furnish reasonable accommodation to the country. There can be no two opinions as to the meaning of the clause, and that is the meaning of the charter granted to any railway company in Canada. The charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway continues:

Upon the reception from the government of the possession of each of the respective portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the company shall equip the same in conformity with the standard herein established for the equipment of the sections hereby contracted for, and shall thereafter maintain and efficiently operate the same.

That clearly fixes what is expected of the railway company. They are expected to give the people of Canada reasonably efficient accommodation. It is up to us to determine the best means to bring that about, and, as I have said, I do not know whether the best means will be through this special legislation or not. It does not matter what legislation you place on the statute-books unless there is provision for proper machinery and equipment for the enforcement of that legislation, the legislation must be useless. We must have some machinery to see that the railway companies carry out the intentions of their charters. The passing of a special Act like this, unless it is followed up with the provision of machinery, will be useless. The individual shipper or combination of shippers, the farmer or merchant cannot possibly fight against a railway company and force the company to give justice; parliament must provide the machinery for that purpose, and I think that the proper method of dealing with these important and difficult questions is through the medium of the Railway Commission which we have created. The creation of that commission was one of the most useful acts of this government. If the Railway Commission are now overloaded with work, we should increase their numbers, and if their powers are not sufficient to enable them to force the railways to properly operate their systems, we should increase their powers. It is up to us to see that the railway companies carry out what it was intended they should do. I think, in connection with the report I have just read and other workings of the Railway Commission, that they have shown that they at least have some power and that they have done a great deal of good at different points throughout this country. I have been at some of the meetings where they met some of the railway

companies and I have noticed that a word from the chairman of the Railway Commission goes a long way. The railway companies do not want to get up against the commissioners and they will do almost anything rather than have the board order them in any special or specific way. I do not know that I should take up more of the time of the House, but I think a discussion of this kind is good. A great many of the people of the country are interested in such a discussion and they are not only interested in it but they expect some definite and positive action to follow. I know what is agitating the minds of the people of the west particularly. I see that it is agitating our eastern friends more or less, and it is evident that we will have to do something and do it soon.

I do not know that I am in favour of a two-cent rate. I think there is very little objection to the existing rate but I would rather see, instead of reducing the passenger rates throughout the country, a reduction in freight rates. I think it would do more good to the general public than a reduction in passenger rates. My position is this : I want to see the railway companies make some money. I do not want to see them haul goods at a loss. We, first of all, want a good service but we want to get it at as reasonable a rate as we possibly can. The first thing is to see that our country is well served and the next thing is to see that we get that service at a reasonable rate.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). Mr. Speaker, I have just one word to say to my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) who introduced this Bill and it is to offer the suggestion that he make what I consider a very desirable addition to his Bill, when it goes as I presume it will, before the Railway Committee or a special committee. I agree with the principle of the Bill but in my opinion it does not go far enough. It provides altogether for the shipper but there is another class in the community who have just as substantial grievances as the shippers have; these are the manufacturers and they are both receivers and shippers. I think the Bill ought to be amended to protect the consignee. Several cases have come under my own observation. I have had a great deal of experience in this matter and I presume that every manufacturer in the country has. We purchase a carload of goods at a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway in Canada and make a through rate to be delivered at our own town, the car comes on, we have the bill of lading signed by the Canadian Pacific Railway but the Grand Trunk takes hold of the car, hauls it from the point of junction to its destination and then perhaps demands $10 or $20 more than the through-freight rate. You have no recourse if you are in a hurry for your goods and if you put in a claim it will take two or three years to have it adjusted. Last April we had a number of cars come in. The cars were shipped in December but did not reach us until April and then they sent in three or four carloads a day. They claimed demurrage, but I would not pay it because of the fact that we could not unload that number of cars. In April three carloads of goods came in with overcharges beyond the bill of lading amounting to $103. I refused the cars. The officials of the Grand Trunk telegraphed to Montreal and they wrote back to us asking us to accept the cars and they would see that the overcharges were adjusted, but I have not received my rebate yet. The matter has not been adjusted. About six weeks after that a carload came in with $200 of overcharges. The goods had been sent from Tennessee on one of the American railways on a through bill of lading, the Grand Trunk took hold of the car at Chicago, or some other point, and there were $200 of overcharges by the railway that had hauled it that far. The Grand Trunk Railway billed it to our door with these overcharges. I refused the car and the agent took the car down to the station and advised the people at Montreal. They wanted me to pay the overcharges and put in a claim. I refused to do that, so they unloaded the car at the station and after waiting a month or so we got the matter settled and word came from Montreal to the railway officials to deliver the car. They wanted us to take delivery at the station, they having unloaded it there. I refused to do it. They wanted $12 to pay for the unloading and $12 to pay for hauling it up to us. I refused it and finally the Grand Trunk came down and threw off the $200 overcharges. Another car came in a few days after which they claimed weighed 66,000 pounds. I knew the car would not weigh over 40,000 pounds and I therefore refused it. After several days advice came from the Grand Trunk head office asking us to have the car sent up to Brockville to be weighed on the scale there. They had no weigh scale at Gananoque although they produced the receipt of their weighee at a point where they had a scale certifying that the weight was correct. They wanted it to be sent to Brockville to be reweighed on the condition that if it were not more than 1,000 pounds short I was to pay the freight down to Brockville and return and if more the Grand Trunk would pay it. I refused to accept it on these terms. I suggested that they put it on the scales at our door and have it weighed by one of their own men and I expressed the belief that they would find out if they did so that the weight that I had mentioned was correct. They finally unloaded it at the station and weighed it and found that the weight was 44,500 pounds although they charged me freight for 60,000 pounds. This case is not adjusted yet although it is six weeks since the car came there. So it goes. I draw

the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) and of my hon. friend from South York to the fact that a railway company should, at the point where it takes the bill of lading from another company, see that the proper charges are made and they should deliver it on the through bill of lading signed by the railway over which the goods have been originally shipped to you. Many manufacturers in this country have claims amounting to $2,000 or $3,000 against railways standing for from one to three years unadjusted. I brought this matter to the attention of the Railway Commission last year but they have not done anything with regard to it yet. I think the time has come when the Railway Commission should make a rule that the railway company receiving goods from another railway company should see that the charges are correct and that having seen that they are correct they should deliver the goods and not hold them impounded as some of them do for one or two months. I think the Minister of Railways should see that the law should be so amended as to meet the cases which I have cited and that the Railway Commission should see that it is enforced.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, this discussion has certainly been not only interesting, but it has been very instructive to myself and, I imagine, to a good many hon. members of the House. It is said that the prosperity of a country can be judged by the ease with which the people can move to and fro and by the facilities afforded for carrying the products of the people from the place of production to the place of consumption with speed and in good condition. That is the object, I believe that the hon. gentlemen who have spoken have had in view. That is the reason why the Dominion of Canada has done so much to assist in the building of railways and, I might also add, in the construction of canals and waterways.

Transportation, by rail and by water, may be called the foundation of commerce. Without railways our products would bring us only the price we could get for them at a market within wagon hauling distance from the point of production; indeed we would have no markets if we did not have transportation. The assistance given to railroads in Canada has not been for the purpose of assisting the railways but for enabling those who produce goods to send them to the markets of the world and get the highest market price. Every day saved in the moving of a product to market means an enhanced price for that product. Every facility that can be afforded to place a product in the market in a condition as nearly as possible equal to that in which it leaves the point of production adds so much to the price of a commodity. In dealing with the question of transportation we—the people—cannot disassociate ourselves from the transportation companies. I repeat what I have already said in this House, that there is nothing to be gained by arraying ourselves against the men who have invested their money in these large enterprises, and I am glad that the debate to-day has been along thoroughly practical lines and free from any tendency to attack the investors in these enterprises. We—I again speak of the people of Canada—are co-investors with the owners of the railways. Up to the 30th of June last we had paid from the federal treasury $128,827,649 in cash subsidies, the provinces have given $35,123,130; the municipalities have given $17,346,633, in all $181,298,413. But more than that has been done for railway transportation; the Dominion and the provinces combined have granted 52,183,063 acres of land in aid of railway construction. Even that is not all, although it is a good deal for six and a half millions of people to have done. In addition, the people of the Dominion and of the provinces have built and are operating 1,890 miles of railway at a cost of $101,000,000. Further, I think it is reasonable to mention it, there have been guaranteed bonds of the different railways to the extent of another $100,000,000. And so you see we, the people of Canada, are co-investors with the railway companies in the transportation problem, and we are interested from the cash standpoint as well as from the standpoint of producers or consumers. We want to be fair to those who have invested their money in railway enterprises and we have been fair. Sometimes, and in some directions, we perhaps overstep the bounds of what might be called practical, in attacking people who have invested large sums of money in certain enterprises, apparently only for the reason that they have been somewhat successful. Selfishness is selfishness wherever you find it, and in all the speeches delivered to-day there has been, may I say, a line of selfishness in that we want to get all we possibly can in the way of transportation; the basic idea of the discussion is that we may benefit ourselves and those around us. We are then all more or less selfish; the man who ships is anxious to get his product to the market though his neighbour is sidetracked; the consignee is anxious to get his goods even though his neighbour's carload is left on a siding. It may be that railway companies are more selfish than we are, because they are the concentrated selfishness of several men combined, but however that may be we have to discuss these things in a practical way and to try to arrive at some wise conclusion. Let me point out, and perhaps some of us do not think of it, that so far as railways are concerned Canada is one of the best served countries in the world, for we have more

miles of railway per head of population than any other country.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Too many and not enough service.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, if there is a proposition to construct a line through South York I do not think my hon. friend will oppose it, nor will any other hon. gentleman oppose the construction of a railroad through his constituency.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) said this afternoon that mile after mile of railway had been built last season paralleling a road already in existence, and that the construction of that railway did no good.

Mr. GRAHAM. That may be, but I think I might hazard the opinion that the railway was not opposed when it was proposed. It all shows our selfishness again; we are willing to restrict every one but ourselves. But the gist of the whole thing lies just there; our territory is large, our population is comparatively small. We have more miles of railway per head of population than any country in the world, but the area of our country is so immense and we are so scattered over it that it is impossible to afford each person the railway facilities he might wish for, or, if it is not impossible it is more difficult than it would be in a thickly settled country. The railways of Canada have a large amount of capital invested in them, amounting to $1,171,937,808, and last year they hauled 163,866,135 tons of freight, and their gross earnings all told amounted to $146,738,214.68. Now, my reason for referring to that is not only to show the investment but to lead up to another fact that about one-sixth of the population of the Dominion earns its livelihood from the transportation facilities which exist here. We are interested in the success of the railways from a commercial standpoint, we are interested as a people from the cash standpoint because we have contributed largely to them, and we are further interested because of the fact that transportation facilities afford a livelihood for about one-sixth —some people say one-fifth—of the population of the Dominion. Now, Sir, a good many things have been said, and I have no fault to find with anything that has been said except perhaps a little undue criticism of the member for South Wellington. He was trying to point out as I understood him, not that he was against the railways carrying out their share of the duty they owe to the country, as they ought to, but he was trying to point out that it was his belief that there was already in the Railway Act sufficient power to compel the railways to do their duty. In this connection he called attention to the fact that there had been hundreds of thousands of dollars expended in the past year in the purchase of cars and locomotives, and equipment. I do not know exactly where the fault lies, but I do know there is a grievance and I want to state frankly that the government admits, sees, and realizes fully that there is a grievance on the part of shippers and consignees in connection with the transportation facilities afforded. The Railway Commission last year sent out several questions to the railway companies along this line, and if the House will bear with me, I will read these questions.

1. Have you a sufficient supply of motive power?
2. If not, how many additional locomotives do you require?
3. Have you an adequate supply of freight cars for your traffic?
4. If not, what is the approximate cause of the shortage?
5. How many freight cars used in your service were destroyed, worn out, or otherwise disposed of during the year ended June 30, 1907?

It will be interesting to the House to learn that there was only one railway company in Canada which admitted that it had any shortage, and that was the Intercolonial Railway. Not that the others had not the shortage, but the Intercolonial Railway, with its usual honesty, answered the question fairly; also probably because the Intercolonial, through the department, was coming to this House to ask for appropriations to enable it to overcome that shortage.

Now, there are two or three comparisons made by the compiler of railway statistics between the United States and Canada as to car shortage. In the United States there are 8,810 cars of all classes for every thousand miles of railway; in Canada last year there were 5,218 cars for every thousand miles of railway. That looks as if we had a much shorter supply of cars than the United States; but, making a fair comparison of our population with theirs, I believe we have as many cars for the purposes needed as the United States has, and perhaps more. Another comparison was this: in the United States the average haul for a freight car was 888 tons, while in Canada it was only 594 tons. That might be accounted for in this way. On their double track or four-track routes some of their cars of later design may be larger than the old cars; but the fact remains that they did make their freight cars haul more tonnage than ours.

I wish to discuss for two or three minutes the question of the statute as it now stands in reference to the Railway Commission. My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Sproule) might possibly say that I got it from the argument of the companies, but I assure him that I read the statute before the company had an argument, in print at least.

Mr. SPROULE. You surely did not read Mr. Chrysler's argument, which seemed to be the brief which the hon. member for Wellington had.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will not say that any portion of the statute is misquoted in that pamphlet, will he ?

Mr. SPROULE. I did not look over it.

Mr. GRAHAM. If I did not read it and my hon. friend did not, we are not in a very good position to discuss its contents. Now, I am free to admit, as I have said, that there is a grievance. There are two sides to the question, however. Having the control of a railway in the department over which I preside, I come into conflict with difficulties every day. It is a fact that many of the men who complain the loudest about the shortage of cars are the biggest sinners themselves in keeping cars when they get them. Cases have been brought to my notice of men using cars for storage purposes instead of the purpose for which they were designed.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. They are fined by the railway companies if they do that.

Mr. GRAHAM. But they try to escape if they can, and I do not blame them. I have found that the railway companies have been pretty lenient about taking to court a question of demurrage.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I have not found it so.

Mr. GRAHAM. Then my hon. friend has been possibly more of a sinner than I have been. There are, as I have said, two sides to the question, and we want to discuss it from the standpoint of fairness, justice and above all practical results. If there be a grievance, which we all admit, then there ought to be a remedy for that grievance. What is the remedy ? It will be agreed, I think, by my hon. friend from South York, that reciprocal demurrage, as applied by statute, is merely experimental as yet. He stated the cases of the State of Michigan and the State of New York. But no person on this continent, I think, really knows yet what the final result of a reciprocal demurrage law placed on the statute-book will be. We in Canada are hardly in the same position as they are in the United States. Every State of the Union can make its own law in reference to demurrage. One State may have a law applicable to this question, while the next State may not. Consequently those who ship in one State may be in a better position than those who ship in the next State. But that only robs Peter to pay Paul, and does not bring about the result for all the people which the needs of the country demand. In Canada we are in a different position. The provinces do not deal with this matter, but the Dominion as a whole has to deal with it.

We have heard a good deal from the west, and I admit that the grievances there are material and substantial, and that some remedy for them must be provided. Possibly the fact that railway competition is very slight, or absent entirely in some districts may account for the apparent neglect of the railways.

There are circumstances, too, over which the railways have no control. Let me point out one particular phase. It has been said that some cars have been placed on sidings. I have seen that done many times myself. For instance, in the case of a snow blockade the demand of the public is that the passenger traffic must be moved no matter what happens to the freight traffic, and the freight cars are placed to one side in order that the passenger traffic may be carried through. But that is only exceptional. I think the dates mentioned by some hon. gentlemen had reference to a time when the snow blockade was such that practically no freight traffic could be moved.

Now, the desire of the government is to get at some general line of action that will meet the grievances, although we cannot hope to bring about a remedy that will be universal so that some grievances will not exist. My hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) whose remarks I very much enjoyed, and from whose practical talk I received a good deal of practical information, will agree, I think, that the Railway Commission ought not to be made a court for the settlement of claims for damages. There is a definite line between imposing a fine or penalty and finding an amount of damages, which I think must be a civil action. I believe that throughout the Dominion of Canada, I might say throughout the continent, no more popular step has been taken than the establishment of that Board of Railway Commissioners. I believe further, and I think my hon. friend from South York will agree with me, that the powers conferred on that board are equal to if they do not exceed the powers given to any other board anywhere. I believe further that our board has done excellent work. I believe the result to the people of Canada cannot be estimated in dollars and cents, because in many instances they have prevented grievances, or circumstances that would have developed into grievances if they had not been prevented.

That board is being overworked. There can be no question about that. Some hon. gentlemen have contended that complaints have been made which have not been attended to promptly. Others say that the board does not feel itself empowered to do certain things. Let me say that there is not a body of men in the Dominion who have worked harder than the members of the Dominion Railway Board. Since that board has been established it has become so popular that many things have been referred to it; and while we have not increased the number

on the board, the number of their duties has been and is constantly increasing. The correspondence that comes to the railway board in little things, little complaints, which perhaps they do not deal with frequently, has become enormous. To their former work several things have been added —the express companies and other things. I want to say frankly that I propose in a few days to introduce a Bill which will increase the membership of the Railway Commission. I hope that the board thus increased will not only be able to catch up with its present work but to undertake new work. In that Bill I may say, without giving away any confidences, that we propose to place the telephones and telegraphs under the commission. But I want to go further and say to my hon. friend from South York (W. F. Maclean) that this matter, dealt with in the Bill now under discussion, has not been neglected. I suppose that no question has been so thoroughly dealt with by magazine writers in the United States as this question of reciprocal demurrage. These articles have convinced me that the writers themselves have not really come to any definite conclusion as to the best way to bring about the result aimed at. They all agree that the American railways are not performing the duties they should on behalf of the public. But how to get the railways to perform these duties in the most expeditious way did not seem any more clear to me after reading these articles than before. I have read a good many articles and have discussed the matter with a good many shippers, and some railway men, and with men like my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who is not only a shipper but a receiver to a large extent of goods coming over the line, and I have tried to get their ideas of the best way to work out a solution of the problem. They all agree that the railway companies owe something for the privilege we have given them. We have given them franchises and subsidies and other concessions; and while I do not agree that the Bill of my hon. friend is the best way of working out this problem, I admit that we must take the position that there are reciprocal responsibilities as between the railway companies and the public. How to get the railway companies to perform their responsibilities fairly and justly to themselves and the people of Canada is the problem. Is it by an inflexible statute, which says absolutely that the day a car is ordered, or a few hours after the day the car is ordered, that order becomes a contract under which the railway companies are bound, under penalties, to carry out certain things —is that the better way? Or would the better way be to use the Railway Commission, as it will be enlarged, to work out the problem, having due regard to what the conditions of the various parts of the country are, and then devise a method by means of which the railway companies will be compelled to give the people fair and proper transportation facilities?

The question has been raised that the present Act does not give the board that power. I am not going to argue that question. I have read all the sections of the Railway Act, and it struck me, as a layman, that they have pretty large powers at present; but after discussing the question further with some men of legal attainments, they pointed out that there did not seem to be a provision which would give the commission the power definitely to compel the railways to do certain things or subject them to a penalty. If that be true—and I have come to the conclusion that it is—I want to say frankly that I propose to place a clause in the Railway Act, by a Bill which will be introduced in a very few days, not only enlarging the commission and referring this question to the Railway Commission, but giving it the power it needs to deal thoroughly with this matter. That it strikes me from a practical standpoint, will bring about the best results. If we had somewhere a statute which had produced the results we are trying to obtain, in a country like Canada, with a similar population, extending over a very large territory, we might follow that statute. But up to the present the question of reciprocal demurrage from a practical standpoint, is only in the experimental stage. We have taken the wise course of naming a commission to work out these difficult problems. Having appointed that commission, having found it very useful, having seen the necessity of increasing its membership, and believing that the commission will bring about practical results, it would be foolish for us at present to depart from the line we have chosen. We ought rather to use our own machinery, strengthen it by legislation if necessary, and work along the lines we have chosen ourselves, and I believe the result will be better than if we placed on the statutes an inflexible law by which we would be rigidly bound.

I asure my hon. friend that this matter is not looked upon lightly. It is one of vast importance to the people and of great interest to the railway companies. We have given these companies large amounts of money and concessions and they cannot get away from their responsibility to give us in return the facilities we require for carrying our goods and which we expected to obtain when we gave these concessions. There is no difference of opinion as to the existence of grievances and the necessity of remedying them. I trust my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) will see that we are in earnest and that, while we may differ from him about the best solution, we are endeavouring honestly to bring about such a solution. If my hon friend is satisfied that the government is prepared to do that he might withdraw his motion—though I do not want at all to press that upon him.

However in the meantime I want to assure the House that the matter will be dealt with in the way I have suggested.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). There can be no doubt whatever as to the great importance of the question of transportation to any country, nor can there be any doubt that in a country, situated as Canada is, that question is perhaps of greater importance than it can be anywhere else. The reasons are obvious. We have an enormous country and a sparse population scattered all over. We have resources of almost infinite scope which require to be developed. Any one of us can, therefore, see in a moment that the problem of transportation, not only within Canada, but from Canada to foreign countries, is one of the greatest we have to consider. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) has said that railways, so long as they are in private ownership, must be regulated. There can be no two opinions about that. They must be regulated because corporations which undertake the duties of transportation undoubtedly take upon themselves great responsibilities. The hon. minister has referred to the large subsidies both in money and in lands which have been granted by the people of this country in aid of these corporations. That, no doubt, is a subject which it is proper to consider, but in my view, the responsibility of any one of these corporations to the people of this country would be just as great if it had not received a dollar of subsidy because any corporation undertaking to exercise a public franchise, such as that of a common carrier, takes that franchise not only for the purpose of making a reasonable profit on the capital invested, but primarily, I would say, to discharge a duty which, after all, is a national function and not a private function. So far as these matters are concerned, I do not think there can be any doubt as to what principles we should proceed upon. The only question that remains is as to the best way of working out the development of these transportation systems in the interest of the people, having due regard, of course, at all times to the invested capital, because it will be the worst possible service to this country to take any step that could be regarded as unjust to men who, under the laws of this country, have invested their capital in good faith for the purpose of affording means of transportation to the people of Canada.

Now, it has always seemed to me in dealing with the regulation of these companies, in bringing about a system which should necessitate the proper discharge of their duties to the public, we may, by legislation, lay down what may be called certain guiding principles. But so long as we are to persevere in the policy of regulation by railway commission, we must, to a very great extent, leave the details to be worked out by that commission. It is absolutely impossible that men assembled in this parliament should undertake to deal with these details which, by the terms of our Railway Act, have been, and still are, entrusted to the Railway Commission of Canada. Therefore I entirely concur in what the Minister of Railways and Canals has said in the line of what I have been advocating in this House for the last three years—that the Railway Commission must be reorganized, that its personnel must be increased, and, if any powers are lacking, those powers must be conferred by further legislation.

Now, the Railway Commission of Canada is undoubtedly the most important tribunal to the people of Canada to-day. I, for one, do not doubt that, even constituted as it is at present, and with the powers which it has at present. The Railway Commission of Canada has been overworked for years. I pointed this out to the government last session and the session before that, and, I believe, the session before that also. I understand that there are thousands of tariffs in the office of the Railway Commission which the members of that commission have not yet had time even to read. much less revise or deal with, and the first and most important duty of this government is to reorganize that commission, to increase the number of its members, and to so constitute it that it can overtake in the early future much of the work that has, of necessity, been neglected in the past. And, in that connection, I would say to the Minister of Railways and Canals and the members of this House that there is no matter of more urgent moment to the people of this country, that there is no matter that will redound more to the credit of the government if the duty is properly discharged, than to see to it that the men who are added to that commission should be men of the highest ability and character, men in whom the people of this country shall have the greatest confidence. The Railway Commission can do work which this paraliament cannot possibly do ; it can deal with matters which this parliament cannot possibly deal with in an adequate manner. But it can only do that work, it can only discharge those duties if its membership is of the character to which I have just now alluded. A friend of mine on this side of the House told me that not long ago he went to one of the states of the American union and was brought in close touch with the members of the Railway Commission of that state. He was astonished in the first place at the ability, experience and business capacity of these men, for they were the very ablest and most representative men that could be found in that state. But he was still more astonished at the earnestness and industry with which these men had devoted themselves, without com-

pensation, or for merely nominal compensation, to the discharge of the duties devolving upon them. They had gone into the subject thoroughly, taking up the problems which our Railway Commission will have to consider, but which the time at their disposal has not yet enabled them to deal with, and they were dealing with the railway question in that state in a most thorough and able manner. This must be done in Canada, if the Railway Commission is to discharge the duties for which it has been established.

You must have a certain driving force behind that commission. Section 28 of the Railway Act has been referred to. This is a very important section, and one which, for the present time, does not seem to have been utilized to any great extent. It provides :

> The board may, of its own motion, or shall upon the request of the minister, inquire into, hear and determine any matter or thing which under this Act it may inquire into, hear and determine, upon application or complaint, and with respect thereto shall have the same powers as, upon any application or complaint, are vested in it by this Act.

So it is not necessary, even under the law as it stands at present, that the Railway Commission should wait for any complaints to be made to it. But if the commission does wait for complaints in respect of matters that should be remedied, it is open to the Minister of Railways and Canals to take up any grievance, and it then becomes the imperative duty of that commission to investigate and inquire into that matter and find the proper remedy. Section 28, as I have said, does not seem to have been very much utilized. The Railway Commission has been overworked in attending to matters, I presume, as to which there was complaint. The Minister of Railways and Canals, up to the present time at least, has not found it necessary, apparently to avail himself of the provisions of this section and to call, as he is entitled to call, upon the Railway Commission to deal with matters of public interest which concern the country as a whole.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) will agree with me when I say that I have brought quite a number of things to the attention of the Railway Commission within the last two or three months.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am very glad to hear it. Of course naturally I would not know very much of the work that the Minister has done ; indeed, in the remarks I made, I was referring more especially to former ministers, because I brought that section to the attention of the government and the then Minister of Railways on more than one occasion. The scope of the Railway Commission will, I think, probably be very much extended in the future, as we come to better understand the powers vested in the commission and the benefit that can be derived from the proper exercise of those powers. I should not be surprised to see in Canada a governmental inspection through the Railway Commission on every railway. Suppose a railway company is carrying on its passenger service in such a way as not to give reasonably good accommodation to the public. why should it be necessary that some individual should have to take it upon himself to bring his complaint before the Railway Commission. Under a system of inspection the Railway Commission will become advised of such matters of neglect and without complaint from any one, call upon the company concerned to remedy the matter. I have seen some things in the country in the past year which seemed to me to call for redress. What is every one's business in the end becomes no one's business, and for lack of some system of inspection and oversight, of the kind I have suggested, these evils continue from day to day and from year to year, creating in the minds of the people of the country more dissatisfaction than the railway companies have yet realized.

Further I believe that the powers and jurisdiction of the Railway Commission in other respects, have not perhaps been realized. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) made a very important contribution to this debate to-day ; he put the matter from his standpoint in a very forcible and convincing way. Among other things he referred to the difficulties which face any man who believes himself to be entitled to compensation from a railway company, particularly to the difficulty that one meets by reason of the waiver clauses in the bill of lading he is forced to sign, which leave him without redress unless it may be in cases of very extreme negligence. The Railway Commission of Canada in respect of matters of that kind have complete powers, because section 340 contains this provision :

> No contract, provision, by-law, regulation, declaration or notice made or given by the company, impairing, restricting or limiting its liability in respect of the carriage of any traffic, shall, except as hereinafter provided, relieve the company from such liability, unless such class of contract, condition, by-law, regulation, declaration or notice shall have been first authorized or approved by order or regulation of the board.

So far then as bills of lading are concerned, the Railway Commission to-day possesses complete jurisdiction to eliminate from them any such unreasonable provision as the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) has pointed out to the House.

The suggestion has also been made that the present Act does not provide for penal-

ties; but section 427 of the Railway Act provides :

Any company, or any director or officer thereof, or any receiver, trustee, lessee, agent, or person, acting for or employed by such company, that does, causes or permits to be done, any matter, act or thing contrary to the provisions of this or the Special Act, or to the orders or directions of the Governor in Council, or of the minister, or of the board, made under this Act, or omits to do any matter, act or thing, thereby required to be done on the part of any such company or person, shall, if no other penalty is provided in this or the Special Act for any such act or omission, be liable for each such offence to a penalty of not less than twenty dollars, and not more than five thousand dollars, in the discretion of the court before which the same is recoverable.

2. Such company, director, officer, receiver, trustee, lessee, agent or person shall also, in any case, in addition to any such penalty, be liable to any person injured by any such act or omission, for the full amount of damages sustained thereby.

This is a very comprehensive provision in the first place as to the penalty which the Crown may exact for breach of the Act, and secondly as to the redress to any person who may be injured in any respect by failure to observe the Act or regulations. Under these circumstances it seems to me that the Railway Commission as at present constituted and with the additions spoken of by the Minister of Railways and Canals affords very fair protection to the people of this country and can be made to afford an almost perfect protection provided the requirements of the Act are carried out, and the board is so constituted that it is able to discharge all the duties imposed upon it by that Act. I doubt if we could find a better method of regulating the railways of Canada than we would have if this is properly carried out. From time to time with increased experience no doubt the Act can be improved; and the result of such discussions as we have had today will undoubtedly be to make that Act more perfect than it is at present.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). I am heartily in sympathy with the principles enunciated in the Bill which is now under discussion. This is not a new question with us in the west; I remember in 1902, introducing a resolution in the legislative assembly there in which attention was called to the many difficulties in connection with transportation from which we are still suffering and speaking of it then as an old question, as indeed it was. There has been no amelioration in the condition since then, and for my own part I think very stringent measures must be taken in order to bring about some bettering of the conditions under which we are labouring in the west. A wealth of illustrations have been brought forward to show the difficulties under which the people in the west are suffering from the present lack of transportation facilities, so at this late hour I need not go into further details or give further illustrations. In regard to the shipment of grain from the Northwest there is a special provision by an Act of this parliament; the Manitoba Grain Act tacitly admits that there is no positive necessity upon the railway companies to supply all the cars required for the shipment of grain at the time they are required. That tacit admission, as I consider it to be, is one that should not be made, and I trust that if the proposals of the Minister of Railways are carried into effect, as I have no doubt they will be, the augmented board will immediately take into consideration the fact that it is incumbent upon the great transportation companies of this country to supply transportation as and when it is needed. I understand that an additional commissioner is to be appointed to the Railway Commission, and that further powers are to be given to that commission which will enable them to deal thoroughly and completely with such questions as this. I hope we shall not have to wait for another five years, as we have waited since that Railway Commission was appointed, until some definite and drastic action is taken to see that the legitimate needs of the shippers of this country are met.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. JOHN HERRON (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to go over the ground that has been so ably covered by the speakers who have preceded me in this debate, but I wish to state that I have received a great number of complaints in reference to this question from boards of trade, town councils, farmers and merchants throughout my riding. From my own observations and as a result of what I have heard I wish to say that I am in favour of the principle of the Bill. I will just mention one instance which has come under my observation to show the disadvantage at which shippers are placed by the failure of railway companies to provide cars when they are required. In one case within the last few years a number of cattlemen ordered cars for the shipment of cattle. They drove their cattle to the shipping point, 70 or 100 miles away from their homes, but the cars were not on the ground for them. They were put to a great deal of expense in holding the cattle there for a number of days waiting for the cars. A great snowstorm came up and they had to hold these cattle there for three weeks around the railway station herding them night and day at an expense probably of $1,000. In the handling of the cattle they probably lost 100 pounds weight, and as these cattle were sold according to the weight which they showed in Winnipeg it would therefore be a loss of about $3 per

animal to the owner. I think that instances of that kind are very serious. These men have no redress under the present law from the railway companies. If railway companies can charge a man who orders cars demurrage, I do not see why shippers who are put to this enormous expense should not be entitled to some redress from the railway corporations. Another instance that might occur and often does occur is this: A farmer who happens to live 15 or 20 miles from a station wishes to ship hay, or grain, or any other kind of produce in a car. He orders his car for a certain day. Expecting to find the car on a siding he goes into the town only to find it is not there. He has to return home and perhaps make a second trip one or two days later and this perhaps goes on for a week. The car may arrive just after he has left the station, and he is, under the law, charged with demurrage on his car. These are instances that are occurring regularly in the outlying portions of the Northwest and for these reasons, not to mention others, I am in favour of the principle of the Bill and I will be prepared to support it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I am more convinced than ever that it is the duty of parliament to lay down the principles which must guide the Railway Commission in the application of the railway law to this country. I do not believe it is the duty of parliament to turn over to this Railway Commission the settlement of a question of this kind. I believe it is the duty of parliament to say that the commission are in some way empowered—and to say it distinctly in legislation—to impose penalties on a corporation that refuses to perform the service for which it was enfranchised. I think we will have to make additions to the railway law in parliament and not merely leave it to the commission to frame regulations. I believe that the whole tendency of the great body of legislation that is now being proposed all over the United States is in the direction of laying down the principles which must govern railway commissions in dealing with this question. Therefore, I cannot agree with the statements that have been made here to-night by some of the speakers that all of the protection necessary to the people is in the Railway Commission as at present constituted. The great fact is that the grievances are in existence to-day. The great fact is that hon. members here to-night have furnished the evidence to parliament that these grievances exist and the people to-day, I believe, expect of parliament that these grievances shall be removed by legislation and not by a reference to the commission. The people of Canada will never accept the doctrine that the functions of parliament must be turned over to a railway commission. The people of Canada do not believe that the great grievances that they may have are to be cured by reference to some other body. The cure of a fundamental grievance of the public, whatever it may be, is in the direct action of parliament in laying down great general principles. So, while I welcome this discussion and am rather pleased with the way in which the subject has been dealt with in the House I still maintain that the people look to parliament for the cure and that they do not look to the commission. I am quite willing that the debate should be adjourned. I will wait with interest to see what proposals the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), on behalf of the government, makes to this House in this connection. But, whatever they may be I wish to tell him, and I wish to tell the House that there is only one way that will meet the case and that is by parliament intervening and providing a direct remedy for grievances such as have been stated here to-night and such as are felt by the people of this country. The grievances are still with us. Their removal is not quite in sight and their remedy will not be effected until direct legislation dealing with them is passed by parliament. That seems to me to be the real expression of opinion as it has been made here to-night. Men have come here from all over this country, grievances exist all over, enormous sums of money are being lost, the public are being inconvenienced, great hardship is being suffered and a commission of three, or five or seven men will not quite effect the cure. The cure, I say, must be in legislation, and while I await with some interest what the Minister of Railways and Canals may propose to bring down, and while I am quite willing that the debate should be adjourned, what shall happen to my Bill and what other steps I shall take in regard to it must remain unsettled at the present moment. But, I am quite willing that the adjournment should take place, and I am quite willing that the minister shall have every opportunity to bring down his proposed legislation.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. TURRIFF. With the consent of the House I would like to take up item 13 in the public Bills and orders for the second reading of Bill (No. 4) to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think that my Bill should also be taken up. I am willing to refer it to the Railway Committee without any discussion. It is Bill (No. 90.) There would be no discussion upon that Bill, and with the consent of the House, I would ask that it be taken up.

Mr. FIELDING. The motion of the right hon. the Prime Minister was not to take

public Bills and orders generally but to take the particular Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean).

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not think there is any objection to my Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman from East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has a Bill on the Order Paper which comes before my hon. friend's Bill, and if we are to take public Bills and orders generally he would have precedence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As a matter of fact what was promised last night was that public Bills and orders should be taken up.

Mr. FIELDING. So I understood.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When the Prime Minister made his motion he did not carry out what was obviously the understanding, but I did not object at the time because the subject proposed for discussion was a very important one and I supposed there had been some arrangement of which I was not aware.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I had no arrangement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When my hon. friend from South York spoke last week he spoke not only on his own behalf but on behalf of others who desired to have a day fixed for public Bills and orders. The Minister of Finance said last night that this would be carried out, and I was a little surprised when the motion was made to-day. It will be necessary for us to have public Bills and orders on some other day because the understanding made with the House last week ought to be carried out.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think that the Prime Minister meant to depart from the understanding.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I presume not.

Mr. FIELDING. With the consent of the House there will be no objection to proceeding with public Bills and orders, and they can be taken up in their order.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The only understanding I had was what took place across the floor and my understanding was that public Bills and orders would be called.

Mr. FIELDING. The Prime Minister probably understood that but did not quite express it in his motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion of the hon. member for East Assiniboia ?

Mr. J. D. REID. We have passed that.

Mr. TURRIFF. No, my Bill is the first on the Order Paper.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentlemen who have the two first orders on the paper are not present and therefore the first order to be called is the Bill of the hon. member for East Assiniboia. I am quite indifferent as to the procedure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The gentlemen who have the first two orders in their names were present this afternoon when they should have been called in the regular course on the understanding which was made.

Motion (Mr. Turriff) agreed to.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia) moved second reading of Bill (No. 4) to amend the Railway Act. He said : The Bill I have the honour to move provides that a railway shall be commenced and at least 10 per cent of its mileage completed and in operation within two years after the date of the granting of the charter. If 10 per cent is not considered a proper amount I would be quite prepared to have that amended in the Railway Committee. The Bill also provides that in the third and fourth years an additional 10 per cent shall be completed and put in operation. I can quite understand that in the case of railways 500 or 1,000 miles long, 10 per cent may be too much to be completed within two years, and in the case of very short railways of say up to fifty miles possibly the requirement of 10 per cent may be too small. However, I wish to see this amendment to the law because at the present time and for years back we have been incorporating railway companies one after the other which pay little attention to the construction of the road. They come here year after year and get charters by the dozen, or get one charter covering a dozen different lines running into the hundreds and even the thousands of miles and they do very little towards building the roads they get charters for. The result is that we have them coming back year after year asking extension of time for building roads that were chartered ten or twenty years ago and on which nothing has been done. I believe that one result of this Bill if passed into law would be that we would have fewer charters applied for by persons who have no intention of constructing in the immediate future.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would it prevent charter mongering ?

Mr. TURRIFF. I do not know if it would prevent charter mongering altogether but it would have a tendency in that direction. The present law provides that a road must be commenced within two years and completed within five years, and the practice of my part of the country is that a road is commenced within two years by grading half a mile or a mile of track and then it stands for three years without anything being done. At the end of five years the company comes back to parliament and gets a renewal of the charter. If it were provided that they should complete ten per cent within two

years and they failed to do so it would be necessary for them to apply for a renewal every two years and that would be a check on them. The present law works out in actual practice that a company gets a charter and does nothing towards the construction of its road, but it holds this charter as a club over every other interest, and the moment another company undertakes to get a charter and starts to build a road the first company starts to build a little piece to keep out the bona fide railway. The amendment I propose would have a tendency to prevent that. Settlers in my constituency have grounds for complaint in this matter. I have said before and I repeat it, that at the present time railway companies appear to be devoting a good deal more attention to building roads which may cut out competing roads, than to constructing railways in parts of the country which are in need of transportation, and which would benefit the settlers. In most cases we grant the larger amount of assistance required for the building of these railroads, and I think this parliament has the right, and it is its duty, to exercise a great deal more authority over the construction of roads in the future than it has done in the past. I think it is the duty of the government and of this House to see that railroads are built in those portions of the country where they are most needed, in order to give facilities to the settlers, instead of permitting the railroads to build lines paralleling existing lines and for no other purpose than to get the start of a competing railway that is already serving the district. In my part of the country there are several districts where settlers have to haul their wheat from twenty-five to fifty miles. It is absolutely impossible to grow wheat profitably under these circumstances; so that the settlers are simply marking time until they can get railway facilities to enable them to farm on a larger scale.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Might I ask my hon. friend what part of his riding is fifty miles from a railway ?

Mr. TURRIFF. On the Canadian Pacific Railway Sault line, running from North Portal to Moosejaw there are settlers who draw their wheat to Estevan.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not in the hon. gentleman's riding.

Mr. TURRIFF. It is just outside of the riding I represent; but in the riding for which I was nominated last fall, and which I propose to represent in the future, there are settlers who have to draw their wheat from forty to fifty miles. However, it makes no difference whether they are in the riding I represent or in that represented by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) the fact remains that they are very much in need of railway facilities. If the Canadian Northern or the Grand Trunk Pacific were in there, the Canadian Pacific Railway, I am quite certain, would find no difficulty in extending their road. At present they say they cannot do so, and they have made no provision, in their estimates of work for this year, for building any lines in that part of the country. In the southern portion of my district, although it is an old and thickly settled part of the country, and has been settled for the last twenty-five years, and there are a large number of farmers who farm from 500 to 1,200 acres, there is no railway, and these people have to haul their wheat sixteen miles. The Canadian Pacific Railway has a line built from Deloraine westward, called the Wascada branch, which they undertook a year ago to extend some twenty miles further, but complained that they could not get the teams necessary to do the grading. The settlers made an arrangement with the company to put on 200 teams, but after a good deal of correspondence between them and Mr. William Whyte, the second vice president of the company, the arrangement fell through. The company made the excuse that they could not get steel rails or ties, and this year Mr. Whyte writes to them that the company have not been able to put anything into their estimates for the completion of that road. It seems to me that that is very unfair, because I am certain that if any of the other companies had a charter and showed any intention of building a line in that part of the country, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would find themselves able to extend the line without delay, and would have no trouble in getting men and the necessary material. They have no difficulty at all in getting money for such purposes. I may say that it is a very level part of the country, and the building of the railroad would not be at all expensive. This extension has been promised time and again, and unless something is done to make the railway company live more up to their undertakings, I do not expect that we shall have much redress in the early future. That part of the Wascada branch was chartered in 1900 for 100 miles. In 1902, 37 miles was built, but since then nothing further has been done. What we want is an extension of 20 or 30 miles further. At one time the company proposed to build a line from North Portal that would serve the same purpose. Either of these extensions would be satisfactory to the people residing in that part of the country. There is another road in that part of the country known as the Lauder-Broomhill branch. That was authorized in 1900, and since that time there has been twenty miles built two or three years, but it is not in regular operation. In the fall a certain number of trains are run to take out the wheat; but I think that in that case also the company should either be compelled to go on building the

road, completing a certain portion each year, or the charter should be forfeited, and other companies should have an opportunity of getting a charter and building a railroad in that part of the country. What is particularly wanted is a branch line extending westward from the town of Estevan, and another branch extending westward from Weyburn. If these two branches were built, they would afford some redress to the settlers in that part of the country and add considerably to the receipts of the railway. The country is losing a good deal because of the neglect to build these roads. A year ago, when there was a considerable blockade in that part of the country, from one town alone in the southern portion of my district there were 150,000 bushels of wheat drawn across the line and shipped through the United States. When that is done a great deal of money is expended across the line. So that not only do our Canadian railways lose the hauling of the grain, but our merchants lose a considerable amount of trade that should naturally belong to them. The time has come when more definite action must be taken, and I would ask the government to give me some assistance in having this amendment put through. If they do not give me any assistance, it will be difficult for me to get it through.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Or perhaps carry that constituency.

Mr. TURRIFF. Possibly. I was going to point out that when we have one railway company working against another, there is a possibility of getting something from the Railway Committee, but if you have the three great railway corporations working on the same side, it is a pretty difficult matter. This amendment, however, seems to me so fair and reasonable that there ought to be no difficulty felt by hon. members generally in giving it a fair support. Since I introduced the Bill I have had a number of letters, not only from the west, but also from the east, commending the course I have taken and pointing out numbers of cases down in the eastern country also where charters have been kept alive ten or twenty years and nothing done. It would be a move in the right direction if, whenever a company got a charter, it was compelled to build a certain portion of its line within two years.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has my hon. friend's practice been in accord with his preaching? Has he always fought in the Railway Committee to prevent the renewal of these charters?

Mr. TURRIFF. My course in the committee has perhaps been less inconsistent than my hon. friend's, but on several occasions I have endeavoured to get something of this kind put in railway charters. The objection, however, was always taken —I do not remember if my hon. friend was one of those who raised it or not—that in doing this we would be discriminating against one particular railway. Therefore I have deemed it better to bring in a Bill that will apply to all charters.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was not the hon. gentleman very ardent the other night in putting through the extension of a charter for a company whose first charter was granted away back in 1885?

Mr. TURRIFF. No, I was not very ardent in getting any of these Bills through, but I knew from past experience in the Railway Committee that there was no use trying to get any special legislation for one particular company, and that it was necessary, therefore, to bring in a Bill that would apply to all companies alike. And as my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) seems to be in sympathy with that legislation I hope he will give it his support when it goes down to the Railway Committee.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). I wish just to say a word in favour of the Bill brought in by the hon. gentleman from East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). No doubt the present situation is unsatisfactory. The Railway Act is supposed to provide for the commencement and completion of railways within a certain limit of time, but that provision has proved entirely ineffective. There can be no difference of opinion as to the harm done by having the country blanketed by charters which are not likely to result in the building of railways, and many of which were probably obtained purely and simply for the purpose of selling them and preventing other railway companies getting charters over the same country. That has resulted in some cases in preventing railway construction altogether in parts of the country where railways have been a pressing necessity for many years past. I quite agree with the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) regarding the absolute necessity for the extension of some of the lines to which he has called attention. and in addition to those he has specified, I would mention one or two of the branches of the Grand Trunk Pacific. The rumor has gained currency that the Grand Trunk Pacific have no intention of proceeding with their branch lines until they have completed their main line through to the coast. I trust this is not the case. The agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific was dated the 18th February, 1904, and they have had four full seasons to carry on their work. The only result they can claim for those four years is that they have been able to run a few freight trains over a small portion of their comparatively easy prairie section, and they have scarcely begun the more difficult

portion of their western section. How long shall we have to wait before the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific is completed? Are these people in the Northwest, who have been relying on getting the branches promised by the Grand Trunk Pacific, to wait until the whole line is completed to the coast? That is a question to which we ought to have some answer. The Grand Trunk Pacific have blanketed a good portion of the prairie provinces and people have been going in and settling in remote districts in the expectation that these districts would soon be furnished with railway accommodation. Some assurance should be given these people that these lines will be built in the near future. There are two lines to which I would like to refer specially. One is the Regina to Brandon branch, which would serve a section of country that has been overlooked, and I think principally because of the very fact stated by my hon. friend just now, namely, that one company came in to build where another had a charter already. The consequence was that the second company jumped in about the same time and they ran parallel lines within two or three miles of each other for a great distance. Now it becomes necessary, in order to fill up one of the gaps, that the Grand Trunk Pacific should go through.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would not that line parallel the others?

Mr. LAKE. It would not parallel it at all closely, and it would serve large sections which at present are a very long distance from a railway. Then there is the branch from Yorktown to Regina. Mr. Morse and Mr. Hayes were both in communication with the people in one of the districts through which that railway was expected to run. They obtained statistics from the people which showed that practically 2,000,000 bushels of wheat would be marketed within ten miles, either side of the survey which would be tributary to this new line. They sent delegates to Montreal to interview Mr. Morse and Mr. Hays, and were assured that the branch would be built in time to take out the crop of 1908. Some of the farmers living along the line have actually promised free grant of the right of way on condition that the line should be completed during the course of the present year. There seems to be absolutely no prospect of that at the present moment. I most earnestly trust that some steps will be taken which will compel these companies, when they have charters, and in some cases, have actually blanketed the country with charters, to go on and build these railways and not simply hold the charters as a means of keeping out other people who would build. I am heartily in favour of the principles of the Bill, though I think some of the details may be improved in committee.

Mr. LAKE.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would like to point out, if I may be permitted, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) proves absolutely what I said a few moments ago. While we insist that railways ought to be better equipped instead of building new lines, yet when it comes to our own territory, it is the new lines we want.

Mr. LAKE. We could have done without one of the parallel lines to which I have referred.

Mr. GRAHAM. We will not go over that, but it brings out the point we had a few moments ago that we look at our own surroundings rather differently from the way in which we look at the surroundings of other people. I have no objection to the Bill going to the Railway Committee to be threshed out there. This question has been before this House for some time, I suppose, as it has been before the provincial legislature—how far should we go in allowing companies to get charters for building lines of railway and hang on to them without doing anything in the way of building? It is a question of a good deal of interest, and whether this Bill would assist in settling the question I am not prepared to say at this time. It may mean that, instead of coming back every five years, the railway people will come back every two years for the renewal.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I am prepared to say something definite on this subject if the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) is not. The member who introduced the Bill fails to put his finger on the sore spot, and of course, he fails to meet the difficulty. The difficulty cannot be met by changing section 150 and substituting a ten per cent clause. The amendment we require is an amendment of the policy of the government. So long as we follow the practice of allowing gentlemen to come in from time to time. as often as they like, for renewal of charters, and grant them these renewals without any reason—certainly without any substantial reason—being given, we shall not cure the difficulty by simply putting on them the duty of constructing ten per cent within two years instead of keeping the old provisions that they shall begin the road within two years and complete within five. One is just as ineffectual as the other. What we really want is for the Minister of Railways and Canals to decide the principles upon which charters shall be renewed from time to time, to lay down a definite policy that will be, in the main, observed. Leave the Act as it is, and do not tinker with it if you are not going to improve it. It is now provided that construction shall begin within two years and be completed within five. How do you advance by simply making it obligatory to build ten or fifteen or even fifty per cent? But, if the government would lay down a definite policy, we should

know when we go into the Railway Committee what to expect, to see maintained and acted upon. If we on this side were a majority, we would lay down a policy. But we are not the majority, unfortunately for the country, and cannot lay down a policy effectively. Let the hon. minister formulate a policy and live up to it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Railway charters are obtained for a number of purposes. Some are obtained honestly with the intention, on the part of those who obtain them, of actually building the line. Others, as my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) who introduced this motion knows, and has had practical experience, I think, in connection with them, are gotten to sell. Others are gotten to prevent companies already in existence, and that would build from coming in; and others to prevent the sale of the bonds of the company that proposes to build. If his Bill would stop the last three, the hon. gentleman would deserve great credit. But suppose this Bill is passed; a railway company fails to build; its representatives will walk up to the Railway Committee and my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) if it suits his locality, will be the first to shout 'carried,' as he has done before. This is an absolutely useless piece of legislation. I remember a case of a charter being obtained with the honest intention of putting the railway through. A little village that happened to be the terminal of the road raised a row, and was as enthusiastic as my hon. friend is in demanding that the road be built. The assessed value of the entire village would not build half a mile of the road, and the road was about one hundred miles long. Now, it takes money to build a railroad. There are many places where roads are desired, but where settlement does not warrant their construction at present, and, until it does, it is not very likely that people will risk their money in building a road that looks as if it will not pay. One or two of the lines referred to by my hon. friend would pay, and I have no doubt that, as soon as it is possible for the railways to get to work on them, these branches will be built. Along by Oxbow, I remember, a few years ago, a plan was arranged whereby the people could ship by the Sault line, and the grain go forward in bond. That had the tendency to spur up the railways in that locality. I have not followed the matter and cannot say at the moment how it came out. But, as I have said, if this Bill were to pass in its entirety and if, in two years, the railway fellows came back asking for an extension of time, my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) would be one of the first to shout 'carried.'

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.—COAST VOYAGES.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenburg) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 12) to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. A. K MACLEAN moved:

That Bill (No. 12) be not referred to the Committee of the Whole, but be referred to a Select Committee composed of the following members:—Messrs. Daniel, Finlayson, Hughes (P.E.I.), Lewis, Pickup, Stanfield and Sinclair.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT—ENGINEERS.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 17), to amend the Canada Shipping Act. He said: This Bill has been before the House for a considerable length of time. I first introduced a Bill similar to it in 1903. It was not then pressed; it was printed and widely circulated for the purpose of obtaining the views of the various mariners in regard to it. I again introduced it in 1904, but it did not pass that year although it was pressed. I again introduced it in 1905 and pursuant to the suggestion of the minister in 1904 it was referred to a special committee who took a large amount of evidence from the various officers of the department, representatives of the Dominion Marine Engineers' Association, and representatives of the various steamboat companies. After taking that evidence the committee did not report and the Bill did not come before the House again. In 1906 it was again introduced and again referred, at the request of the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to a special committee who took further evidence but again the committee did not report. The Bill has since been modified in form and substance. As a result of the evidence taken before the two special committees the officers of the Dominion Marine Engineers' Association interviewed the officers of the Marine Department, and as I believed, and as they reported to me, they reached a compromise arrangement with the officers of the department whereby the Bill in its present form was to be accepted by the department. I introduced it in exactly this form last year on that assumption, but I was amazed to find after it had been introduced that some misunderstanding had arisen and that the officers of the department were not prepared to report to the minister what the officers of the Dominion Marine Association had reported to me they had agreed upon. It had reached the stage when it was about

to be considered when the Minister of Marine departed for England and consequently it was not passed that session. I again come before the House with the Bill in its present form, asking that it be passed. It is simple in its verbiage, although it is somewhat far-reaching in its effect, having regard to the law as it at present stands. It involves in the first instance the question of whether or not the certification of marine engineers is good in principle or not. Originally this principle was adopted as being a good principle so long ago as 1868. The preamble of 31 Victoria, chapter 65, reads :

For the greater security of life and property on board steamboats navigating the waters of the Dominion of Canada or owned or registered in the Dominion of Canada and departing from or arriving at any port or place in the Dominion of Canada——

Laying down that which is afterwards enacted as being for the greater security of life and property.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Did that refer to passenger boats?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. To passenger boats and all kinds of steam vessels.

Section 27 of that Act reads :

It shall not be lawful for any person to employ another as engineer or for any person to serve as engineer on any steamboat unless the person serving or employed as engineer is licensed by the said board.

The practical effect of that Act was that none but certificated engineers could lawfully be engaged upon Canadian vessels. That remained the law for fourteen years, from 1868 to 1882, when another Act was introduced, 45 Victoria, chapter 35, and again the preamble of that Act says :

For the greater security of life and property on board steamboats navigating the waters of the Dominion of Canada or owned or registered in the Dominion of Canada and departing from or arriving at any port or place in the Dominion of Canada——

While the preamble of the Act is the same, it created a great number of exceptions. It changed and altered the law by enacting that the following exceptions to the Act of fourteen years previously should prevail, that a certified engineer was not necessary :

1. On steam yachts used exclusively for pleasure.
2. On tug boats.
3. On freight boats under 150 tons gross.
4. On boats used for fishing or the carrying of fish under 150 tons gross.
5. On steam dredges.
6. On elevators or vessels of like kind.

These exceptions are contained in section 477 of the Act. The effect of that is that only passenger boats and freight boats of over 150 tons gross must carry licensed engineers.

My first contention is that there is no reason for that, that if the preamble of the Act of 1865 and of this Act of 1882, is correct, and it is the principle that the enactment is for the greater security of life and property, then there is no justification for these exceptions. I took the trouble after seeing this large list of exceptions to look up 'Hansard' to find if reasons were given for this departure from the policy that had existed for fourteen years. Would you believe it, Sir, there is not one word of explanation from the minister of that day explaining that this Bill which he then introduced made this alteration in the policy which had prevailed for fourteen years or that it had the effect of making the exemptions which I have enumerated. There may be some reason for it. It does not appear on 'Hansard' at all events.

Now, this remained the law until 1898 when a new steamboat inspection Act was passed practically creating the same exceptions. And again, in 1903, we legislated, by 3 Edward VII, chap. 66 in respect to this matter when the parliament of Canada again created practically the same exceptions. But hon. gentlemen will find, if they look at that Act, 3 Edward VII chap. 66, that the legislation is practically the same although it extends the department's jurisdiction so as to cover naphtha and gasolene launches. The effect, however, in so far as it appertains to steamboats is to exempt, first, pleasure yachts without hire or remuneration (2) all tugs (3) freight boats under 150 tons gross (4) steam dredges, and (5) floating elevators or vessels of a like kind. Then, in the revision of the statutes, by chap. 113, which is the Canada Shipping Act, the Steamboat Inspection Act and several other Acts are embodied in the Canada Shipping Act. Section 556 of that Act is the clause, I think, which deals with this question. It is somewhat anomalous and ambiguous in its terms but I believe that the department have construed that it has made no difference in the law. At first sight it appeared to me that it had changed the exemption in reference to tug boats and that it only exempted tugs under 150 tons gross. But, I believe that the department have construed the Act, on the advice of the Department of Justice, the department holding that it has made no alteration in the law. The revised statutes therefore leaves the law practically as it was and the exemptions under it are : Steam yachts used exclusively for pleasure or private use without hire or remuneration (2) all tug boats, (3) freight boats under 150 tons gross (4) steamboats used exclusively for fishing purposes and under 150 tons gross (5) steam dredges (6) floating elevators or vessels of a like kind. Is it right that that should be so? If we have regard to the original principle involved —that is the greater security to life and property—why should these exemptions exist ? I have yet to hear the reasons for

it. There certainly were no reasons given in 1882 and I again ask if it is for greater security of life and property what reasons can be given for these exemptions ? It is perhaps right—at least I am so informed by the Marine Engineers' Association and the officers of the department—that some exemptions should exist and as a result of my inquiries and as a result of the meeting by the Marine Engineers' Association and the officers of the department it was determined to put into this Bill that exemptions should be made of all boats of 10 nominal horse-power if a single steam cylinder, or 18 horse-power if double cylinder.

Mr. W. K. MACLEAN. Why do you take the horse-power instead of the tonnage ?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I am not particular provided you can get the tonnage to fit in. I believe that can be done. I believe that the officers of the department are making inquiries and endeavouring to arrive at a fair basis upon which these exemptions can be made, but the people on whose behalf I have introduced this legislation seem to think that this is the fairest and the most equitable way of providing for these exemptions. I am not wedded to it and if any practical way in which the steam tonnage can be specified is agreed upon I have no objection.

Mr. GERVAIS. What about floating elevators ? Is there any good reason why they should be subject to employ licensed engineers ?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I am coming to them. That will also exclude pleasure yachts of ten nominal horse-power—of a single cylinder or eighteen if a double cylinder. But even then, if you are going to protect life and property, why should pleasure yachts of a large size go into crowded waters where large freighters and passenger boats are lying without properly certified engineers being employed on them? If an explosion took place would not that be as likely to injure the property of others as well as the people who are on board? I can see no good reason then for this exemption which has been handed down from year to year by the various statutes which have been enacted. Then as to tugs, that has been the most important grievance of the marine engineers. During the years since the alteration of the law tugs have grown into very large steam vessels as everybody who has anything to do with the upper lakes knows. These tugs have increased enormously in size and a good many of them are as large as the freight carriers on the lakes. They are all exempt of every size and character. Can any one conceive of any reason why they should be? I must confess that I have never been able to do so. They are in constant use for the purpose of towing larger vessels in the crowded harbours, they are used for towing barges, for dredges, for floating elevators, and if an explosion took place upon any one of these tugs on any of our waters the loss would be tremendous not alone to the tug but to those boats, elevators or barges, which might be floating at their side. Therefore, I say I cannot understand why this exemption should exist. And again on these barges, dredges and elevators about which these tugs are working there are very frequently employed thirty, forty or fifty men. Both in the interest of life and property it seems to me that if you require the certification of engineers at all it should apply to tugs.

Then, let us look for a moment at the absolute incongruity of the law in so far as tugs and freight boats are concerned. A freight boat is exempt only if it is under 150 tons gross. Will any one tell me why a tug boat which is over 150 tons gross should not come within the law when a freight boat does? I made the statement a moment ago that tugs had greatly increased in number on the upper lakes, and in fact I include all of our inland waters from Montreal to Fort William. The tugs on the lakes during the last ten or twenty years have greatly increased both in size and number. I find on looking at the figures for the year 1903—the last year for which I have a return—that in the inspectorate of Mr. Dodds, who has to inspect the boilers and machinery of all vessels, he inspected 138 passenger boats, freighters, tugs, barges and dredges. Of that number there were 80 vessels of various kinds and 58 tugs, among others the 'Winslow,' 353 tons gross; the 'Balize,' 250 tons gross; the 'Boscobel,' 617 tons gross, and 'Saginaw,' 357 tons gross. Will anyone tell me why these tugs should be exempt? If they were freighters, and some of them are larger than freighters, they would not be exempt. In McKeen's inspection there were 146 of all kinds of boats except tugs, and 126 tugs, amongst them such as the

	Gross tons.
'Magnolia'	367
'Metamora'	239
'Reginald'	187
'Harrison'	150
'Onaping'	256
'Traveller'	438
'Charlton'	389
'Keoughe'	225
'Wenonah'	161

In the Montreal division inspected by Laurie there were 73 vessels of every other kind and 60 tugs, such as:

	Gross tons.
'Hamilton'	320
'J. L. Murphy'	173
'Mansfield'	169
'Bronson'	285
'C. B. Powell'	272
'Fraser'	320
'Fraser'	320
'Albert'	269

I have yet to learn why these tugs should be exempt while freight boats of a smaller size are not exempt. I also have yet to learn a reason with any logic in it why freight boats under 150 tons gross should be exempt if the principle of security of life and property is to be invoked at all. And as to steamboats under 150 tons gross, used exclusively for fishing purposes, why should they be exempt? Carrying fish is the same as carrying any other freight and why should fishing steamboats be exempt? I do see a possible reason why a tug used for taking up nets and only for that purpose might not be required to carry a certificated engineer, but I am informed that practically no tugs are employed for that purpose of more than 10 horse-power with a single cylinder or 18 horse-power with a double cylinder. My hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Gervais) spoke of floating elevators, dredges and vessels of a like kind. These elevators and dredges are in the harbour and if they are in the harbour of Montreal they are in a very congested harbour and their boilers are liable to explode unless the engineers are competent men.

Mr. GERVAIS. None have yet exploded.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. That may be, but if you apply the principle of the greatest security to life and property you invoke a certificated engineer whether it is on a floating dredge or an elevator or a tug or anything else. If the principle is right, why not apply it to the fullest extent; it works no hardship and it is thoroughly in line with the idea of protection to life and property.

Mr. GERVAIS. I would commend to the hon. gentleman the maxim 'de minimis non curat lex.'

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I did not catch what my hon. friend said.

Mr. GERVAIS. I quoted in Latin the legal maxim, that the law does not concern itself with very small matters.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I do not know how far the province of Quebec has gone, but in the province of Ontario they have gone so far as to require a certificate from stationary engineers and there is no exemption.

Mr. GERVAIS. It is the same in the province of Quebec.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. If you apply it to stationary engineers why not apply it to floating elevators if you want to protect life and property? It seems to me to be more urgent that you should require a certificate from an engineer engaged in a boat upon the sea or upon the inland lakes than from a stationary engineer. Now, in the United States they have been very particular to protect their own. We saw that the other day when the question of masters and mates was discussed, and we see it with still more force in the case of marine engineers. Under the Canada Shipping Act at present, engineers from the United States can and do come over here and work on our numerous tugs, barges and floating elevators, and freight boats under 150 tons gross, to the exclusion of our own men and we make it very easy for them to get a certificate because they leave their families in the United States and work during the summer months here and being domiciled in that way in Canada for three years they can get a certificate. I do not think that is right. If we look at the American statutes we find they do something for the protection of their own. Section 4131 of the Federal statutes of the United States reads :

> And all the officers of vessels of the United States who shall have charge of a watch, including pilots, shall in all cases be citizens of the United States. The word officer shall include the chief engineer and each assistant engineer in charge of a watch on vessels propelled wholly or in part by steam, and after the 1st of January, 1897, no person shall be qualified to hold a license as of commander or watch officer of a merchant vessel of the United States who is not a native born citizen, or whose naturalization as a citizen shall not have been fully completed.

That was amended to read : That the last clause of section 4131 of the Revised Statutes be amended so as to read :

> All the officers of vessels of the United States shall be citizens of the United States, except that in cases where on a foreign voyage or voyage from an Atlantic to a Pacific port of the United States any such officer of any vessel is for any reason deprived of the services of an officer below the grade of master.

So that by the statute of the United States practically no man can work on an American vessel unless he is an American citizen. I say to the department, to this government, and to this parliament, that while there may have been in the earlier days of Canada some reason for not putting in force a similar national law in this country, Canada is to-day past that stage, and is large enough to protect itself; and if the United States thought it wise to protect their mariners in that way, it is time for us to wake up and extend the same protection to Canadian citizens. The evidence which was given by the officers of the Marine Association is part of the record of that committee, and I might be permitted to read a few lines to show what these men feel in this regard.

Mr. BRODEUR. Before my hon. friend leaves that part of the subject, will he be kind enough to tell us whether the laws of the United States require tug boats to have certificated engineers?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I have not data in regard to that, but my information is that they do.

Mr. BRODEUR. Without any regard to the tonnage of the vessel?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I am unable to give my hon. friend the information; but they practically require a certificate for everything. Mr. Kronk in his evidence says:

Surely owners of steamboats will not place dollars and cents before life. The unqualified incompetent engineer is the most expensive to him in the end. We have wise laws and regulations to safeguard the travelling public; why not grant the same protection to the labouring man? Is his life worth any more to his family in holiday attire than in his blue jeans? For on some of these wrecking tugs as many as thirty men are sometimes employed, and from four to twelve on tugs and barges; that is, barges, I mean to say, under 150 tons gross tonnage. These may run without licensed engineers, but must have a licensed captain. Are the captain's duties of any more importance to the owner, or the lives of the crew any more dependent upon the captain than the engineer? You need more than a mere machine to answer bells. We believe a qualified and competent engineer to be a valuable asset to any steamboat owner, and that the man who has not proven his ability and shown proof of his experience has no right to be entrusted with the care and management of boilers and intricate machinery, much less the lives of human beings. We know that engineers on the railroads serve a certain length of time preparing themselves thoroughly and pass an examination before they can have charge of an engine, whether freight or passenger. Surely it is just as important that the steamboat engineer should serve time and prove his fitness by an examination before an inspector? There is also another phase of the question that seems to have escaped the eye of a patriotic Canadian steamboat owner, namely, that even on some of our largest tugs alien engineers are pulling the throttle, while no man who is not a citizen by birth or naturalization can run the smallest craft propelled by steam in the United States.

Then, Mr. Milne spoke as follows:

Americans can come to Canada and take charge of our boats and run them without their certificates, without any question at all, not even being required to take the oath of allegiance in any shape, whereas engineers of the present day are all sworn—you are all aware of that—and held responsible, while these men come in and run without a temporary certificate even. They come here and have their families living across the stream, run for a certain length of time on our tugs and ask for an examination, and Mr. Adams cannot refuse it. That section that I have referred to reads as follows:—

But such applicant, if not a British subject, shall only be entitled to a certificate, if in addition to the qualification required by this Act, he has been domiciled in Canada for at least three years, and foreigners serving as engineers in ships registered in Canada shall be deemed to be domiciled in Canada while so serving.

I cite these short paragraphs to show how the men themselves feel on this matter. One word as to the nature of the Dominion Marine Engineers' Association. It has been said that that association is in the nature of a union, and that it has formed an alliance with the Dominion Trades and Labour Council. That is not so. It is altogether a separate and distinct association. These men are banded together for their own interests. They meet either once a week or once every two weeks. They are an educated body. They have councils situated in different parts of the country where they educate young men in marine engineering. That is the first idea of their association. Then, they are banded together for obtaining legislation in their own interest and for their mutual good generally, and it seems to me that they ought to be encouraged and protected. The effect of this Bill is to bring the law back to what it was in 1865 and for fourteen years afterwards which there was no reason given for changing. It is for the greatest security of life and property that certificated engineers should be employed, and I hope the principle of this Bill will be given effect to. I realize now that it will necessitate a change in the penalty clause of the Act, and we will amend it in that respect when it reaches the committee. The two clauses of the Bill are simply to put the law back to where it was, to remove these exemptions, and to require Canadian vessels to carry certificated engineers. I move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. GERVAIS moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let the Bill be read a second time now, and the hon. gentleman can discuss it in committee.

Mr. GERVAIS. The discussion cannot take place to-night. it is too late as I would like to give at some length the reasons why I object to the theory of this Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gervais) objects to the principle of the Bill?

Mr. GERVAIS. I do. There are strong objections to the passage of this Bill. Some of my constituents, like the Montreal Grain Elevating Company, have strong objections against this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Complete census of the Northwest provinces.—Hon. Sydney Fisher.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business does the government intend to take up on Thursday?

Mr. FIELDING. The French Treaty, and, if that is disposed of, Supply, with the estimates of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Motion agreed to. House adjourned at 12.30 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 19, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

RIVER GODFROI WHARF.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the total amount spent upon the construction of the wharf at the mouth of River Godfroi from 1904 to the 1st of February, 1908?
2. What is the total amount which has been spent in works upon the road leading down to the said wharf?
3. Have the said works (a) upon the wharf, (b) upon the road, been executed by day work or by contract?
4. What was the estimated cost of said works (a) upon the wharf, (b) upon the road leading to said wharf?
5. Who were the persons named to superintend the said works, what was the remuneration agreed upon for said persons, at what rate were they paid, and what was the total amount paid to each of them?
6. If the said works were executed by contract (a) upon the wharf, (b) upon the road leading to the said wharf, what was the amount of the contract in each case, and what was the amount of the extras?
7. Have the said works been inspected by the government? If so, by what officers, and have the said works been accepted in each case?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works) :

1. $4,406 for wharf and approach.
2 & 3. Wharf and road were covered by one contract for a lump sum of $4,200. It is impossible to tell the cost of each part separately.
4. $4,200 for the two works together.
5. Stephen Trahan ; paid 27 days at $2.50 per day ; total paid him, $135.
6. Contract, $4,200 as above ; extras, $71.
7. (a) J. L. Michaud, resident engineer. (b) Yes.

PORT ST. FRANÇOIS WHARF.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. How much has been paid for the wharf at Port St. François, in the province of Quebec, from the inception of said works to the 1st of February, 1908?
2. Have the said works and construction been executed by contract or by day work?
3. Who were the persons named to superintend or conduct the said works, at what salary were they named, what was the amount in reality paid to them by the day, and what amount have each of them received up to the 1st of February, 1908?
4. By whom and when have the said works upon the said wharf been inspected, and have they been accepted by the government?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works) :

1. $5,594.05 for wharf and building thereon.
2. By day's work.
3.(a) In 1905-6, John O'Shaughnessy, foreman for construction of wharf.
(b) Paid 25 days at $2.70 per day.
(c) $67.50.
(a) In 1907-8, L. P. H. Bourk, foreman for erection of shed.
(b) Paid 44 days at $3 per day.
(c) $132.
4. (a) J. L. Michaud, resident engineer.
(b) Yes.

Mr. R. N. WALSH asked :

1. Has the government constructed a shed for the reception of merchandise on or near the wharf at Port St. François? If so, what is the total cost of said shed to date?
2. Was the said shed constructed by contract or by day work?
3. To whom was the contract awarded, who was appointed to superintend the work, what was the salary of said superintendent per day, and what was the total amount paid to the said superintendent or superintendents?
4. What is the length, height and width of the said shed, and what was the estimated cost of the same?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works) :

1. (a) Yes.
(b) $597.89.
2 & 3. By day's work, under superintendence of L. P. H. Bourk. Salary, $3 per day ; total paid him, $132.
4. Length, 36 feet ; height, 16 feet ; width, 20 feet. Estimated cost, $600.

WHARF AT NICOLET RIVER.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the total cost to date of the wharf at the mouth of the Nicolet river?
2. Have the works upon the said wharf been executed by contract or by day work?
3. Who were the persons employed by the government as superintendents of the said works, how much were the said persons paid per day, and what is the total amount paid to them up to the 11th of February, 1908?
4. Have the said works been inspected? If so, by what officer, and at what date has the government accepted the said works?
5. What is the total amount expended to date in connection with the construction of the said wharf?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works). Which wharf is it? Is it the one at Ball's mill?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will have the answer to-morrow.

CHIEF CUSTOMS INSPECTOR.

Mr. STANFIELD asked :

1. What are the duties of the chief customs inspector?
2. Where is his office situated?
3. What is the number of his staff?
4. What is the total amount distributed for seizures?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. The chief inspector of customs ports has direct supervision over the customs inspectors west of the province of Quebec, who report to the Department of Customs through him. He also has supervision over the work of the special customs officers attached to his staff, who are employed on seizures, drawbacks or as relieving officers. He is also required to make special inspections and investigations and to report on matters referred to him from time to time by the Department of Customs.
2. Toronto.
3. 9 inspectors and 15 special officers.
4. Total amount distributed for seizures during the nine months ended 31st March, 1907, $42,559.39. Vide page 52, Auditor General's Report.

ALLEGED IRREGULARITIES ON THE SOULANGES CANAL.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. Is the government aware that irregularities are said to have taken place on the Soulanges canal?
2. If so, was an investigation ordered by the Department of Railways and Canals on such irregularities?
3. Who was, or were, the commissioner or commissioners?
4. What has been accomplished by such investigation, and was a report made?
5. What does the government intend to do in the case?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Certain charges have been made against the overseer.
2. No, a commission has been issued for the purpose of inquiring into the alleged irregularities.
3. Mr. Louis Boyer, advocate of Montreal, is being named a commissioner.
4. Investigation has not yet been started.
5. Will depend upon the findings of the commission.

BUTTER EXPORTS AND IMPORTS.

Mr. R. N. WALSH—by Mr. Boyce—asked :

1. What quantity of butter was exported from Canada during the year ended December 31, 1907, to (a) Great Britain, and (b) the United States?
2. What tariff does the United States maintain against Canadian butter?
3. What duty is levied by this government upon butter imported from the United States?
4. How much butter, if any, was imported into Canada during the year ending December 31, 1907, from (a) Great Britain, (b) Denmark, and (c) the United States?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. The exports of butter from Canada during the year ending December 31, 1907, to Great Britain amounted to 3,748,389 pounds, and to the United States to 198,381 pounds.
3. The duty levied on butter imported from the United States into Canada is 4 cents per pound.
4. The imports of butter during the year ending December 31, 1907, from Great Britain amounted to 241,188 pounds, from Denmark nil, and from the United States 247,041 pounds.

CUSTOMS OFFICERS AT ALBERTON, TIGNISH, AND MIMINEGASH, P.E.I.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. What are the respective salaries of the customs officers at Alberton, Tignish, and Miminegash, Prince Edward Island?
2. Has any complaint or report been made to the Customs Department *re* overcharge of dutiable goods at Alberton? If so, what is the nature of such?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. Alberton, $400 ; Tignish, $500 ; Miminegash, $150.
2. Complaints against the customs officer at Alberton for receiving small sums of money not fully accounted for as customs duties,—the matter being still under consideration.

PAYMENTS TO STEEL CONCRETE COMPANY, LIMITED.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. What sums of money were paid during the fiscal year 1905-6 and 1906-7 by any department of the government to the Steel Concrete Company, Limited?
2. For what purpose were such payments made?
3. What orders for work or material to be done or supplied by that company are now being filled, and what is the aggregate amount payable for same?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). As there are several departments

involved, I will ask the hon. gentleman to allow this to stand as notice of motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for return.

TIMBER BERTHS 1413, 1414 AND 1415, ALBERTA.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

Have licenses been issued for timber berths Nos. 1413, 1414 and 1415, in the province of Alberta? If so, when and to whom?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). No.

GOVERNMENT DREDGE, CAPE BRETON.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN—by Mr. A. Martin—asked:

1. What sum did the government or the Department of Public Works charge the firm of W. W. Lewis & Company, of Louisburg, N.S., for the services of the government dredge 'Cape Breton' for dredging about their wharf property at Louisburg, December 9, 10, 11 and 14, 1907?
2. Has the amount charged for such services been paid to the government?
3. How much per day did the department pay for the services of the tug 'E. M. Cates' in attending on or assisting the government dredge 'Cape Breton' at Morien, Glace bay and Louisburg harbours, and what was the total amount so paid?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Minister of Public Works):

1 and 2. Nothing.
3. $30 per day; total amount, $1,770.

FORCHU FISH HATCHERY.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN—by Mr. A. Martin—asked:

1. Who was the supervisor and superintendent of Forchu fish hatchery during the year 1907?
2. What are his duties, and during how many days was he actually engaged in the performance of his duties in 1907?
3. What remuneration did he receive for 1907?
4. During the absence of the superintendent, who acted as his deputy or substitute, at what remuneration and under what authority?
5. Does his deputy or substitute make returns under oath as to the discharge of his duties?
6. Is the department aware that H. C. V. Levatte, supervisor and superintendent of Forchu fish hatchery, resides at Louisburg, a distance of twenty-seven miles from Forchu and that he is seldom seen at Forchu?
7. What did Mr. H. C. Baker receive for distributing seed lobsters from Forchu fish hatchery for the year 1907?

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

1. H. C. V. Levatte was employed to superintend the operations at the Forchu lobster pound.

2. To check the total number of lobsters placed in the pound, see that they are properly fed and cared for and to check the number returned therefrom to the sea, as well as a general supervision of the operations at the pound. Number of days employed 72.
3. $3 per day or $216.
4. No provision was made for the employment or payment of an assistant; but the department is informed by Mr. Levatte that during his absence a Mr. Hanley acted for him.
5. Not to the department. All reports come direct from Mr. Levatte.
6. The department is aware that Mr. Levatte resides at Louisburg.
7. No amount for this specific service as his contract covered incidentally the distribution of seed lobsters.

HARBOUR MASTER, LOUISBURG, N.S.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN—by Mr. A. Martin—asked:

1. Who is harbour master at the port of Louisburg, Nova Scotia?
2. What remuneration did he receive for his services during the year 1907?
3. Does he make returns to the department? If so, at what intervals?
4. What was the amount of harbour dues collected at the port of Louisburg for the year 1907?
5. What amount of the harbour dues collected for or during 1907 has been forwarded to the department, and at what date?

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

1. H. C. V. Levatte.
2. Returns for 1907 not yet received.
3. Yes, yearly.
4. Returns not yet received.
5. Returns not yet received.

DREDGING AT MIDLAND AND TIFFIN.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

1. Were tenders invited for dredging done at Midland during the summer of 1907?
2. If so, who tendered therefor, and what were their respective rates?
3. Who did dredging at Midland and Tiffin in summer of 1907, and what rates were paid therefor?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Minister of Public Works):

1. Yes.
2. First set of tenders with Public Accounts Committee. Prices being too high, the following tenders were received on a second call:

For Midland:

	Rock.	Other Materials.
Canadian Dredge and Construction Company	$ 2 25	.26
R. Macdonald		.33
R. Weddell	2 00	.27

	Rock.	Other Materials.
For Tiffin :		
The Owen Sound Dredge and Construction Company ..	2 00	.27
R. Macdonald		.33
R. Weddell..	2 50	.31
3. At Midland :		
Canadian Dredge and Construction Company	2 25	.26
At Tiffin :		
The Owen Sound Dredge and Construction Company ..	2 00	.27

FISHERIES QUESTION BETWEEN DOMINION AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. What instructions have been given to the agent or representative of the Dominion government who is to confer with the provincial government with a view to the settlement of the fisheries question, &c.?

2. Will the government lay on the table of the House such instructions, together with any order in council and other documents touching the same matter?

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

1. He is instructed to confer with the accredited representatives of the several provinces affected and to report to the Department of Marine and Fisheries as to some practical basis for a settlement of the relative rights and jurisdiction respecting the fisheries.

2. The government will gladly lay on the table the order in council appointing the agent.

ARMOURY AT TRURO.

Mr. STANFIELD asked :

What is the department's estimate on the armoury at Truro for heating and electric wiring?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Minister of Public Works) :

As the contract for wiring has not been awarded, the department is of opinion that such information should not be made public at present.

BONUS ON CONTINENTAL IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the government recently decided to increase the bonus to continental booking agents on immigrants from European countries to Canada?

2. If so, what will be the bonus rate in future paid, and what has been the rate hitherto?

3. Will the government lay on the table of the House a copy of the order in council altering such bonus, and of the circular issued to agents in consequence thereof?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.

2. £1 per adult and ten shillings per child. The rate hitherto has been ten shillings per adult and five shillings per child.

3. In response to a return called for by the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Uriah Wilson) there was laid on the table of the House on 13th February, a copy of the order in council dated 6th January, 1908, increasing the bonus on continental immigration, and all circulars issued in that connection to date.

LAND PATENTS.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. In respect of the N.W. ¼ of section 8, township 53, range 4, west of the 5th meridian, was the land first entered for as a homestead? If so, when and by whom?

2. Was it subsequently acquired from the Crown by purchase? If so, when, by whom, in what manner, and at what price?

3. Where is the residence and what the occupation of the present owner?

4. Is it a fact that this quarter-section is situated close to the proposed town site of the Grand Trunk Pacific at Wabanum lake?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes, 12th June, 1906 ; John Howey.

2. Yes ; on the 30th October, 1906, by John Howey who purchased the land for coal mining purposes at the rate of $10 an acre, the sale including both the surface and under rights.

3. The place of residence of John Howey appears to be Edmonton, his occupation has not been furnished.

4. The government has no information.

DR. A. C. HAWKINS, HALIFAX.

Mr. DANIEL—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Is Dr. A. C. Hawkins, of Halifax, an official of the Department of Agriculture, or of any other department of the administration?

2. Has the said department or any of the departments issued instructions to their officials prohibiting them from being candidates for municipal office?

3. Is the minister of the department aware that Dr. A. C. Hawkins is at the present time a candidate for the office of mayor of the city of Halifax at the ensuing election?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). On behalf of the Department of Agriculture, the answer to each of these questions is No. On behalf of the Department of the Interior the answers are as follows :

1. Dr. Hawkins is an official of the Immigration Branch of the Department of the Interior.

2. As far as the Interior Department is concerned, no.

3. The Interior Department has no information on this subject.

AVERAGE PRICE OF SCHOOL, TIMBER AND COAL LANDS.

Mr. LAKE asked :

What was the average price per acre obtained by the government from January 1,

1906, to December 31, 1907, for (a) school lands, (b) timber berths, (c) coal lands in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, respectively?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

(a) Manitoba, $11.37; Saskatchewan, $20.96; Alberta, $11.41.

(b) Manitoba, 79¼ cents; Saskatchewan, 32 cents; Alberta, 28 cents.

(c) Manitoba, $7; Saskatchewan, $7; Alberta, $7, for coal rights only.

RECEIPTS FROM LANDS, MINES, MINERALS AND TIMBER.

Mr. LAKE asked:

How much money and scrip has the government received on account of the lands, mines, minerals and timber, in each of the provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, during the following periods: from July 1, 1896, to June 30, 1905, and from July 1, 1905, to December 31, 1907?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, in regard to this question I would ask the hon. member (Mr. Lake) to amend it, if it is possible, so as not to require a separate return for the several provinces, and I would also ask him to change the question to a notice of motion for a return.

Mr. LAKE. If the minister could give that information approximately it would suit my purpose, but I would like, if possible, to have a separate account for the different provinces.

Mr. OLIVER. It is quite possible, but it involves a very much larger amount of work to make the separation than it does to make the return without the separation. If the hon. gentleman insists, of course we can make the separation, but it will take a very much longer time—I think, out of proportion probably to the purpose it will serve. But, in any event, I will have to ask that the question stand as a notice of motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

AREA OF DOMINION LANDS DISPOSED OF.

Mr. LAKE asked:

What is approximately the total area of Dominion lands disposed of by the government in each of the provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan between July 1, 1896, and June 30, 1905, distinguishing between lands for agricultural purposes, grazing, irrigation, timber and coal; and also from July 1, 1905, to December 31, 1907?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I would ask that this stand as a notice of motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

Mr. LAKE.

LAND PATENTS.

Mr. LAKE asked:

In respect to northwest quarter-sections 16, 24, 28, west of second meridian.

1. What homestead entry or entries have been made, and at what dates?

2. Have applications to cancel been made or received, and at what dates?

3. Have any inspections of the land been made by government officials? If so, what was the result of the same?

4. Have extensions of time been granted? If so, on what grounds?

5. When did the present holder first commence residence duties?

6. Has the land been finally disposed of by the government? If so, how?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Pierre A. Tanguay made homestead entry on the 29th May, 1902.

2. 19th September, 1903, W. R. Kane applied for inspection; 4th August, 1906, agent reported an application for inspection. Gave no name.

3. 9th August, 1905, Homestead Inspector Pollock reported residence from the 1st of August to the end of November, 1904, with father on the n.e. ¼ of the same section; 35 acres sown in wheat—crop hailed out.

13th June, 1906, Homestead Inspector Oliver reported residence with father during the summer of 1904; 4 horses; 50 acres cropped.

2nd October, 1907, Homestead Inspector Skene reported residence on N.E. ¼ adjoining since June, 1907. Family in Quebec; 15 acres new breaking; 55 acres in crop.

4. 17th November, 1903, until 1st May, 1904. On father's representations and promises. 8th April, 1904, until 1st May, 1905. 19th August, 1905, until 1st May, 1906. Crop destroyed by hail. 17th May, 1906, until 1st July, 1906. Considerable area under crop claimed. 28th June, 1906, until 1st August, 1906. 12th November, 1906, until 1st April, 1907. 2nd May, 1907, until 1st July, 1907. Undertakes to go into residence.

5. 1st August, 1904, with father on N.E. ¼ of the same section.

6. Entry was cancelled, but it was decided to reinstate homestead on condition of Tanguay going into actual residence at once.

Mr. LAKE asked:

In respect of the southeast quarter-sections 16, 24, 28, west of second meridian.

1. What homestead entry or entries have been made, and at what dates?

2. Have applications to cancel been received? If so, at what dates?

3. Have any inspections of the land been made by government officials? If so, what was the result of the same?

4. Have extensions of time been granted? If so, on what grounds?

5. When did the present holder first commence residence duties?

6. Has the land been finally disposed of by the government? If so, how?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Adolphe Tanguay made homestead entry on the 29th of May, 1902.

2. 19th of September, 1903, by W. R. Kane. 13th May, 1905, Robert Brown says he applied for an inspection, but this was not officially reported.

3. 9th August, 1905. Homestead Inspector Pollock reported 75 acres in crop. Wants further protection.

13th June, 1906, Homestead Inspector Oliver reported no residence; 80 acres in crop.

2nd October, 1907, Homestead Inspector Skene reported residence on N.E. ¼ of the same section since the 15th of September previous; 55 acres broken and cropped now fallowed.

4. 17th November, 1903 until 1st May, 1904. On father's representation and promises. 8th April, 1904, until 1st May, 1905. 23rd August, 1905, until 1st May, 1906; crop destroyed by hail. 17th May, 1906, until 1st July, 1906; considerable area under cultivation claimed. 28th June, 1906, until 1st August, 1906. 12th November, 1906, until 1st April, 1907. 2nd May, 1907, until 1st November, 1907.

5. 15th September, 1907, residence, presumably with father, on adjoining ¼ section.

6. Land sold to homesteader at $3 per acre.

FIRE GUARDIANS IN ALBERTA.

Mr. HERRON asked:

How many fire guardians have been in the employ of the Interior Department between the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the international boundary line in the province of Alberta, what are their names, the wages paid per day, the number of days employed, the total amount paid each man, between the 1st January, 1901, and 1st January, 1908?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

Name of Guardian.	Rate of wages per day.	No. of days Employed since Jan'y 1, 1901.	Total Amount Paid.
	$ cts.		$ cts.
C. B. Miller.....	4 00	100	400 00
D. F. McIntosh....	4 00	72	288 00
J. A. Grant.....	4 00	396	1,584 00
E. L. Bell.....	4 00	362	1,448 00
Geo. D. Winder....	4 00	76	304 00

'LADY OF THE LAKE.'

Mr. SCHAFFNER asked:

1. Has the government purchased the steamer 'Lady of the Lake'?
2. If so, what was the price paid for said steamer?
3. Is the government aware that she was left at one of the small wharfs on Lake Winnipeg?
4. How many men are in charge of said boat?
5. What are the names of the men in charge of the 'Lady of the Lake,' and what is the salary paid to each?

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

1. Yes.
2. $8,000.
3. Yes.
4. One.
5. N. Couture, $45 per month.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all correspondence between Lieut.-Colonel Mallette, of the 64th Battalion and the Department of Militia and Defence, concerning Major Sabourin, of St. John, Quebec.—Mr. Bergeron.

For a copy of all correspondence between Lieut.-Colonel Mallette, of the 64th Battalion, and the Department of Militia and Defence, for the organization of a regiment in Valleyfield, Quebec.—Mr. Bergeron.

For a return setting forth in respect of the following coal lands:—

1. The name and address of the first applicant and the date thereof.
2. The names and addresses of all subsequent applications, with date thereof, in the order of application.
3. The name and address of the party to whom the mining rights were granted, with date of sale or lease by the government.
4. Price paid per acre, sale or lease.
5. Date and amount of first payment on account of purchase price.
6. Dates and amounts of each subsequent payment on account of purchase price.
7. Total amount paid as purchase price and balance, if any, still unpaid.
8. How long reservation was made by the department in favour of the grantee or his assigns.
9. The names and address of all parties to whom assignments were made, with date of each assignment, and date of its registration with the department.
10. The name and address of present owner of said mining rights.
11. A copy of all correspondence in reference to the same:

Township 7, range 3, west of fifth meridian; sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, less the southeast quarter; section 7, less east half; section 8; section 9; section 10, less southwest quarter; section 11, less southeast quarter; section 14, less east half; section 15; section 16, less northeast quarter; section 17; section 20, less east half of northeast quarter; section 21, less south half and northwest quarter; section 22; section 28; section 27, less east half; section

32, less east half; section 33; section 34, less east half.

Township 7, range 2, west of fifth meridian; sections 18, 20 and 21.

Township 6, range 3, west of fifth meridian; sections 27 and 28; section 32, less west half; sections 33 and 34.—Mr. Ames.

For a return showing all sales of Dominion lands, other than coal lands, of 160 acres and upwards, in the province of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta which have been made by the government during the calendar year 1907; the prices obtained; names of purchasers; dates of sales; and in general terms, the grounds upon which sales were authorized.—Mr. Lake.

For a copy of a memorial addressed to His Excellency the Governor General respecting a reference to the Privy Council in regard to the constitutionality of the Saskatchewan Act passed by the legislative assembly of the province of Saskatchewan on May 23, 1906; together with a copy of all correspondence, telegrams or other communications, relating thereto, between the Dominion government or any member thereof, and the government of Saskatchewan or any member thereof.—Mr. Lake.

For a return showing: 1. What amount the firm of H. N. Bate & Company has received from each department of the government since the year 1896 for supplies, giving the amount paid each year separately.

2. What amount the firm of W. C. Edwards & Company has received from each department of the government since the year 1896 for supplies, giving the amount paid each year separately.—Mr. Taylor.

For a return showing what amount has been paid the Rolla L. Crain Company, of Ottawa, in each year since 1896; and the general character of the supplies furnished.—Mr. Blain.

For a return showing how much money has been paid since 1896 to the Eclipse Manufacturing Company, of Ottawa; how much each year; and the general character of the supplies furnished.—Mr. Blain.

REVENUE CONTRIBUTED BY AND EXPENDITURE ON ACCOUNT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. D. ROSS (Yale-Cariboo) moved :

For a return (a)showing the revenue contributed by the province of British Columbia for each and every year from 1872-3 to 1905, inclusive, under the following heads:—

1. Customs.
2. Chinese immigration.
3. Inland revenue, excise, weights and measures, gas inspection, electric light inspection, methylated spirits, sundries.
4. Post offices.
5. Public works, telegraphs, Esquimalt graving dock, casual.
6. Experimental farm.
7. Penitentiary.
8. Marine and fisheries, sick mariners' fund, steamboat inspection, examination of masters and mates, casual and harbours, fisheries.
9. Superannuation.
10. Dominion lands and timber.
11. Vancouver assay office.
12. Miscellaneous.
13. Public debt.
14. Any other source.

Mr. BRODEUR.

And (b) showing expenditure by the Dominion of Canada on account of the province of British Columbia, for each and every year from 1872-3 to 1905, inclusive, under the following heads:—

1. Public debt.
2. Charges of management.
3. Lieutenant Governor.
4. Administration of justice, judges, &c.
5. Penitentiary.
6. Experimental farm.
7. Quarantine.
8. Immigration.
9. Pensions, &c.
10. Militia.
11. Public works, buildings, harbours and rivers, dredging.
12. Telegraphs, agency.
13. Mail subsidy.
14. Marine and Fisheries, Dominion steamers, lighthouses, meteorological, marine hospital, steamboat inspection, miscellaneous, fisheries, fisheries inspection, hatcheries.
15. Indians.
16. Subsidies.
17. Dominion lands.
18. Customs.
19. Inland revenue, excise, weights and measures, gas and electric light.
20. Esquimalt dry dock.
21. Post office.
22. Chinese immigration.
23. Defences, Esquimalt.
24. Chinese immigration inquiry.
25. Bounty on minerals.
26. Miscellaneous.
27. Vancouver assay office.
28. Railway subsidies.
29. Any other sources.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). This motion, Mr. Speaker, calls for a very full return. I have no objection to it on that score but I would like to point out to my hon. friend (Mr. D. Ross) that there will be very great difficulty in making up a return by provinces that will be thoroughly correct. I propose to let the motion go but there will be difficulty in making a precise statement as to the receipts of the different provinces. For example, the motion calls for the revenue contributed by the province of British Columbia. I suppose that all that a return would show would be the revenue collected at the different customs ports in British Columbia. That probably would not be a fair statement of the revenue collected. However, if it is understood that the motion shall be passed subject to the difficulties of complying with it I have no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. And to the precedent.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, it is a troublesome one.

Motion agreed to.

MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved :

That it is the duty of the government to enter into negotiations with the government

of the province of Quebec, with a view to removing all obstacles to the abolition of toll gates upon the roads of the island of Montreal?

He said : Mr. Speaker, I am ready to proceed with the two motions standing in my name, of which this is one, and I have but a few remarks to offer in support of both of them. The first enunciates, Mr. Speaker, the duty of the government to enter into negotiations with the government of the province of Quebec with the view of removing all obstacles to the abolition of toll-gates on the island of Montreal. I have already, Mr. Speaker, on several occasions, since I have been a member of this House, representing the county of Jacques Cartier, referred to the intolerable nuisance which results from the maintenance upon the island of Montreal, of the obsolete system of toll-gates and I have been encouraged to persist in my endeavours because my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), if I mistake not, when he was in opposition, in the hour of promises and pledges, held out to the people of my county, that, with the assistance of the then leader of the opposition in the province of Quebec, the late Hon. Mr. Mercier if he were returned to power and still more, if my right hon. friend were returned to power, the old Tory institution of toll-gates and toll-bars would be swept away in a very short time. I had always expected that the right hon. gentleman would make it a point to redeem that promise when he came into power and when he possessed, as he does, the key to the situation, being the largest creditor of the corporation, holding all the bonds of that corporation and having it in his power to cancel them as they should undoubtedly be cancelled in order to facilitate the removal of that institution. But the right hon. gentleman in this, as in some other instances, since he has attained power, seems to have forgotten, in the enjoyment of the fruits of office, the pledges he made to electors before he resumed the reins of office. As my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) says, toll-gates still exist not only on the island of Montreal but on other islands and even on the mainland in many places. My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) was one of those also who, in those days, promised the abolition of toll-gates and declaimed against their abuses. But the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) was revolutionary. He wished to physically remove them—not to await the ordinary action of the administration but to have them swept away immediately.' Nothing has been done and I am now obliged to have recourse to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who is very cold, I notice, in regard to the claims we are making surrounding this long standing abuse. In two words, Mr. Speaker, because I do not wish to detain the House, the result of the present system is that the roads are badly kept. The turnpike trustees have not sufficient resources to meet the increasing demands, and the wear and tear upon those old highways is so much greater than it was when this system was instituted, I think, nearly seventy years ago. They have not the resources, the roads are badly kept, farmers suffer and all those who drive out upon the highways around Montreal that are under the control of trustees suffer likewise. It prevents the repair and the opening of new roads because the turnpike trust have control of the highways. They are interested in preventing the multiplication of roads. Everytime additional roads or cross roads are opened they are obliged to place new toll-gates, or, in some instances, what they call check-gates. This means an increase in expense without any increase of revenue, and the result is opposition and delay with regard to the opening of new roads in the territory immediately surrounding the populous city of Montreal where we ought to be opening new roads and avenues and dividing up lots continually. The farmers suffer from this. If the surrounding municipalities desire annexation one of the difficulties in the way is the existence of these toll-gates and the obligation is imposed upon the municipalities that desire annexation of making arrangements previously with the turnpike road commissioners.

The nature of the corporation is in itself objectionable, because it is non-representative ; the majority of the trustees are named by the Dominion government, who are the holders of the bonds, the minority is named by the provincial government, the corporation itself is organized by the local government and regulated by provincial statute, its meetings are not public, it publishes no reports, it does not call for tenders for work to be done on the roads ; the whole system is obsolete, having been created long before the existence of our present municipal code in Quebec. Everybody nowadays knows that the toll-gate system has been almost universally abolished, and in that respect we have been set a very good example by the province of Ontario, both as to the improvement of their roads and the abolition of the toll-gate system. The difficulty is just this—my right hon. friend is in power here and his friends are in power in Quebec, and when we go to the Quebec government for relief we are told to see the great chief at Ottawa who holds the key of the situation. And when we apply to the Dominion government they seem bashful about taking action. We know that the provinces, as a rule, are not slow to apply for assistance to the federal government, but this case appears to be an exception. I have moved in this parliament on several occasions in regard to the matter, and when I tell the Dominion government that these bonds are worthless, and that there is no possibility of recovering

upon them, that the tolls do not afford sufficient revenue to pay the expense of keeping the roads in order, that interest on the bonds has not been paid for more than ten years and that there is no prospect of its ever being paid, my right hon. friend and his colleagues tell us that they cannot interfere. They tell us that the Turnpike Trust is a municipal corporation under the control of the provincial government, and that the action must begin with the provincial government. Hence we are sent from Caiaphas to Pilate and with the usual result, that when we come to Pilate, in the person of the Finance Minister, he washes his hands of the whole thing. Surely the city of Montreal and the island of Montreal has furnished enough money since confederation to the Dominion exchequer for railways and other public works all over the country ; surely, in view of the fact that we are the large furnishers of the Dominion treasury, we are entitled to some consideration. Under these circumstances, on behalf of the farmers who suffer and to whom the system has become obnoxious, and who know that it would only require a little joint effort by both governments to remove the difficulty, I have moved that the Dominion government itself, the Department of Agriculture, my right hon. friend, on account of the pledges he gave, should enter into communication with the local government. If Caiaphas will not confer with Pilate, Pilate must confer with Caiaphas, and I think the approach should be made by the Dominion government. I have therefore moved that the Dominion government, the bondholder who controls this Turnpike Trust and names the majority of its members, should either itself or through the majority of that board enter into communication without delay with the local government. There is this advantage, and perhaps it is the only advantage, that the local government is a friendly government to this government, so that part of the difficulty is removed in the way of doing something useful for the farmers and those who live in the municipalities immediately surrounding Montreal. No doubt the Dominion government will want to know what is the financial condition of the corporation, and whether there is any possibility of receiving interest on the bonds. And in that respect the government should name a commissioner to take these matters into consideration. The late Mr. Préfontaine took a warm interest in that question ; he was a minister of the Crown and member for Maisonneuve, and he was most fully aware of the nature of our grievance. I had correspondence with him on the subject. I have a letter from him in which he expressed his willingness to name a commissioner, but he held that such commissioner should also inquire into the toll-gate system around the city of Quebec. Strange to say, there are toll-gates also around that ancient city, and Mr. Préfontaine wished to join both issues in the same inquiry. I held that both inquiries should be distinct, as I did not see what the toll-gate system in Quebec had to do with the toll-gate system in Montreal, and while the correspondence was pending Mr. Préfontaine left for Europe and never returned alive. Mr. Préfontaine was aware of the necessity for inquiry, and I can send his letter to the Minister of Finance if he desires. The Dominion government has power, under chapter 104, to inquire into any matter of public interest, and surely this is a matter of public interest. My right hon. friend thought it was of great public interest when he was in opposition, and when he declared that toll-gates should be abolished by any Liberal government that had the power to do so. I urge again that the Minister of Finance should appoint a commissioner, so that when the time comes to decide the question he will have the report of the commissioner on the financial condition of the Turnpike Trust showing that these bonds are worthless, thus enabling him to say that the people in the district affected should be allowed to adopt the modern system of administering roads, and that the vicinity of a large and populous city like Montreal should not be plagued with these toll-gates.

My hon. friend need not go far to find such a commissioner. There is Mr. Kent, a friend of this administration, who is a competent man in every way, who knows as much about the system of roads in the vicinity of Montreal as I know myself. There is Mr. Alexander Desmarteau, also a friend of the administration, who has travelled on these roads time and again, who is a skilled accountant and fully competent to make that inquiry. We have an interest of over $250,000 in these roads, and surely it would be proper for this government to pay $300 or $400 or $500 in order to ascertain exactly how it is that for ten years we have not received any interest on our bonds and that there is a continual complaint as to the grievances that exists. The president of the Turnpike Trust, Mr. Trenholme, is a man in whose judgment in regard to the remedy to be applied I would place implicit reliance, but I presume that, being himself a member of the trust, he might not be considered competent to act. I have given the government the names of three gentlemen who are friends of this administration and who would be able to conduct the inquiry. Under any circumstances, is it not the duty of the government to ascertain why these bonds are not being honoured? Under the previous regime the interest was paid regularly. Is it not the bounden duty of the government to have the matter looked into, not by sending an employee of the department to look over the books during a few hours, but thoroughly, with the necessary powers to summon witnesses, to hear the grievances, and to decide what remedy might be applied.

It seems to me that the government should assent to the adoption of both of these motions. The first one merely puts on the government the duty of opening negotiations; the second simply asks the government to seek information by a commissioner. Both of these motions are reasonable, and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister is pledged to their acceptance and to remedy the grievance which I have brought to your notice.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend opened his remarks by stating that on a certain occasion I had declared to the electors of the county which he has now the honour to represent, that if at that time I had the good fortune to be returned to office I would find a way to abolish the toll-gates on the island of Montreal in co-operation with the then leader of the opposition in the Quebec legislature, Mr. Mercier. Now, my hon. friend has a good memory, but, without any boasting at all, I think I have a better one, and I will at once give the reason why. I never was in the county of Jacques Cartier except on two occasions—in the year 1896, at the time of the general elections, when I addressed a meeting, unfortunately not with much success, and in the year 1895, when there was an election between Mr. Charbonneau and Mr. Décarie. I do not remember that I spoke on that occasion about the toll-gates at all. My hon. friend says I did, and he is very positive. I do not think he was present on that occasion, but one thing I am sure of, that I could not have said to the electors of Jacques Cartier that along with my late friend Mr. Mercier I would find a means of abolishing the toll-gates, because unfortunately Mr. Mercier at that time was in his grave. My hon. friend has forgotten that, and therefore I say that I have a better memory than he has, and I would advise him to have his memory or the memory of those who have informed him better instructed. I doubt if I ever did use the positive or emphatic terms which my hon. friend attributes to me. With this question, however, I am familiar. I have heard it discussed by my hon. friend many times, but I have always been under the impression that he was not so anxious to remove a grievance as to have a grievance against the government which he could parade before the electors of Jacques Cartier. It has always seemed to me that he was trying to say something that would enable him to go before the electors of that good riding and tell them: See what I have done for you; I have brought this question before the House, and brought it in vain. If my hon. friend had been as anxious as he professes to be for the removal of the toll-gates on the island of Montreal, which I agree with him are a nuisance, it seems to me he would have taken other means than those he has taken. He asserts that it is the duty of the government of Canada 'to enter into negotiations with the government of the province of Quebec with a view to removing all obstacles to the abolition of toll-gates upon the roads of the island of Montreal.' Now, what has the government of Canada to do in this matter? The government of Canada is simply the holder of the bonds. But there is another question to be determined. The roads to which he alludes, and which are the subject of this motion, are now under the guardianship, operation and maintenance of the commissioners of toll-gates. There is a preliminary question to be decided: If the commission is abolished who is going to have charge of these roads? That is a question to be settled by the electors of my hon. friend and the government of the province of Quebec. As soon as they have agreed that the roads shall be maintained by someone, whether it be by the government of Quebec, the city of Montreal or the electors of my hon. friend, they can come to us, and I think they will find us pretty liberal and well disposed to hear them. But my hon. friend knows as well as I do, and better, that the difficulty is not here, but amongst his own people. I do not know whether my hon. friend ever told the electors of St. Laurent or of Cartierville or of the other localities affected, if the toll-gates are removed you must take these roads under your own charge. This is the first thing he should inform them, and not lead them to believe that the roads would be maintained by the angels, by the government of Quebec or by the government of the Dominion.

My hon. friend is far more eloquent on this question in the House than he is in his own county. The difficulty is not with the Canadian government so that there is no need for his using so much eloquence here. Let him put his own house in order before he comes to this House and then we will be disposed to listen to him. I beg to move in amendment:

That all the words after the words 'of the government' be erased and the following substituted 'to receive all the overtures that may be made by the government of Quebec with a view to removing all obstacles to the abolition of toll-gates upon the roads of the island of Montreal.'

Mr. J. E. LEONARD (Laval). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take any part in this debate, but the words that have just been uttered by the First Minister remind me the promises that he has made at Ste. Rose when the general elections were on. The hon. First Minister has just said that he had never promised to the people of Jacques Cartier and of the surrounding parishes of the city of Montreal to remedy the grievance complained of. I will re-

mind my right hon. friend that on nomination day, at Ste. Rose, when he was surrounded by all the head staff of the Liberal party, he allowed the then candidate—now the Honourable Judge Fortin—and he also approved what he said, that if the county of Laval would elect his candidate, and that if he would himself come into power, he would remedy immediately the grievance of which were suffering the ratepayers of Laval and Jacques Cartier. More than that, on the 8th of January, 1902, when I had the honour to be candidate for the county of Laval, the hon. the First Minister thought that it would be useful to his party if he would come and support my opponent, Mr. C. A. Wilson, lawyer of Montreal, and, in the presence of the First Minister, Mr. Wilson declared, that he had the promise of the hon. the First Minister that the grievance of which the people was complaining would be remedied, if he was elected member for Laval. I do repeat it, the hon the First Minister was present and he approved what Mr. Wilson said, if not in open words, at least by his silence and by the warm support which he gave him in this election.

This question, Mr. Speaker, is much more important than some people may think. I have right before me a letter which has been written to one of my constituents on the 10th of February, 1908, by Messrs. Laurendeau, Pelletier & Pelletier, attorneys for the Turnpike Trust. As my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier said, all the surroundings have been, since a few years, divided up into building lots. More than that, the city of Montreal has extended its limits in taking a part of the counties of Laval and Jacques Cartier. The owners of these lands, after having divided them into building lots, have naturally opened streets, which have been registered and all that for the benefit of the buyers of these lots.

For instance, you have Mr. George Muir and others near Montreal, who have divided their property into lots, have opened streets and given to the city of Montreal a part of these streets. The farmers of the county of Laval and of the county of Jacques Cartier are obliged to travel by the roads under the control of this commission or by the streets recently opened by Mr. Muir and others, his neighbours. Well, here is a letter signed by Messrs. Laurendeau, Pelletier & Pelletier :

Montreal, 10th Feb., 1908.

Geo. Muir, Esq.,
Ahuntsic, P.Q.

Dear Sir,—We are directed by the trustees of the Turnpike Trust to take against you legal proceedings in order to compel you to close the road which you have opened on your property and by which people are allowed to pass and to evade the payment of the tolls on the turnpike roads. We are directed also besides that to claim from you the sum of $150, for fine incurred up to this date.

On default of an immediate settlement, we will be obliged to prosecute you.

Your most obedient servants,
(Signed): LAURENDEAU, PELLETIER & PELLETIER.

This is the state of things. I understand that the First Minister may be somewhat embarrassed. I understand also perfectly well that he is absolutely incapable to remedy that state of things, but why did he give us to understand on the public platform and elsewhere that the promises made by his friends, silently approved by him, that if ever the Liberal party would come into power he would remedy the grievance of which were suffering the people of the county of Laval and other surrounding counties. We have then the right to come to-day before this House and to say to the hon. the First Minister and his friends that it is now their duty, and principally the duty of the First Minister who is the head of the government to take immediately the necessary steps to remedy this state of things, and to have the courage to fulfil the promises made publicly, promises that the ministerial candidate was using to fight his opponents.

The means proposed to this House are very easy. We do not intend to make any political capital out of this question. I see the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) smiling, I may however tell him that such is the case, and that if the Liberal government of to-day succeeds in remedying the grievances of which we are complaining, I believe that he will have in this way the best means to defeat me at the next elections. Taking this view of the situation, it is not certainly in my own personal political interests to try, as I do, to obtain justice from the government, but the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) as myself look more after the interests of our constituents than of our own personal interests. And even, if we were incurring the risk to put into the hands of our opponents a powerful weapon which they could use against us, we would rather secure to the people the best advantages possible.

What we want the government to understand is that they should put before this House a correct statement of the finances of the Turnpike Trust, which, as my hon. friend of Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Monk) says controls so entirely our roads that no care is even taken to maintain the roads as they should be, as everyone who travels over them knows very well. This government should oblige this trust to give us better roads. Would it not be only justice to the farmers who are obliged to pay the tolls levied by this trust?

We want to have a statement as to the standing of this commission and as well we would like that the government would say to the Commission : We are ready to relieve you of your debt as represented by your debentures, which are not bringing us

any revenue, because you are not even paying the interest.

But nothing can be done ; not only this Commission is not forced to keep the roads in good repair, but it is used to help the Liberal party. As an instance during the general elections of 1900 the payment of the tolls at La Longue Pointe were suspended for about ten days, that is to say, eight days before the polling day and two days after. That was done at the request of Mr. Fortin, the Liberal candidate.

Mr. BELAND. (Translation.) Are you in a position to prove this statement?

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Yes, I can prove it, because I never assert anything which I am not able to prove.

Eight days before the polling day the tolls were abolished, but two days after the gates were re-established, and since then the farmers have been obliged to pay the tolls. That is the reason why we want these gates to disappear. If the government who is the creditor of that trust, and who cannot collect the money which is owed to them and not even collect the interest, desires really to control that trust he should accept this motion. It seems to me that he should try to be acquainted with the facts exactly, and the standing of the Trust ; and when the government will know all about it, it will be easy to convince himself that the debentures which he has are absolutely worthless, and then he could abandon them without making great sacrifices. It would be a noble action on his part and which would not entail no loss to the country. Then the federal government would be in a position to go the provincial government at Quebec and say to them : Abolish these gates.

Now Mr. Speaker, the right hon. First Minister says that the member for Jacques Cartier makes lots of noise and lamentations on the position of these poor farmers. But he says that my hon. friend has forgotten to say who will take charge of these roads. Well, I will say to the hon. First Minister that if he undertakes to abolish the toll gates between Ile Jesus and island of Montreal, the farmers of the different parishes will agree to maintain and will maintain the roads in a better condition than they are presently. The hon. First Minister answered to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier in putting to him another question. I don't think it is the proper way to look at a so serious motion as the one proposed by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. If the hon. First Minister is really anxious to be acquainted with the present situation of the farmers concerning these turnpike roads, he should accept this motion and grant an enquiry. Let the government appoint whom he wishes to make the inquiry, provided they are people willing to do their duty, we will be satisfied, and then the First Minister will not be obliged to ask the members of the left what means they suggest to remedy to that state of things.

I have reason to believe that the farmers of the counties if Jacques-Cartier, Terrebonne and Deux-Montagne are willing to assume the cost of maintenance of these roads, and for myself I am in a position to say that as soon as the government will abolish the numerous toll-gates around the city of Montreal that the ratepayers of the county of Laval are willing and ready to maintain in a good state of repair and traffic all the roads leading to the city.

The right hon. gentleman has proposed an amendment which to my mind does not mean much. He moved that the words 'to enter into negotiations with the government of the province of Quebec' be struck out, and the following be substituted therefor, 'receive all the overtures that may be made by the government of the province of Quebec.'

If I am well informed the Quebec government is the friend of the government at Ottawa. If I am also well informed, the Quebec ministers travel twice a week between the ancient capital and Ottawa in order to settle the present friction between the members of the Liberal party in Quebec. It looks very much as if no one of the provincial ministers enjoyed the confidence of the Liberal party in Quebec, and that they were obliged to come to the first minister at Ottawa to apply the remedy to the incurable friction in the provincial Liberal party.

Mr. TALBOT (Bellechasse). (Translation.) They are not ordinary frictions.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) No, they are not, and my hon. friend from Bellechasse knows it perfectly well, because his friend the provincial member for his county will soon disappear from the political stage.

Mr. TALBOT (Translation.) I do not know anything about that. It is the first time I hear the thing mentioned.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) In short, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the time has arrived that this inquiry should have been instituted by the government. The time has arrived to remedy the grievance which has existed for so long time and to fulfil the promises made to the electors of the counties surrounding Montreal. If the government is willing, the matter will be soon settled, and myself will have no more any ground for the complaints we are airing since a so long time in the House.

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words in answer to the remarks made by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Léonard). It must be admitted that everybody in the province of Quebec regret that

this last vestige of the feudality, the toll-gates, still exist in that province. In fact it is the last remembrance of the old times, for, only a few years ago, we had them in the city of Montreal.

This famous question was brought before the courts, and thanks to the judgment delivered by Hon. Justice Taschereau, now Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals, it was suppressed for ever. Unfortunately the toll gates are still in existence on the island of Montreal. But that island is not the only place where the toll-gates exist. There are some around Quebec, every body would be pleased if this vestige of old times would disappear.

Complaints are made that the Turnpike Trust does not keep its roads as well in as good repair as they should be, and the hon. members for Laval and Jacques Cartier are urging the abolition of the toll-gates. No doubt that those living in these counties want to have good roads, but the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), has forgotten to tell us by what he would replace the present system. This is not the first time that he raises this question in this House. More than once, during the last twelve years I have been here, I have heard the hon. member for Jacques Cartier pressing the matter before the House, but has never suggested any practical solution of the problem. He did not even let us understand that the ratepayers of the county of Jacques Cartier were ready to make some sacrifices in return for the abolition of these toll-gates. I doubt very much if the hon. gentleman would propose clearly to take the burden of the maintenance of these roads, if such a proposal would be favourably considered. I will ask the hon. member if he is ready to abolish these toll-gates, and let the cost of maintenance of the roads fall upon the city of Montreal and the surrounding municipalities. I doubt very much that the ratepayers would support such a proposition.

Mr. LEONARD (Translation.) I have already told it to you a minute ago.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) That is true. Mr. Léonard went further than the member for Jacques Cartier. These gentlement would like to look into the accounts of the Turnpike Trust.

I do not know what those accounts are nor have I ever had the opportunity of noting in what way they are kept.

Any farmer, any market gardener would rather have good roads attended to by the commission than the quagmires which would probably exist should these roads be attended to by every one concerned. After all, it is not for the federal parliament, but for the provincial legislature exclusively to deal with this question, and the hon. members for Jacques Cartier and Laval are well aware of it. The hon. member for Laval who has taken part in many campaigns during the last ten years in his county should know that this question of turnpike roads has been debated there practically ever since confederation has been in existence. I remember, for instance, that from 1881 to 1886, before the regretted Mr. Mercier got into power, there were several by-elections in the county of Laval. At that time the Liberal party supported Dr. Gaboury as a candidate and asked that the turnpikes should be abolished. The Conservative party was all-powerful in the province of Quebec at the time, they could take action but they never thought fit to apply to the Quebec legislature for the suppression of those turnpikes. Later on, in 1886, Hon. Mr. Mercier became prime minister, which he was up to 1891. I remember having taken part in some elections in that county. It was then the Conservative candidate, Mr. Leblanc, now the leader of the opposition in Quebec, who blamed the Liberal government for not abolishing the turnpikes. After 1892, Mr. Leblanc who had become an important member of his party—he occupied, at that time, in the legislative assembly of Quebec, the same position as you occupy here, Mr. Speaker—while he had credit with his party, made no move towards supressing those turnpikes. And the Liberals in the county of Laval who were then on the opposition side, accused Mr. Leblanc of not keeping his promises. This shows that the question is exclusively within the purview of the provincial legislature and that it is the candidates for the Quebec legislature who are, in turn, accused of lacking good faith.

My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, who is an authority in constitutional law, does know that this question is one exclusively for the provincial legislature to consider; but he likes to come before the House—as the hon. Prime Minister has said—in order to pick up a grievance against the government in view of the coming elections.

The hon. member is much of a Norman, and consequently he is very cunning. Whenever a question comes up which might affect the county of Jacques Cartier in some degree, we are sure to hear him protest in behalf of the franchises and privileges of his county. For instance, while I was absent these last few days he raised the question of the postal delivery in the town of Lachine. My hon. friend knows very well that Lachine is far distant from Montreal, and is by no means entitled to this postal delivery. Still, in order to make capital stock for himself, of no low standard after all, he has brought this question before the House. Now, the voters in Jacques Cartier are intelligent and they read the papers, and so they will surely say: Why, just see what a vigorous fight our member is making in our interest.

But my hon. friend has shown himself to be still more of a Norman. There is not far from the county of Jacques Cartier an

Indian reserve by the name of Caughnawaga. Those Indians work in the industrial establishments of that county. The law forbids the innkeepers to sell the Indians intoxicating liquor. Well, in order to please those innkeepers, my hon. friend proposed to amend the law so as to wipe this this restriction off the statute.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I do not think this question has anything whatever to do with the motion now before the House. Consequently, the hon. minister is out of order.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) I have no hesitation in admitting at once that the point raised by my hon. friend is well taken, and I come back to the question.

An hon. MEMBER. (Translation.) The Indians are behind.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) We shall speak of the Indians at no greater length.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Nor shall we speak of liquor.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) As a conclusion, I second the amendment proposed by the hon. Prime Minister, and I still maintain that the object which the hon. member has in view is to create an imaginary grievance so as to be able to say to his electors : Just see all I have asked the government, and I could not get it. I met with no success as to the postal delivery, as to the suppression of fines imposed upon the innkeepers who sell liquor to Indians, or as to the suppression of turnpikes ; although I have upheld your rights with energy for twelve years, the government always turned a deaf ear.

Mr. Speaker, the federal government was unwilling to run after their debtor and say : We release you of your debt. For what is the hon. member asking after all? He proposes by his motion that the federal government should have a conference with the provincial government and say : We know that the Turnpike Trust are unable to pay their debt, so we will release them of it. Frankly, is not the means suggested by the hon. Prime Minister more rational? The federal government knows perfectly well that the trust do not pay their interest, but it is not for the federal government to make the first step. Even if they did release the trust of that debt, is it decidedly sure that the provincial government would be satisfied? In fact, the Turnpike Trust derive their powers and their charter from the provincial legislature and not from the federal government. What authority have we over them that we might abolish them? The question is only too clear, and I think my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier should withdraw his motion.

Otherwise, the people in Montreal are well aware of the fact that every one having a right to vote in the county of Jacques Cartier and having a grievance, whether against Peter, John or James, is sure to find an echo on the floor of the House of Commons.

I have quoted a few moments ago the several occasions upon which my hon. friend has addressed the federal parliament in order to voice the complaints, imaginary or real, originating from the county of Jacques Cartier ; but I believe that in this particular circumstance, my hon. friend should accept the amendment suggested by the hon. Prime Minister, who has granted a good deal so far by giving his word to the effect that the government is ready to receive any proposition, to listen to any advances, which the Quebec government might happen to make.

Mr. L. ROBITAILLE (Quebec county). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in case the proposition made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier might be voted upon, I wish to give some explanation. Last year, when a motion similar to this was presented before the House, I said a few words in favour of it. The reason I gave at the time was that this was a part of my programme, as the question seemed to be a pretty important one as far as my electors were concerned. I think the hon. Postmaster General will remember having heard it discussed during the campaign which took place in the county of Quebec.

As the hon. Postmaster General said a moment ago, this question is rather within the purview of the provincial legislature, and I am satisfied of the amendment presented by the hon. Prime Minister.

However, I may say to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier that should the Conservative members of the Quebec legislature stick to public interest in the same degree as he does here himself, they would have ample information to gather as to the method adopted by the Ontario government in macadamizing and metalling the roads since it has abolished the toll-gates.

I think the provincial government offers the municipalities, through its Minister of Public Works, a bonus equal to half the amount of what it costs to keep the actual roads in good order, and besides half the amount of what it costs to build the new roads.

I must declare that, in case the present motion should be voted upon, I will support the amendment proposed by the hon. Prime Minister, for the following reason : In the course of last summer my electors were made aware of the position I took last year when I supported the motion presented by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. Whether right or wrong, I do not know, but they seemed to be pleased with the present system. Now, my policy is that I should follow the opinion of my electors. I think, then, that by giving the vote I am about to give, I comply with the desire of the majority of my electors.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. En français.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the majority of the House will understand me better in this language, so perhaps I may be pardoned if I speak it. It would seem to me, in looking over the amendment proposed by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that there is an appropriateness which, at first glance, one might not recognize. I think I would like to move an amendment to the amendment, if the rules of the House permitted. The Prime Minister proposes to amend the original motion so as to make it read :

That it is the duty of the government to receive all overtures that may be made——

I presume by the government of the province of Quebec.

—with a view to removing all obstacles to the abolition of toll-gates on the roads of the island of Montreal.

In the first place, one naturally asks : What are these 'overtures,' which, according to the Prime Minister, it is the duty of the government to receive? I have the dictionary before me that I may be sure to correctly understand it. I find that 'overture' means 'an instrumental prelude to an opera or ballet.' Well, if the people of the island of Montreal are satisfied to take this method of approaching their mightiness, I suppose we should offer no objections. 'To remove the toll-gates.' But I may be told that this is not the only meaning of the word and is not the one intended here. Another meaning is this, 'an intimation of willingness to make terms ; tentative proposal.' For what purpose ? 'To remove the toll-gates.' If I were proposing to amend this resolution, I would greatly extend its importance. I would propose not merely to remove the toll-gates in the island of Montreal, but to remove the toll-gates around the parliament buildings at Ottawa. For it is generally believed by the people that the parliament buildings are all surrounded by toll-gates which prevent the people reaching the departments unless they are prepared to pay a high rate of toll. It is true that those who pay that toll may be recouped by the public, but the toll must be paid. Why should we not do away with these toll-gates, even though we should not have the 'overtures' in concord of sweet sounds which make people happy and ready and willing to give away everything that belongs to others? If the motion be amended so as to provide for doing away with the toll-gates around these departments, I shall be glad to hold up both hands in favour of it. It would be a notable reform if, for instance, people could get into the Department of the Interior without paying tolls ; if they could get contracts for public buildings or for dredging without paying toll. But these toll-gates are on every avenue leading to the public departments. Even though the removal of these toll-gates should involve some expense, it would result in a saving to the country in the end. Many will view with hope the fact that the government are desirous of receiving overtures. But they seem to be always ready to 'receive overtures'—I have no doubt that every one who gets something from the departments knows that long ago. We have heard, for instance, of their 'receiving overtures' for the sale of liquor in the Yukon. One gentleman told me that he was invited to pay $20,000 for the privilege of taking whisky into the Yukon. Well, if the government are ready to 'receive overtures' to do away with these rascally toll-gates around these departments we cannot too soon begin upon those 'overtures' ; for, whether they be musical overtures or not, it will be music to the public ear to hear such a movement in progress.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Translation.)—Mr. Speaker, the hon. Postmaster General, who has just taken his seat, has stood here as the authorized representative of the government in the district of Montreal. The position he has taken is hardly in keeping with the statement made formally by his colleague and neighbour, the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur), who never missed a single opportunity of denouncing the system of toll-gates. He has stated time and again that one of the first duties of the government, should his party get into power, would consist in changing this system. I hope the Minister of Marine will say a few words about this matter, and so much the more so, that, if what rumour says is true, the Minister of Marine and the Postmaster General, who are sitting side by side, are not on those good terms that one would like to witness in a government well organized. These rumours are, no doubt, unfounded, but if under the circumstances, after the hon. Postmaster General, who represents the remote county of Gaspé has spoken, the Minister of Marine remains silent, the rumours which have been circulated for so long a time about the uneasiness that prevails between them will be justified in public opinion. We are entitled to an expression of opinion from the ministers on a question which seems to them of minor importance, but which for us is material, and I blame the Postmaster General for having dealt with it in a light manner, for it appeals to a large extent at this moment to the market gardeners and to the farmers of that district. When the hon. Postmaster General said that we were asking the federal government as a creditor to run after his debtor in order to tell him that they released him of his debt, and when I saw the hon. Prime Minister laugh as he heard

these utterances, it seemed to me that he himself did not look upon that question as being so important as it is.

We have here some other gentlemen who are interested in the solution of that question and should the tame amendment proposed by the Prime Minister be adopted, we would not have gone any further than we were at first when this discussion was started. The county of Two Mountains is just as much interested as are the counties of Laval and Jacques Cartier. The member for this county knows that we are not dealing with this question here laughingly. It is a serious one; it has been presented with eloquence by the member for Laval. In asking the government to abolish these toll-gates after fifteen years sufferings, are we making a blunder? Is that the opinion of the member for Terrebonne whom I now see at his seat and whose electors are also interested? I see the member for the county of Hochelaga (Mr. Rivet) also at his seat. Does the town of Westmount, whose interest in this question amounts to more than $7,000, does that hon. member believe that in asking for an inquiry in order to ascertain as to whether we should not obtain from the federal government that they should give up their claim, we are acting unthinkingly? Is that his opinion? What does the member for l'Assumption think of it? He whose electors are just as much interested as my own, since they often come to Montreal and have to suffer from what the Postmaster General has called a feudal institution which should have been abolished long ago.

Even the member for Vaudreuil is interested in this question, for during certain seasons of the year his electors happen to pass in the roads affected by the toll-gates which I am now complaining of. When we ask that the federal government should intervene and that an inquiry commission should be appointed, do these gentlemen think that such a request in not in conformity with the public interest? Is that anything unfair and which should not obtain their support? The Postmaster General said that we could refer the matter to the provincial government. Does he know that when we apply to his partner, the Hon. Mr. Gouin, Prime Minister of Quebec, he refers us to the federal government, which the hon. Postmaster General represents here?

It is thus that we are sent from Caiphas to Pilate, nobody caring to assume the responsibility of fulfilling the promises made.

In 1902 the hon. the Prime Minister attended the nomination meeting alluded to a moment ago by the member for Laval. He had come to support his candidate, Mr. Wilson. At that meeting I myself heard Mr. Wilson speak in support of the very policy which the Prime Minister has just declared that he would not approve of in my county or in any constituency in the neighbourhood of Montreal. Under the circumstances, the premier's amendment does not appear to me serious.

We ask him to enter into negotiations with the Quebec government, a government which he controls, of which he is the main adviser, and he suggests an amendment declaring that if the provincial government comes to him he will be willing to hear their statement of the case.

And my young friend from the county of Quebec (Mr. Robitaille), whose riding is likewise afflicted with turnpikes, considers this a wise and reasonable solution. I notice in my colleague from the county of Quebec a change of mind which I regret. The scales have fallen from his eyes. He has travelled on to Damascus and he has seen light; perhaps he has seen something else. But we, Mr. Speaker, who have received no such electric shocks, and are still in darkness, persist in believing that it is unnecessary for the federal government to declare by an amendment that if approached by any government on a question of public interest, they will consider the overtures they may make. We are of opinion that the matter should be taken more seriously.

The hon. the Postmaster General does not appear to be as conversant with the subject as his colleague, who controls more directly the patronage of the district of Montreal, and whom, I hope, we will presently hear. He said that the farmers preferred the present system. What does the learned minister know about it? He reminds me of McDuff, of Shakespearian fame, whose children had been murdered by Macbeth. Somebody suggested that he should wreak vengeance on Macbeth. How can I, he exclaimed, Macbeth has no children? There are no turnpikes in the learned minister's riding, he can therefore afford to treat lightly what is to us a serious matter.

Does my hon. friend, does the right hon. Prime Minister suppose that the farmers of Laval, Jacques Cartier, l'Assomption, Terrebonne, Two Mountains, Joliette and Hochelaga are not intelligent enough to understand that if these turnpikes disappear they will be obliged to make some other provision for the maintenance of the roads?

Why should the Postmaster General insist upon my telling him how this would be done if the turnpikes were abolished? Oh, he says, they do not explain this to the electors. Well, it is unnecessary to point out to the people of Jacques Cartier that if you abolish one source of revenue it must be supplemented in some other way. The Postmaster General may be sure that the electors of Jacques Cartier are quite as intelligent as his own, and they fully understand that one source of revenue disappearing some other plan must be devised to meet requirements.

Hon. RUDOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). (Translation.) Will my hon. friend allow me to put a question?

He says that the electors of his county are as intelligent as those of Gaspé. How does he explain that Lachine hotelkeepers cannot distinguish between an Indian and a white man ?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Have I understood aright what my learned friend has just said ? Is it possible that in this House, in the presence of the representatives of the country, he dares to state, to the shame of the electors of Jacques Cartier, that Lachine hotelkeepers cannot distinguish between a white man and an Indian ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) My hon. friend stated last year that the law should be amended for that reason.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Let me assure my hon. friend that he is mistaken. Hotelkeepers of Lachine and of all other localities in my county are quite able to distinguish between a white man and an Indian.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us close this debate in a grave spirit. The question is more serious than the government believes. In the immediate vicinity of Montreal, at the division line between the counties of Jacques Cartier and Laval, the commission has placed a turnpike on the Sault road. They had no right to do this, their action is a violation of the Montreal City Charter and of the law. This is the grievance of which my hon. friend from Laval has spoken, and it is within the power of the federal government to apply an immediate remedy. As the member for Laval has explained, several of his electors are suffering from this state of things. At Côte Saint Laurent, tolls are being illegally collected from farmers and others, and those who pass without paying are sued. It is a flagrant injustice. The government has a right to control this commission and the Finance Minister might make immediate use of his powers to put an end to the abuse.

The Prime Minister's amendment seems to me rather a joke. I hope the House will adopt the two motions submitted by me. The right hon. Premier remarked that several years running I have taken up the time of the House with this question. It rests with him that I should not do so in future ; let him put an end to the grievances complained of. If the government will do so, they may acquire in these counties an influence which may be useful to them.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, after the pressing appeal made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, it is a pleasure for me to say a few words upon the motion now before the House and which reads as follows :—

That it is the duty of the Government to enter into negociations with the government of the Province of Quebec with the view of removing all impediments to the abolishing of turnpikes on the roads of the island of Montreal.

It may be useful briefly to explain the situation with respect to these turnpikes. They are, I believe, administered by a corporation owing its legal existence to the provincial government. At a time when the trust was composed of friends of the member for Jacques Cartier, the federal government was requested to take over the debentures then issued. It follows that today the government is simply in the position of a creditor holding debentures.

Who are the parties chiefly interested in this question ? The municipalities through which these roads run. If they believed that these roads were too burdensome, they would be the first to complain and to request the provincial government to take steps with a view of abolishing them. I am not aware that the municipalities concerned have taken any such action. If turnpikes were abolished on the island of Montreal, the parish of St. Laurent, for example, would be obliged to maintain the roads within its limits. As the people of St. Laurent are not the only ones who use these roads, as they are also used by the people of Montreal, those of the counties of Laval, Two Mountains and elsewhere, the latter, under the present system of tolls, contibute something towards their maintenance. Does my hon. friend suggest that the municipality of St. Laurent should be burdened with the whole expense of maintaining these roads ? I can well understand that the municipality is not over anxious to take steps towards assuming alone an expenditure now divided among the people of Montreal, Laval and Two Mountains. I do not therefore believe that the suggestion of my hon. friend is in the interest of the parish of St. Laurent nor of the municipalities of the county of Jacques Cartier, situated near Montreal, as it would oblige them to pay more than they do at present. The matter is quite clear.

My hon. friend has stated that the methods of the trust are not of the best and that money is spent uselessly. We have no proof of that. On the contrary, I am informed that the administration is very economical. The trustees' chief difficulty is that they are unable to raise the rates of toll, in order to pay interest on their indebetedness.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Does the hon. minister suggest that the rate of tolls should be raised ?

Mr. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). (Translation.) No, on the contrary. But my hon. friend contends that we should insist upon the payment of interest on the money due to us, which would bring about an increase in the rate of tolls.

My hon. friend asks that the turnpikes be abolished. But what persons would then

be obliged to contribute towards the maintenance of the roads ? The burden would fall entirely upon the municipalities through which they run. Their case would be that of the parish of St. Laurent. Is it not better that the roads should be maintained by a commission as they are to-day, without payment of interest upon the debt, and the expenses paid by means of tolls collected from the people of Montreal, Laval and Two Mountains who use them? The moment the turnpikes were abolished the parish of St. Laurent would lose just so much revenue. Is that the proposal made by my hon. friend ?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I understand that my hon. friend is in favour of continuing the present system.

Mr. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). (Translation.) I say that the proposed change would not be in the interest of the parish, and the municipalities appear to be of the same opinion, as they have not requested the government to allow them to take over the roads.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Municipalities in Jacques Cartier county have repeatedly requested the abolition of turnpikes.

Mr. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). (Translation.) Am I then to understand that these municipalities are ready to take charge of the roads ?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) They ask that the turnpikes be abolished, the government remitting the debt.

Mr. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). (Translation.) My hon. friend well knows that abolishing the turnpikes is not the only question: there is also the maintenance of the roads. Who will maintain them, who will fill up the ruts and holes ?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) What did the hon. gentleman promise at a time when he sat on the opposition side of the House ?

Mr. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). (Translation.) The promise I then made is contained in the Prime Minister's amendment. We are awaiting overtures to study the question.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I think the Postmaster General's argument this afternoon was more effective than yours.

Mr. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). (Translation.) I was absent at the time, as I believed that the hon. gentleman would not proceed with his motion; the thing has happened several times before.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I was ready every time it was called and I defy the hon. minister to prove the contrary. It was called the day before yesterday; as the hon. the Finance Minister was not present, I did not press it.

Mr. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). (Translation.) My hon. friend is mistaken. The motion has been called every Monday and Wednesday since the month of January. At all events this is not a point of much importance.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) It is of great importance, as my hon. friend says that I was not here.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Well, I will take my hon. friend's word for it. Unfortunately, I was absent this afternoon when the motion was called. I was obliged to leave the chamber to confer with the people from Jacques Cartier on certain questions, and now my hon. friend finds fault with me. I cannot be everywhere at once.

To return to the question, the member for Jacques Cartier would have the turnpikes abolished. But that is not the whole question. Who is to take charge of the roads ? My hon. friend would leave their maintenance to the municipalities, I suppose.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) My motion is before the House; why does not the hon. minister discuss it?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) No, no. My hon. friend wishes the government to negotiate with the provincial government. Suppose his motion was carried, what would we have to say to the provincial government? Would he wish the whole burden of maintenance to be placed on the parish of St. Laurent, whereas it is now divided among several localities.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Well, as the hon. minister asks me, I wish you to begin negotiations and I will then submit my plan.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) My hon. friend is not reasonable. Since several years he has been giving special attention to this question, he has been in close contact with the parties interested, and now he says to us: Begin negotiations and I will afterwards tell you how to proceed. Well, I wish him to state whether the municipality of St. Laurent should or should not be called upon to pay, in order that we may know how we stand. If his plan is a good one, why does he not explain it ? The postmaster general described the situation correctly when he said that we are the creditors ; should we go to the debtor and inquire: what do you want us to do for you ? That is not what is generally done. Any proposals should come from the interested parties. None are more interested in this case than the municipalities. They therefore should suggest plans for the maintenance of the roads. If the people from Laval and other counties cease to pay anything,

then the people of St. Laurent must pay all ; I fail to see that there are any others.

Under the circumstances, it seems to me that the Prime Minister's amendment is the only one that can be considered, and I believe that on reflection, my hon. friend will come to the same conclusion.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) What remedy would my hon. friend suggest?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) As I represent the creditor, I think the debtor should make a suggestion.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) How did the hon. minister intend to make provision for this expenditure, when in 1892, '93 and '94 he promised to settle this matter if returned to office?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) We are ready to receive overtures. I do not recollect having ever discussed this question on the hustings, except once when I met the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. The plan which I suggested is the same as that which I now submit.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Two Mountains) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, since the hon, member for Jacques Cartier wishes to know what are the views of my constituents in regard to his motion, I shall be glad to satisfy him as to that, and also as to what are my own views, if the House is called upon to give a vote on that question. My answer is recorded in the amendment moved by the right hon. leader of the House.

Farmers in the county of Laval, Terrebonne, Two Mountains and Jacques Cartier, who are called upon to pay the tolls exacted by the Turnpike Trust, would hail with pleasure the abolition of these tolls, a relic of the feudal system, as the Postmaster General so aptly termed them.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I understand that the hon. member is in favour of the Lemieux wing ?

Mr. ETHIER (Translation.) I am not aware that any such thing exists for the time being; but my hon. friend thinks he has in hand a fine opportunity of making some political capital with an eye to the coming election; for he does not let a single session pass without unflinchingly bringing before the House that question of the turnpike roads. Drawing on his talents as a professor, well versed in consitutional law, he ventures to move, with wonderful fearlessness that the Dominion government should enter into negotiations with the provincial government, with the object of finding some means of doing away with these turnpikes. Whenever the hon. member is called uopn to state what is his plan for the settlement of this question, he answers: I have a plan, but I keep it in my pocket, and in due time I shall let the country have the benefit of it. Well, I wonder if he really means it. Is such a stand in keeping with the high position the hon. gentleman occupies in his party? Is a public man warranted in thus keeping under cover a device which he refrains from showing to the government? He has referred to the existence of factions; let him cast his eye around him and he will discover any number of factions. Let him spend some time in Montreal visiting the various Conservative clubs, made up of heterogeneous elements, and he will find out as much as he wants about factions.

It seems to me that the hon. Postmaster General has well answered the contention set forth in this motion. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier seems to have completely lost sight just now of provincial rights, those rights which he so often likes to talk about and to uphold. That trust is constituted under a provincial charter. Should the Dominion Government now attempt to abolish it, would not those hon. members on your left, Mr. Speaker, exclaim: Why not strike at the root of the evil? Why not go to Quebec and call upon the creators of that trust to effect the required changes?

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier stated that a turnpike had been set up at St. Laurent, although the trust's charter, its constitution and the law forbade it. If the trust has exceeded its powers and taken advantage of the willingness of the ratepayers to submit to such tolls, there is a remedy to that, which the law provides. This question should be taken to the local legislature and not brought before this House. Why such persistence in calling upon the Dominion parliament to correct these grievances?

My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier will not make known his remedy; but after considering his proposal, I venture to say that a worse state of things would prevail if the House complied with his request.

The electors of the counties of Laval and Two Mountains are not alone in contributing toward the maintenance of these roads. The citizens of Montreal contribute more than one-half of the cost, their numbers being so much larger than those of the farmers who proceed to town once a week to sell their products.

Supposing that system was done away with, who would be called upon to settle the current debt, the floating debt, and who would look after the maintenance of those roads? What assurance have we that they would be in as good condition as they are to-day? Is the hon. member for Jacques Cartier in a position to lay before the House a single resolution from a municipal council requesting that these turnpikes be done away with?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Then you are in favour of keeping the turnpikes?

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) My hon. friend's question is the best proof that he is trying to make political capital out of this. Is he in a position to show to the House a single resolution of the council of the county of Jacques Cartier? I do not think so.

And the hon. member for Laval, who, with a disinterestedness worthy of a great cause, he being the secretary of the county of Laval, ventures to ask his constituents to take charge of those roads wholly at their expense; is he, as well, in a position to lay before the House a single resolution of the council of that county approving the stand taken by the member for Jacques Cartier?

Laval and Jacques Cartier are not the only two counties under the control of the trust. I understand that there is a similar organization in Queebc, and that in some other localities tolls are exacted on bridges.

I say that we should call upon the Turnpike Trust to repay the amount they owe to the government, instead of offering to cancel their obligations; and it may also be appropriate to call upon the hon. member for Jacques Cartier to lay on the table of the House that admirable plan which he refuses to exhibit, that unspeakable boon which is to be such a solace to his constituents. Under those circumstances, I consider myself in duty bound to vote in favour of the proposed amendment.

Mr. GUSTAVE BOYER (Vaudreuil). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, evidently the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has some hidden design. He even seems intent on playing some prank on the hon. member for Vaudreuil, whom he invites to take part in this discussion, although his county is not in any way concerned in it. As a matter of fact, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier might as well have called upon the hon. member for Beauharnois to express an opinion on the subject. I am not any more desirious, just now, than I was a moment ago of taking part in this discussion, so ably carried on by the hon. Postmaster General, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and other hon. members; nor shall I take up the time of the House in expounding the reasonableness of the amendment moved by the right hon. Prime Minister.

On the other hand I do not wish to make any show of indifference, whenever the name of the county of Vaudreuil is mentioned in this House.

The doing away with the road tolls, that is with the turnpikes, is a question which is of no interest whatever to my constituents, and my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier as well as my hon. friend from Beauharnois are perfectly well aware of it.

These hon. members have of late inquired in this House as to the dredging carried on at various places in the county I have the honour to represent. Now, let me tell them that since the government has repaired our wharfs, dredged the channels in our rivers, and even through some of our villages, we are in a position to ship and receive various products and goods along our waterways, as well as along the railway lines which the government subsidized. The government, which I take this opportunity to thank, has followed a wise policy.

Driving to Montreal is for my constituents a thing of the past. But, if we were obliged during summer to use a horse and vehicle when on a trip to the metropolis, we certainly would not object to paying certain tolls to those who provide us with macadam roads.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier deems it desirable to do away with turnpikes and the accompanying tolls; and on the Prime Minister inquiring how he would make up for the loss of revenue resulting therefrom, he replies, rather childishly, that the loss would have to be made up from some other source. Now, I fail to see how the people would be benefited by such a change. Indeed, Sir, unless the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is willing to disclose to us the plan he claims to have evolved, and which may have its good points, I shall remain under the impression that he wishes to lay unduly on our shoulders a responsibility which should remain with the provincial government. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier causes me still greater surprise when he expresses his intentions of confiding to enterprise of almost private character what is better accomplished by public bodies. He poses nevertheless as a friend of the community. Last year again, in this very House, he proposed a Bill for the purpose of enabling the farming community to invest their savings and effect the sale of their products by means of co-operative effort.

We cannot expect to have good roads in the country until they are put under the control of corporate body. My hon. friend is perfectly aware of it. In the meantime, each citizen will be looking after his part of the road, as he pleases, and the municipal council will have no control over him except through its inspectors, who do not give much trouble to any one, including themselves, when it comes to enforcing municipal regulations. This has been so well understood by the ratepayers of the parish of Vaudreuil, in the county of Vaudreuil, that, for the last two years, through co-operative effort they have succeeded in macadamizing a good part of the roads within their territory. The promoters, men of good will intended thereby to set a good example for the remainder of the county. Let us hope that it will be effective. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is a recognized fact that the farmer single-handed is unable to carry out these improvements, and that he requires the stimulating influence of enterprising and public-spirited leaders to bring them about.

The metalling of the roads in Vaudreuil parish are an uncontrovertible proof of my contention. The insignificant expenditure entailed on the various interested parties would have been very much heavier, if the old system of every one for himself had been followed. Though I had no desire of getting away of the question now under discussion, it struck me that the suspicious proposal advocated by the member for Jacques Cartier cannot be entertained at a time when, in villages more especially, and even in country places, the tendency is to entrust municipal councils with the duty of maintaining highways. It is contended that with such a system roads would be kept in a more uniformly good condition, and that the collection of the taxes required for such work would be more properly and fairly effected. Although I am not ready to endorse such a scheme, I think it would give better results than the plan which my hon. friend for Jacques Cartier is unwilling to give out.

Mr. L. A. RIVET (Hochelaga). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to incur the displeasure of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier by refusing to take a hand in this discussion as other hon. gentlemen have done. This is not a new question, as for the last twelve years, particularly at every session, it has been brought before the House, in some shape or other, suggesting the same arguments, presented in almost the same language. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has resolved this year, as usual, to take up the time of the House with this everlasting question, and he has deemed it advisable to mention my name in the course of his remarks. Well, I may state that the county of Hochelaga is in no way interested in this matter, except, in, so far as the city of Westmount would be in debt to the amount of $7,000 to the Turnpike Trust.

There are no turnpikes in my constituency. However, before advocating their abolition, I would like to ask what steps would be taken to provide for the maintenance of roads on the island of Montreal? The hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who has denounced this system with such vigour and in such indignant tones, should know that these very roads have been instrumental in bringing market gardening in the island of Montreal to that enviable degree of prosperity which it enjoys to-day, and that without them the city of Montreal would not have been benefited thereby in such a large measure.

I do not claim for my part, to be satisfied with the turnpike system; but so long as no other means of providing for the maintenance of the roads has not been laid before this House, I, like other hon. gentlemen, shall vote in favour of the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the House.

Just now, there exists not only in the county of Jacques Cartier, but in other counties as well, a strong feeling against this system of turnpikes; but that is not a sufficient reason why the Dominion government, who have no jurisdiction in the matter, should interfere.

House divided on amendment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

YEAS:

Messieurs.

Adamson,	Lemieux,
Archambault,	Logan,
Aylesworth,	Loggie,
Beauparlant,	Lovell,
Beland,	Macdonald,
Black,	Maclean (Lunenburg),
Bourbonnais,	McCarthy (Simcoe),
Boyer,	McColl,
Brodeur,	McCool,
Caldwell,	McIntyre (Perth),
Calvert,	McIntyre (Strathcona),
Carney,	McKenzie,
Carrier,	McLean (Huron),
Cash,	McLean (York, C.),
Chisholm (Antigonish),	McLennan,
Clarke,	Marcile (Bagot),
Conmee,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Copp,	Martin (Wellington),
Crawford,	Mayrand,
Cyr,	Meigs,
Delisle,	Michaud,
Demers,	Miller,
Desjardins,	Oliver,
Devlin,	Pardee,
Dubeau,	Parmelee,
Dugas,	Paterson,
Ethier,	Parent,
Fielding,	Pickup,
Finlay,	Power,
Finlayson,	Proulx,
Fisher,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fortier,	Rivet,
Galliher,	Robitaille,
Gauvreau,	Roche (Halifax),
Girard,	Ross (Cape Breton),
Gladu,	Ross (Rimouski),
Graham,	Rousseau,
Grant,	Schell (Glengarry),
Greenway,	Schell (Oxford),
Guthrie,	Sinclair,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),	Sloan,
Hunt,	Smith (Nanaimo),
Jackson (Selkirk),	Smith (Oxford),
Kennedy,	Stewart,
Knowles,	Talbot,
Lachance,	Templeman,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Tolmie,
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Turcotte,
Lapointe,	Turgeon,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turriff,
Lavergne (Drummond & Arth.),	Verville,
Law,	Watson,
LeBlanc,	Wilson (Russell),
	Wright (Renfrew),
	Zimmerman.—108.

NAYS:

Messieurs.

Alcorn,	Leonard,
Armstrong,	Lewis,
Avery,	Macdonell,
Barr,	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Beattie,	

Bennett,	Martin (Queens, P.E.I.),
Bergeron,	Monk,
Blain,	Morin,
Borden (Carleton),	Northrup,
Boyce,	Owen,
Brabazon,	Paquet,
Chisholm (Huron),	Porter,
Christie,	Reid (Grenville),
Clare,	Roche (Marquette),
Clements,	Schaffner,
Cockshutt,	Smith (Wentworth),
Elson,	Sproule,
Foster,	Stanfield,
Ganong,	Taylor,
Haggart,	Walsh (Huntingdon),
Henderson,	Ward,
Herron,	White,
Jackson (Elgin),	Wilmot,
Kemp,	Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Lake,	Worthington,
Lancaster,	Wright (Muskoka.—53.
Lefurgey,	
Lennox,	

PAIRS:

Messieurs.

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Telford,	Tisdale,
Bickerdike,	Maclean (York, S.),
Harty,	Seagram,
Bureau,	Osler,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Barker,
Pugsley,	Daniel,
Emmerson,	Fowler,
Sifton,	MacLaren,
Dyment,	Broder,
Tobin,	Pringle,
Gordon,	Crocket,
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),	Marshall,
Johnston,	Forget,
Macpherson,	Ames,
Hall,	Perley,
Harty,	Bristol,
Carvell,	Staples,
Ratz,	McCarthy (Calgary),
German.	Thompson.

Motion as amended agreed to.

MONTREAL TURNPIKE ROADS.

Mr. MONK moved :

That it is the duty of the government, pursuant to chapter 104 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, part 1, to institute an inquiry into the situation of its claim upon the Montreal Turnpike Roads, now bonded to the government of Canada, in order to pave the way to provincial legislation, looking to the abolition of toll-gates on the island of Montreal.

He said : The remarks I have already made apply to this motion. If the government were disposed to accept this motion I would save the House any further remarks.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) by long experience knows that if he is right he can always expect the government to accept anything that he wants. On this occasion we think he is right and therefore we accept the motion.

Motion agreed to.

TRIAL AND CONVICTION OF FREDERICK BLUNDEN.

Mr. H. A. WARD (Durham) moved :

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports, documents and papers, in relation to the trial and conviction of one Frederick Blunden, for cattle stealing at Macleod, in the province of Alberta, in 1904.

He said : Mr. Speaker, if any explanation is necessary as to the reason why the papers referred to in this motion should be brought down, I may say at the outset that from information in my possession from reliable sources in the Northwest I am led to believe that, in the conviction of Frederick Blunden referred to in the motion, that there has been a very grave miscarriage of justice. This man was convicted at Macleod in 1904. His conviction was the outcome of the trial of a man named Train who was tried at the same place a short time previously for cattle stealing. Train was shadowed for two days previously to his apprehension by the Northwest Mounted Police and when he was discovered in the act of killing cattle he said that the cattle were his own. When it was pointed out to him by members of the Northwest Mounted Police that the brand Y.T., which represents cattle belonging to Mr. Lane of Calgary, was on the cattle he said that he had made a mistake. There was no word said at the time or for two months, I understand, afterwards, implicating the man Blunden, but after two months incarceration in jail, this man gave out to the police, I suppose, that he had bought these cattle from Blunden and on the evidence of Train alone who was promptly allowed to go by the judge, Blunden was convicted of cattle stealing and sent to the penitentiary at Edmonton for ten years. From the information in my hands I believe that fresh evidence has come to light and that the members of the Northwest Mounted Police who were interested in the trial were or are now in possession of evidence showing that this man is entirely innocent. It seems, therefore, very little to say that there has been a miscarriage of justice and I think it is only reasonable that the papers should be brought down and that we should know exactly on what evidence this man was convicted. I understand that a very large number of the residents about Macleod and other portions of the Northwest have signed the petition which has been sent in to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) but which has not been acted upon in any way. The impression throughout the country, in so far as I can learn, is that this man has been unjustly treated. I understand that no

pardon is asked for in this petition, that no pardon is asked for by the friends of this man who is incarcerated at the present time, but that simply in the light of new evidence which has come out he should be given a new trial which the people there are confident will result in his acquittal. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, move the motion which stands in my name.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, the case of the man who is mentioned in this motion is simply one of several cases, more or less of a similar character, the files in respect to which are in the Department of Justice, and an ordinary application for some interference with the action of the court. Not long after I took charge of the department the case of this particular prisoner was brought to my attention by letters, some from himself, some from other members of his family and some from persons writing on his behalf. The claim was made that there had been a very great miscarriage of justice in the case of this particular man, which had been considered on more than one occasion by my predecessor in office. A copy of the evidence, taken in shorthand at the trial had been procured, and was upon the files of the department accompanied by petitions, by voluminous correspondence, and by the contentions in writing of the solicitor or barrister by whom the prisoner had been defended. The claim was made that this case ought to receive, at the hands of the Minister of Justice, a new trial. The assertion was very roundly made by those who were interested in the prisoner's case, as it has been made to-day, that there had been a gross miscarriage of justice in the case of this particular man and that the judge before whom he had been tried did not appreciate the evidence, did not give effect to the evidence for the defence, but received the evidence for the prosecution and acted upon it entirely contrary to that which was just and right. Under these circumstances it was, of course, a matter of duty that I should read and consider with all the care I was able to give to it the evidence which had been presented. I have read that evidence, every word of it, and I have read it more than once. It is voluminous but it is the ordinary evidence, if I may so describe it, that one might expect to find given upon a trial of this character. There is as well, among the papers in the case, the report not only of the judge before whom the case was tried, but that of another judge of the court, who, on a subsequent occasion, tried the man, Train, whose name is mentioned in connection with this prisoner, Blunden, and upon whom Blunden seeks to cast the responsibility for the offence for which Blunden has been committed. The contention, I may say, on Blunden's part has been that undoubtedly the cattle which are in question were stolen cattle but that the offence was committed not by him—Blunden—but by Train. The report from the judge before whom Train was tried is also upon the files and it was obtained because of the special contention which Blunden was making or which was being made on his behalf, in order that the fullest knowledge could be had of the facts of this case.

Mr. LANCASTER. Was Blunden tried by a jury or by a judge alone ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It is some months since I looked at the papers and perhaps my recollection is not quite perfect but it is that both of these men were tried, with their assent, summarily, or by speedy trial without the intervention of a jury. I may not be accurate in that regard. The necessity, as I tried to explain at considerable length in a discussion which took place in the House last week upon a motion, for a return of a general character—the necessity of maintaining the confidential nature of reports from judges, I think, must be admitted. In this particular case the views of each of these two judges were expressed with absolute freedom in these reports in regard to both Train and Blunden, in regard to their trials, in regard to the estimation in which they were held by their neighbours and in regard to the circumstances of these particular charges : they are of an absolutely confidential nature and I would urge upon the hon. member who has introduced this motion that he should not ask that such documents should be made public or that the contents of them should be given to the world. In regard to the evidence at the trial there is not the slightest objection on my part, and there cannot be on anybody's part, that it should be brought down as a return if my hon. friend thinks it is worth the expense of being copied. The copy which has been sent to the department is upon the files and I should not have the slightest objection to my hon. friend or to any person perusing that evidence which was, of course, given in open, public court, and no more have I any objection in the world to all the correspondence which I have written or which has been written by my predecessor in regard to this case being put before the public. I seek, however, to protect—and I hope my hon. friend will be willing to protect, from publicity, the reports of the judges in so far as they are of a confidential character and all the confidential papers in connection with the case. It is not, of course, for me, I think, to express, or to form, any opinion as to whether the judges before whom these cases were tried came to a proper conclusion or did not do so. It was a case, in so far as Blunden's trial was concerned, in which the evidence was somewhat contradictory, in which Blunden himself went into the witness box

and was subjected to cross examination by the crown prosecutor. Any one can form his own conclusions upon the evidence. I cannot pretend to say that I have not formed an opinion upon the evidence, and I have expressed that opinion in some of the letters I have written to members of Blunden's family or to persons interested on his behalf. But, I might point out that it is not, as it seems to me, my duty or my right to review in any way the work of the court upon the trial of this or any other prisoner whether the decision is given by a jury or by a judge. It is in this case—pre-eminently it is in this case—a question of fact. It must generally be so, in the case of the trial of an accusation for an offence against the criminal law, and the determination of that fact depends very generally upon the particular witness or set of witnesses whom the judge or the jury, whoever is the tribunal determining, believes to be telling the truth.

This case was one of that character. It was a question for the judge (if there was no jury as I think there was not) to determine whether he believed the account of the matter given by the witnesses for the prosecution or the contradiction given for Blunden by those who were testifying on his behalf. In coming to a conclusion upon any question of that character it is perfectly manifest that the judge, or the jury, who see and hear witnesses giving their testimony—and probably have some local knowledge of the character for truthfulness of the witnesses who are testifying—are in an infinitely better position than any other person can ever be to determine upon which side the very truth of the matter lies. And accordingly this application coming before the Department of Justice, originally at any rate in the shape of an assertion by the prisoner of his innocence on an application that a new trial should be ordered by the department, the minister who preceded me, (and I concur entirely in his view,) took the position that we could not properly interfere otherwise than upon an application for clemency; that he could not properly review the work of the trial judge or jury, and that he could not undertake to say that those witnesses, whom the trial judge or jury believed, were not those who were speaking the truth and that the truth lay on the other side of the case altogether. That was something that no minister was in a position properly to do and I declined to do it or to interfere upon any such grounds. That having occurred more than 18 months ago, since then applications to reconsider have been numerous and the case has been reconsidered on several occasions. I have on more than one occasion gone through the evidence to make sure that there was nothing I had overlooked unwittingly or that might probably change my view of the position in which the case stood. The sentence is certainly a considerable one and it may be a case in which it would be quite proper to recommend the exercise of clemency, but up to this time no such application has been made. On the contrary, the position taken by those interested in the prisoner is that it would be improper to ask, or to accept, clemency because that would imply that the decision of the tribunal was correct, and the whole contention on the part of the prisoner has been that the Minister of Justice ought to intervene and retry and decide that the judge or the jury before whom the case was originally tried had all gone wrong. It is upon that footing entirely that the case has been presented, and that manner of presenting it is one with which I certainly cannot concur. I would urge then that my hon. friend should modify his motion by inserting after the word 'papers' the words: 'so far as the same are not of a confidential character.' If that modification is acceptable to my hon. friend I have not the slightest objection to bring down a copy of all the papers, including the evidence, and including all the documents that have passed from the Department of Justice in the matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should think that the motion means that as it is at present, and the only question remaining is as to what are confidential documents. Are we to understand that the reports of the judges in these cases have always been considered confidential to the extent that they cannot be brought down to the House ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think I recollect a case in which the judge's report was not so regarded. It was the case of a boy who had been convicted in the county of Colchester, N.S., and Mr. F. A. Laurence who has been lately appointed to the bench of Nova Scotia was the Crown prosecutor, and he was exceedingly astonished and exceedingly angry at the conduct of the government in that case. I think the judge's report was brought down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In that case I think the boy was pardoned absolutely.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Speaking from memory, the facts of that case were that an Armenian peddler was found dead, and the boy who was in the vicinity was put on his trial for murder or manslaughter, and based his defence entirely on an alibi. The prisoner after conviction, I am not sure whether it was before he was sent to the penitentiary or not, made an affidavit prepared for him by his counsel upon instructions in which he declared that he had shot the peddler but that he had done so accidentally. And without sending the case back for a new trial, without subjecting him to any cross-examination, and without even waiting for the report of the trial

judge, the government opened the penitentiary doors and set that man free. That seemed to me to be a very extraordinary case, and if the Minister of Justice followed that precedent he would not have very much difficulty in dealing with the present case. I merely mention this to show that the report of Mr. Justice Ritchie was in that case laid before the House and was not regarded as confidential. It may be that there are good reasons for regarding such reports as confidential but at first blush these reasons do not present themselves to my mind. I am ready however to be convinced. In the present case, as I understand from the presentation of it made by my hon. friend (Mr. Ward) the prisoner stoutly declares his innocence and does not want any pardon, because he says he is not guilty. May I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Ward) if he asks for a new trial in the courts or for a hearing before the Minister of Justice.

Mr. WARD. A new trial in the courts.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would infer from the remarks of the Minister of Justice that such was not the case. This man has brought to the attention of the government, as I understand, some new facts which were not brought out in the trial and he asks, not that he shall be pardoned because he declares himself to be innocent, but having regard to the new facts which he says he can disclose, he asks that the Crown shall give him a new trial in the courts. That is all he does ask, under all circumstances it seems to me it is not a very unreasonable request for this man to prefer. I would ask the government to take it further into consideration. It is rather an unusual case that a man should reject absolutely the idea of receiving a pardon and should want to demonstrate his innocence in the courts. If there be anything at all in his assertion that he has new facts to disclose and additional evidence to offer, it seems to me that it may be a case deserving of the consideration of the government. I do not understand that the former statute which provided for a new trial in such cases has been repealed. Therefore there is no difficulty, so far as the power of the government is concerned, and this case seems to present unusual aspects which do call for the intervention of the Crown.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I might recall, if I may be permitted, a discussion which took place a few days ago on a cognate subject, in which the practice of the Department of Justice in this country and the practice in Great Britain was reviewed. The Minister of Justice stated, I believe without contradiction, that the reports of judges in cases similar to this one are always made by request of the Department, whereas in capital cases the judge is always bound to make a report of the proceedings to the department. The Minister of Justice did not contend the other day, nor does he to-day, that in all cases, with absolutely no exception, these reports are confidential, but I am not aware that, outside of capital cases, any report of a judge has been brought down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There does not seem to be much distinction.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In a capital case the judge is bound by law to make a report to the Department of Justice. In other cases, if an application for mercy is made, invariably, even in minor cases, the opinion of the judge who tried the case is sought and has always been treated as confidential by the department.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They are in the same category except that in one case the judge is bound by law to do what in the other case he does at the request of the Department of Justice.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What a man does by law he does under the sanction of the law and takes the consequences, but in a case of this kind the opinion of the judge is asked simply because he is conversant with the facts and the practice of the department, and also I understand the practice in England, has been to treat that as confidential. In capital cases, however, the Minister of Justice, I understand, does not claim that this confidence is absolutely sacred. There are occasions when it is imperative to bring down the report of the judge. He cited the Riel case and the Shortiss case. There was another case in which the rule was departed from, and the report of the judge was brought down. I forget the name, but I remember the circumstances very well. The body of a man who had been shot dead was found on a country road. The contents of his basket had not been touched and his pockets had not been rifled, so that there was evidently no motive of profit. The man was not known in the locality to anybody, and therefore the motive could not be revenge. A boy of sixteen or seventeen years of age was placed on trial, and was convicted on circumstantial evidence. He was the son of a fisherman, and it was shown that he had taken one of the small leaden pellets used by fishermen to sink their nets, and the wadding of the gun was a weekly newspaper published at Boston and sent to the boy's father every week. The circumstances showed clearly that the boy had been guilty of the killing and he was convicted by the jury. His counsel did not avail himself of the provision of the law which allowed the boy to give evidence. After he had been convicted, the Minister of Justice and those responsible for his life were curious to know what could have induced the boy to commit such a crime. He made a confes-

sion to his pastor—I think he was of the Methodist persuasion—to the effect that he had taken one of the pellets off his father's nets and put it into his pocket in case he might shoot a bear. He thought he saw a bear, but when he came near it he saw that it was a cow, and in his excitement he forgot to uncock the gun and in trailing it after him he shot the man, who was at some distance. He was sure that no one had seen him, and he thought that his best defence was to deny. But after the trial he made this confession to his pastor, which had all the characteristics of truth. Therefore it appeared that while he had shot the man he was not guilty of murder, and therefore he was given a full pardon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I suggested was that the unusual considerations which the right hon. gentleman has mentioned were considerations for the jury, not for the government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If they had been presented to the jury, well and good, but they had not been presented to the jury. Under the circumstances, we laid the whole of the papers before the House. With regard to the present motion, the Minister of Justice, I think, has made a very fair suggestion, that the motion be amended by inserting the words 'not confidential' after the word 'papers,' and when the papers are brought down my hon. friend will see whether he should persevere in his demand for a new trial.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln). I do not know much of the details of this case, but I can hardly agree with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) in the position he has taken. If he is not certain whether this man had a jury trial or not, and if this man still protests his innocence and asks for a new trial before a jury, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) is taking a very serious responsibility in refusing that appeal. I understand him to say that he does not believe in having cases re-tried before the department or having the department interfere with the decision of a court and reversing it. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman in that view, but the department is not asked to try the case. And the fact that this man although he has been in jail three years, is not asking for mercy, is rather in his favour. I have more sympathy with the man who, although he has been in jail three years, still protests his innocence and asks for a jury trial, than I would with a man who asks for clemency. The fact that this man says that he did not steal those cattle and wants to have the evidence threshed out again before his neighbours in that part of the country where he was supposed to have committed the offence, ought to tell in his favour, and I think that the hon. minister (Mr. Aylesworth) is taking an arbitrary stand when he says that this man must acknowledge his guilt and ask for clemency before anything will be done for him. Every man is entitled to a fair trial. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) says that this man got it, as far as he knows. But what harm would be done if this man were given a new trial before a jury? It is said that new evidence has come forward since his conviction. If so, he should get the benefit of that evidence.

A word as to the confidential or non-confidential character of the reports of judges. I have had experience in cases of this kind during some twenty years, and my experience is that what a judge has to do in public is better done than what he does in private. Judges are human, and they will say and write things confidentially that they would not publicly. I am not at all inferring that they will not, when making confidential reports, say what is true, but what I mean is that they would be more careful when their reports are public and consequently open to criticism. I am not quarrelling with the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in the distinction he draws between a report solicited and one which is not solicited. But why should a report on a capital case be not confidential and a report on another case be confidential? Is there no other reason than that the one is unsolicited and the other is not? They both come under the duties of the judges. The statute requires a judge to make a report in a capital case. It also requires him, when he is asked for it, to make in a report in a case which is not capital. In both cases his opinion is given on the question whether the man should be set at liberty or be given a new trial. If what he says in a capital case should not be confidential, I cannot see why the same rule should not apply to his report in a non-capital case. In the present instance ten years sentence was imposed upon this man; and I think that what ought to be done, even if this amendment be accepted, is to give the judges to understand that when they report in any criminal case, whether that be a capital case or a minor case, their reports shall not be confidential.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER (Kootenay). I do not know the merits or demerits of this particular case in question, but I wish to make one or two statements regarding the matter. For some years I lived in the section of country which my hon. friend (Mr. Herron) represents, and during that time I acted in a great many cases as crown prosecutor.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Were the prisoners always acquitted?

Mr. GALLIHER. Possibly. My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) will agree with me that a great many of the offences

tried, during my time at least—that is between 1888 and 1896—were for cattle stealing or cattle killing, and my hon. friend will bear me out when I say that it was very difficult to obtain a conviction against the parties accused. And although my hon. friend the leader of the opposition jocosely referred to the fact that possibly all these men were acquitted during my term as crown prosecutor, I might say, without being egotistical, that I believe I was the first crown prosecutor in that section who actually did secure a conviction for cattle stealing. In any event the manner in which their cattle were being rustled—that is stolen or killed—sometimes by Indians and often by white men,—became a very serious matter to the ranchers. The law was then—and I presume, while administered by the Dominion government, continued to be up to 1904, the date at which this man was tried—that in cases where the value of the property stolen did not exceed $500, or it may have been $300, the case was not one for trial by jury. It was not a case in which the prisoner could exercise any option at all. He had to be tried summarily before a judge. That was the law all the time I was there. So, as to the fairness of this prisoner's trial, I presume that he was tried under the law as it existed, and before a judge but without a jury. As I say, I have no remarks to make as to the justice or injustice of the sentence, except the remark in passing that a sentence of ten years does seem severe. I think this case was tried by a certain judge and that it was the first case of cattle stealing brought before him, and that this sentence had a very salutary effect throughout that ranching country. Of course, that does not alter the fact that the man may have been innocent. I am simply stating a fact concerning the condition of the country, which, I am sure, my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) will agree with me in saying did exist at that time.

Mr. JOHN HERRON (Alberta). I have had many letters from my riding with reference to this case within the last two years. The man's brother and some other relatives have been requesting me to take the matter up with the Minister of Justice, and I have had similar requests from all kinds of people in that neighbourhood. I remember the trial, and know all the circumstances surrounding the case at that trial. Many people in that section of the country think that that man was very unjustly punished, and have been asking for a new trial. I presented their request to the Minister of Justice on one or two occasions, but without much hope of a new trial. I believe this is a case in which injustice has been done to a prisoner. I have been told that there is new evidence to be brought forward. I think the government will be doing justice if it gives the matter further consideration and grants the new trial.

Mr. GALLIHER.

Mr. WARD. I am satisfied to accept the amendment proposed by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth). At the same time, I would like to ask him if he would allow me to look at these judges' reports. He offered, in his previous remarks, to allow the whole file to be examined, but if he would allow me to look at these reports it might assist in the determination of the matter. I need not quote the section of the Criminal Code to my hon. friend—as I am sure he is aware of it—to show that he has the power we are asking him to exercise and to grant a new trial before a judge and jury. After I had concluded my remarks here this afternoon a sworn declaration was handed me, made out as late as the 13th instant, in connection with this case, saying that there is new evidence. The evidence goes to show that this man Train was seen with a bunch of cattle, I think, on the day previous to that when the mounted police discovered him in the killing of them. He was seen driving them between two points, and, as I understand, this declaration says that these points were from the direction of the cattle of Mr. G. Lane, of Calgary. In the face of these declarations, and of other new evidence coming up, I think it is only right that the minister should take into his most serious consideration whether a new trial should not be granted. And I shall be very glad to go over this declaration and other facts that I have in my possession with him with that end in view. Therefore, I accept the amendment of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I understand that my hon. friend (Mr. Ward) has expressed a desire to see personally the reports of the judges in this case. I have no objection except on the ground of the effect which the publication of such a report, even to one individual, must have upon the minds of the judges themselves. It is a favour on the part of the judge to make a report in a case of this kind. We ask him to do us that favour, and, of course, to report confidentially. If it should become the custom to make public these reports by bringing them down in this House, the judges would either decline to make these reports altogether or they would take great care to say nothing in any report that they would object to having published. In that way the reports would cease to have value. Now, the judges know that they are speaking confidentially and are free to express their opinions about witnesses and others as they never would do, and never could be asked to do, if the reports were to be made public. I am willing in the present case to show the reports to my hon. friend, but I must ask him to treat them as absolutely confidential.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Perhaps it might be advisable to amend the Criminal Code, and impose upon the judges the duty of making these reports. I do not

see why such a report should be asked as a favour from a judge of the land. The change I suggest would not interfere with continuing to regard the reports confidentially, should that be considered the best course, as I think it is. But it certainly does seem a little anomalous for the government, the Crown, in whom is vested the pardoning power, to have to ask a judge as a favour that which it should be free to demand from him as a right.

Motion as amended, agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—MR. R. A. E. LEECH.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice to the government that at an early day, on motion to go into Supply, it is my intention to move a resolution condemning the appointment of Mr. R. A. E. Leech as superintendent of the distribution of seed grain in Alberta and Saskatchewan.

At six o'clock the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 20, 1908.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 101) respecting the Fort William Terminal Railway and Bridge Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

WINDING-UP ACT AMENDMENT—MANITOBA APPEALS.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 102) to amend the Winding-up Act. He said: The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Winding-up Act to make provision as to the court before which appeals should be taken in the province of Manitoba. In the province of Ontario, and in the province of Quebec, there is an Appellate tribunal, the appeal is to the Appellate Court. In the province of Manitoba, although the Court of Appeal has now been established the appeal remains to the court en banc. This amendment is introduced at the instance of the Attorney General of Manitoba in order to confer Appellate jurisdiction upon the Court of Appeal of the province of Manitoba.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read first time.

QUESTIONS.

ST. JOHN RIVER—REMOVING SNAGS.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Was the work of removing snags from the St. John river during last season let by tender?
2. If so, how many tenders were received, who obtained the contract, and at what price?
3. What was the total cost of the work?
4. If not by contract, who did the work, and at what cost?
5. What disposal was made of the logs and trees taken from the river?
6. If the work was not done by contract, how much time was occupied in performing it?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works):

1 and 2. No.
3. $2,072.81.
4. Work done by a force of men in employ of this department under foreman A. L. Peatman.
5. Snags were hauled up above flood level.
6. From 20th July to 31st October.

MR. A. W. FRASER, K.C.

Mr. MARSHALL—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

Is Mr. A. W. Fraser, K.C., of Ottawa, engaged as counsel or in a supervising capacity in addition to a solicitor in connection with the purchase of the property on the west side of Sussex street as a site for the new government buildings? If so, how much money has been paid him, and how much is he still to receive?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. Yes.
2. $1,000 has been paid to him on account. How much he may still receive will depend entirely on the amount of work he may have to do.

Mr. MARSHALL—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. How much money has A. W. Fraser, K.C., of Ottawa, received from or through the Public Works Department since 1896?
2. What legal status, or connection has A. W. Fraser, K.C., of Ottawa, with the Public Works Department?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (for the Minister of Public Works):

1. $2,023.35.
2. None.

NICOLET RIVER WHARF.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. What is the total cost to date of the wharf at the mouth of the Nicolet river?
2. Have the works upon the said wharf been executed by contract or by day work?
3. Who were the persons employed by the government as superintendents of the said works, how much were the said persons paid per day, and what is the total amount paid to them up to the 11th of February, 1908?
4. Have the said works been inspected? If so, by what officer, and at what date has the government accepted the said works?
5. What is the total amount expended to date in connection with the construction of the said wharf?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works) :

1 and 5. Total cost of wharf opposite Ball's mill : $3,550.91.

2. By day's work.

3. (a) Foreman in charge of work, John O'Shaughnessy. (b) Paid $3 per day. (c) Total payment, $75.

4. Wharf was built under supervision of and inspected and passed by resident engineer, J. L. Michaud.

'HANSARD' DEBATES—AVERAGE COST PER COLUMN.

Mr. SINCLAIR asked :

What is the average cost per column of publishing the 'Hansard' debates?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

The average cost of publishing the official report of the debates of the House, based on the expenditure incurred in connection with the publication of the debates of last session (1906-1907), amounts to $5.43 per column.

Summary.

Cost of printing and paper as per statement of King's Printer.....	$2 50
Fixed charges, viz : salaries of reporters, translators &c., as per statement of clerk of Debates Committee..	2 93
Total cost per column.. ..	$5 43

GRAZING AND IRRIGATION LANDS—TOWNSHIPS 12 TO 19, RANGES 15 TO 21, WEST 4.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. What lands, if any, have been reserved for grazing purposes or for acquisition by means of irrigation within the tract described as follows: Township 12 to 19, inclusive, in ranges 15 to 21, west of the 4th meridian?

2. When were such lands so reserved, and for how long is it the purpose of the government to continue such reservation?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I would ask that this be allowed to stand as notice of motion for return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for return.

ST. ANICET WHARF.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries having declared that no money were spent on the construction or repairs of the St. Anicet wharf, was there any money spent on said wharf by the Department of Public Works, or any other department, since 1896?

Mr. MONK.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works) :

By the Department of Public Works (1896-1907) : $4,553.55.

TRURO, N.S.—TAX BILL TO GOVERNMENT.

Mr. STANFIELD—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Has the Dominion government ever received the following bill from the town of Truro:—

Dominion government, to town of Truro, Dr.

Frontage tax, Esplanade, 840 feet, at 50 cents	$ 420 00
Brunswick street, 353 feet, at 50 cents..	176 50
Prince street east, 1,480½ feet, at 50 cents..	740 50
	$1,337 00

2. If so, has same been paid? If not, why not?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

No such Bill ever received so far as can be ascertained.

COAL LANDS IN THE WEST.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

In respect of each of the undermentioned blocks disposed of as coal lands by the government, viz.: Sections 2, 4, 9, 15, 17 and 28, of township 7, range 3, west of the 5th meridian,

1 When and by whom was the first application made for right to acquire?

2 When and to whom was the original grant of mining rights made?

3. What transfers of rights have been recorded, when were such transfers dated, and when registered with the department?

4. Who is the present owner or occupant as known to the department?

5. What is the name and address of each company or person above referred to?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I would ask that this be allowed to stand as notice of motion for return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for return.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

In respect of each of the undermentioned blocks disposed of as coal lands by the government, viz.: Section 13, of township 9, range 4, west of the 5th meridian; section 16, township 10, range 3, west of the 5th meridian; section 15, township 11, range 4, west of 5th meridian; section 20, township 12, range 4, west of the 5th meridian; section 5, township 13, range 4, west of the 5th meridian; section 21, township 19, range 7, west of the 5th meridian, 1. When and by whom was the first application made for right to acquire?

2. When and to whom was the original grant of mining rights made?

3. What transfers of rights have been recorded, the date of transfer, and date of registration of same?

4. Who is the present owner or occupant as known to the department?
5. What is the name and address of each company or person above referred to?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I would ask that this also be allowed to stand as notice of motion for return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for return.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CLAIMS AGENT.

Mr. CROCKET—by Mr. Daniel—asked :

1. When was the office of claims agent on the Intercolonial established?
2. Did E. H. Allen hold that office?
3. When was he appointed, and what was his salary ?
4. Has he retired from that position? If so, when, and for what reason?
5. Has his successor been appointed? If not, when will the appointment be made?
6. Who is performing the duties of Intercolonial Railway claims agent?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. November, 1900.
2. Yes.
3. November, 1901, $133.33 a month.
4. January 28, 1908, reason not stated.
5. No.
6. Mr. George Ackman.

LAND PATENTS.

Mr. LAKE—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked :

In respect of the east half of sections 36, 31, 25, west of third meridian.

1. Was this land ever entered for as a homestead?—If so, by whom, and at what date?
2. Has the patent been issued? If so, to whom, and at what date?
3. If purchased, what was the purchase price, and who was the purchaser?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. No.
2. Yes, to Benjamin E. Chaffey ; N.E.¼ and N.½ of S.E.¼, April 9, 1907 ; S. ½ of S.E.¼. March 9, 1907.
3. Not purchased. This land was acquired under half-breed scrip and assigned to the patentee, Mr. Chaffey.

QUARANTINE LANDS.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. Have quarantine lands in the neighbourhood of or adjacent to the town of Estevan, Saskatchewan, recently been disposed of by the government?
2. If so, were the said lands put up to public competition, and did the highest bidders in all cases secure the lands?
3. Who were the successful bidders, and what were the prices paid?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. John C. Finn, the N.E.¼ of section 18, township 1, range 8, west 2nd meridian, at $3.50 per acre :

James Rutherford, the N.E.¼ of section 16, township 1, range 8, west 2nd meridian, at $3 per acre.

Thomas H. Henderson, the S.E.¼ of section 16, township 1, range 8, west 2nd meridian, at $4 per acre.

These sales are subject to the cultivation of at least 20 acres of land and twelve months continuous residence.

CONCILIATION BOARDS.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD asked :

1. How many applications for conciliation boards have been made under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act since it became law?
2. How many boards have been constituted under the Act?
3. How many disputes have been settled, without a strike, when the provisions of the Act have been involved?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour) :

1. Twenty-nine in the cases of mines and other industries connected with public utilities; one in the case of industries other than those connected with pubilc utilities.
2. Twenty-six in the case of mines and other industries connected with public utilities; one in the case of industries other than those connected with public utilities.
3. All disputes referred to boards with one exception have been settled. Strikes being thereby completely averted or immediately terminated. The strike of coal miners at Springhill which lasted from August 1 to October 31, is the only instance in which any cessation of employment has followed a reference to a board under the Act. Four inquiries are now proceeding.

EXPENDITURES AT MONTREAL, QUEBEC, &c.

Mr. ROBITAILLE asked :

1. How much money has been spent in the port of Montreal for the past fifty years (a) for wharfs, (b) for dredging in port, (c) for transportation facilities by grain elevators, railway tracking, &c. (d) for dredging between Montreal and Quebec?
2. How much money has been spent in the port of Quebec for the last fifty years?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Stands as a notice of motion for return.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

BASEMENT OF LANGEVIN BLOCK.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. Is the basement of the Langevin block used for departmental purposes?
2. If so, how many employees are stationed there, what are their names, and what are their hours of employment?
3. Has any report complaining of the want of light, bad ventilation, and unsanitary condition of these offices been received by any department of the government?
4. If so, has anything been done to relieve the conditions complained of?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Yes. By Post Office Department.
2. There are 46 employees located there. Their names are as follows :

W. D. O'Brien, R, Greenfield, J. Briggs, J. H. Lewis, M. J. Mahon, W. Ferguson, J. L. Spence, P. B. Dunne, C. P. Dontigny, J. P. Chilton, J. Murphy, G. Elbourne, W. H. Murphy, P. Kehoe, W. J. H. Pearce, L. Durocher, J. T. McElroy, P. Mahoney, W. H. Cheney, T. J. Nolan, J. H. Jones, S. Dawson, O. May, D. E. McIntyre, J. Marier, E. T. Edwards, W. H. Jeffery, C. A. Devlin, H. Chamberlin, W. Cooch, J. H. Elliott, J. Bell, A. Bernier, P. Braceland, W. Stirling, R. J. Edwards, M. J. Harrington, C. F. Gagné, S. E. Day, J. Burns, L. Labonté, A. Chartrand, T. A. Caffarati, P. L. Dodd, T. O'Connor, P Higgerty.

They are employed from 9.30 a.m. to 4.30 p.m. with an interval of one hour and fifteen minutes for lunch.

3 and 4. The question of the unsanitary condition of these offices has been brought under the notice of the Postmaster General and is now engaging his attention.

BAYONETS FOR ROSS RIFLES.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. What provision has been made for the supplying of bayonets for the Ross rifles already delivered to the government?
2. Are there any bayonets available for these rifles?
3. Does the Lee-Enfield bayonet fit the Ross rifle?
4. Has the Lee-Enfield bayonet been supplied to men of the permanent corps?
5. Have they been able to fit it on the Ross rifle?
6. Has there been any difficulty in adapting or using this bayonet on the Ross rifle?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Minister of Militia) :

1. Twenty bayonets made according to a sample suggested by the department were, during the last summer, placed in the hands of troops for trial and were found satisfactory. Steps are now being taken to secure the manufacture in Canada of sufficient bayonets for the Ross rifles now delivered and under contract.
2. No.

3. No.
4. The Lee-Enfield rifle with bayonet has been supplied to the permanent force.

5 and 6. No such impossible task has been attempted.

POSTAGE OF WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

1. Has the Postmaster General received the following telegram from D. F. McLean, president of the Nova Scotia Press Association, on behalf of the Nova Scotia Press Association, 'I protest vigorously against discrimination respecting postage on weekly newspapers of Nova Scotia, as specified in recent amendment to postal convention between Canada and the United States.'
2. What action does the government propose taking in the matter?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Yes.
2. It is impossible for this department to consent to any arrangement, which would put the American weekly papers on the same footing as dailies. The daily papers have been found by experience to be unobjectionable, but, owing to difference in classification, the United States department allow many weeklies in their mails, which are not newspapers, but are practically advertising matter, and which this department could not allow in the Canadian mails. To allow the weeklies in would be to open the gates to the mass of worthless advertising matter against which this department felt compelled to take action a year ago, and which, owing to the action, has been cleared out of the Canadian mails entirely.

The publishers of Canadian weeklies can, however, send their newspapers to offices in the United States, where they may be mailed to their destination at the rate of one cent per pound.

PAYMENTS TO IMMIGRATION AGENTS.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked:

1. Has the government offered or paid any special prizes to immigrant agents in Ontario?
2. If so, to whom were the prizes paid?
3. Did James S. Waugh, of Chatham, receive any special price or remuneration for his active services in placing immigrants?
4. If so, what was the amount, outside of the regular fee of $2 which he received for placing immigrants?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1 and 2. No.
3 and 4. No.

CUSTOMS REFUNDS.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

What are the general particulars of the refunds by the Customs Department of $59,-

511.51 to the American Cereal Company; of $15,753.11 to Walker & Sons, and of $74,191.11 to Massey Harris & Co., in the years 1905-6, as shown in the Auditor General's Report; and under what item of the Customs Act were the refunds made?

Hon. W. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

The refunds shown in the Auditor General's Report for the year ended 30th June, 1906, were by way of drawback, and were made in connection with goods for exportation from Canada under authority of Section 247 of the Customs Act as then in force. (Chapter 32 Revised Statutes of Canada, 1886).

The general particulars of these drawbacks are as follows:

Duties refunded to the American Cereal Company on grain and other materials used in connection with cereal foods exported.

Duties refunded to Hiram Walker and Sons on bottles and other articles used in connection with the manufacture of spirits exported from Canada.

Duties refunded to Massey-Harris Company on iron and other materials used in connection with the manufacture of agricultural implements, &c., exported from Canada.

MUTUAL RESERVE LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF NEW YORK.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked:

1. Is the Minister of Finance aware that the Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Company of New York is at present in the hands of a curator or liquidators in the United States?
2. Does the department intend to look after the interests of the policy-holders of that company in Canada?
3. If so, in what way?
4. What is the number of that company's policies now in existence in Canada?
5. What is the amount of the deposit made by that company now in the hands of the government?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1. The Minister of Finance is aware that the Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Company of New York is at present in process of liquidation, and that receivers have been appointed to carry out the same.

2 and 3. The interests of the Canadian policy-holders are now engaging the attention of the department. It has been represented to us that the proceedings taken at Toronto under the Winding Up Act are intended to protect the Canadian policy-holders.

4. The number of the company's policies at present in force in Canada is not known, as the last return which the company was required by law to make to the department has reference to the date December 31, 1906. The number of policies then in force was 2,044 insuring an amount of $3,919,142, of which 303 policies for $571,400 were upon the assessment plan.

5. The amount of the company's deposit with the Receiver General of Canada is $265,066.66, par value, and in addition there is deposited with the Canadian trustees acting for the Receiver General in that behalf $62,250 or in all $327,316.66.

ROYAL GRAIN COMMISSION.

Mr. STAPLES asked:

1. Who are the members of the Royal grain commission?
2. How long were they employed?
3. What is the total cost to date of the said commission?
4. What action does the government intend taking on the said report?
5. Has the evidence taken by the commission been printed for distribution?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. John Miller, Indian Head, Sask., chairman.
Wm. McNair, Keys, Man.
G. E. Goldie, Ayr, Ont.
J. R. Boyle, Edmonton, Alberta, secretary from July 20, 1906 to December 24, 1906.
Ernest Neild, Toronto, Ont., secretary from May 15, 1907 to December 5, 1907.
2. From July 19, 1906, to December 5, 1907.
3. $30,797.21.
4. The matter is under consideration.
5. No.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

FRENCH COPY OF DEBATES—DELAY IN DELIVERY TO MEMBERS.

Mr. H. S. BELAND (Beauce). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to move the adjournment of the House with a view to discussing the question of the issuing of the French speeches within twenty-four hours of their delivery in this House.

You will remember, Sir, that at yesterday's sitting a number of speeches were delivered in French, that part of the debate having ended about five o'clock in the afternoon, which sitting, in accordance with the rule laid down for Wednesdays, was adjourned at six o'clock. Now, if hon. gentlemen will refer to yesterday's 'Hansard,' page 3570, they will find the following entry:—

Messrs. Ethier, Boyer and Rivet having also spoken in French, the report of their speech will appear in the next issue.

Now, I contend that such an announcement is the indication of an intolerable state of things, requiring the application of some prompt and effective remedy. We had always understood that French and English were on the same footing, and that the report of the House of Commons' Debates was to give out simultaneously the speeches

delivered in both languages. I say then that we should endeavour to find out the reason of the existence of such a state of things with a view to correcting it. What is the reason of the delay in the present instance ? Does the fault lie with the Printing Bureau; is it so poorly equipped, so short of help that it finds it impossible to issue the French copy of the Debates within twenty-four hours ?

Does the fault lie with the staff of shorthand writers ? We have two French stenographers, and I have reason to believe that, in the present instance, they have very well done their work and forwarded, from time to time, as required, to the Printing Bureau, copies of their extended shorthand notes, in such a way that it would have been possible to include them in the morning's issue of the report, which comes out, I believe, about ten or eleven o'clock. So the fault does not lie with the staff of reporters, and we have to look for it somewhere else. The last folio was forwarded to the Printing Bureau early this morning, notwithstanding which, this morning's 'Hansard' is minus the speeches of Messrs. Ethier, Boyer and Rivet.

It is quite clear then that the reporters are not responsible for this delay ; they have done all that it was possible for them to do. I realize that there are only two of them to report the speeches delivered in the French language, and should subsequently that number be found inadequate, it may be incumbent on us to increase it. I understand, however, that the English-speaking typographers are unable to set up type for the French copy, while the French-speaking typographers do both French and English work. Hence the delay, when the latter are not numerous enough to cope with the work in both languages. I say that such a state of things is absolutely intolerable, and should be brought to the attention of the proper authorities, in order that steps be taken toward its improvement. If the number of French-speaking typographers is insufficient, it should be increased, so as to give complete satisfaction to members who prefer to express themselves in French, as they have the perfect right to do.

If this was the first occurrence of the kind, I would not have moved the adjournment of the House to discuss the matter. But on a previous occasion, the exact date of which escapes me, the issuing of a French speech was very much delayed for the same reason.

Therefore I think it is my duty to move the adjournement of the House.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE (Montmagny). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, if I am allowed, I wish to say a few words in support of the remarks just made by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland). The hon. member's complaint is perfectly well founded, and voices, I believe, the feelings of the French members of the House, and those of the English members as well.

I am informed, from a reliable source, that the extended shorthand notes of the French speeches delivered yesterday in this House were forwarded to the Printing Bureau quite early. The two French stenographers having stayed up through the night to extend their shorthand notes, should not be held responsible for this delay. If there is any one to blame, it is the Printing Bureau.

Besides, as stated by the hon. member for Beauce, this is not the first time that we are met with a similar difficulty. A couple of years ago, I believe, when the question of the autonomy of the Northwest provinces was being discussed, a day or two elapsed before the report of a French sitting was issued.

My hon. friend from Beauce is unwilling or unable to point out a remedy. He is content with stating that the fault rests with the Printing Bureau. Now, to my mind, the remedy is easy enough to apply. A year or two ago, I requested the House to appoint a French-speaking superintendent at the Printing Bureau. True, a Mr. Draper was appointed, but he should be looked upon as an English-speaking superintendent. The Printing Bureau is a sort of state department, the same as the library, and it should be under the control of two officers, one to look after the French printing and the other after the English printing. If I remember well, the appointment of Mr. Draper was recommended by the Debates Committee.

We have had last year, that unfortunate matter relating to the Revised Statutes of Canada, the French edition of which is yet unfinished, since its index is not yet published, although a whole year has almost elapsed. It seems to me it would be a small matter, indeed, to appoint a French superintendent. As to the printing of the French Hansard, this also is subjected to unaccountable delays. As much as five weeks will sometimes elapse before it is distributed to us. The people of the province of Quebec as well as the French speaking population of the other provinces suffer a serious prejudice. It seems to me it is incumbent upon the debates committee to interfere. The government itself should take immediate steps, in seeing that a sufficient number of French printers are employed, so that the work is proceeded with as expeditiously and intelligently as is done for the English language.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Two-Mountains). (Translation). I am personally interested in the question which has just been brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend for Beauce (Dr. Béland). I had not intended to bring about this discussion, but since I am offered an opportunity to do so, I will join in with the hon. member for Beauce, and with the hon. member for Mont-

magny (Mr. A. Lavergne) in supporting the remarks they have just offered on this subject. Mention was made of the Debates Committee, of which I have the honour to be a member for some years past. That committee as was stated by the hon. member for Montmagny, recommended a couple of years ago, the appointment of a French superintendent at the Printing Bureau, to look over especially the printing of French documents. A similar question was also raised before the committee, as to the employment of French printers in sufficient number to ensure a quicker and better, and more effective service. We had come to the conclusion that the number of French printers was inadequate, and that the English printers were unable to perform the work required for the printing of the French documents.

My hon. friend for Montmagny has also alluded to the translator's staff and to the delay incurred in the distribution of the French 'Hansard.' It is true that we often receive that version two or three weeks after the distribution of the English revised edition, but I want to tell the House that the fault does not lie with the translators, who are placed under the control of the Debates Committee. These translators, eight in number, invariably do their work within the twenty-four hours, which follow the reception of the English unrevised. It often happens that the sittings of the House are unusually long, and that their work piles up at the rate of upwards of 50 pages. In every case each man takes his share, and works till morning, if necessary, in order that the French copy shall be sent immediately to the printer. It follows logically that the translation is not the cause of the undue delay incurred in the distribution of the French 'Hansard.' Just as in this particular case, I insist upon stating that the French reporters are not to blame for the delay, because the last copy from the shorthand notes was sent to print this morning at 7 o'clock. These reporters worked all night transcribing their notes, so that the 'Hansard' should not be delayed. How is it that when the House sits till three or four o'clock in the forenoon? the English unrevised is invariably distributed about 11 o'clock in the forenoon? There is unquestionably something defective in the management of the Printing Bureau. Some reform there is urgently needed. I, for one, don't see why two or three French speeches, covering hardly three or four pages of the 'Hansard' should have been left out, when all copy had been sent to print before 7 o'clock in the morning, especially when we get every day and without any such delay, the English unrevised, which covers 15 to 20 pages.

It is time that this question should be settled once for all. In fact, were we to speak French in this House two or three times a week as was done yesterday, the same thing would happen over again, and we would be placed under the obligation of waiting days and days before being acquainted with these French speeches, which can no longer be tolerated. I will say one word in conclusion about the manner in which the following notice was inserted in the 'Hansard':

Messrs. Ethier, Boyer and Rivet, also addressed the House in French. The report of their speeches will appear in a later edition.

I wonder if the printer that got up this thing, makes a specialty of this style of notices, but to my mind it is of very bad taste. It seems to me he could have devised some other linear drawing for framing this addenda.

I hope some good result will ensue from this debate and that such delays will not occur again in the future, also that the report of the French speeches will be printed concurrently with the English speeches.

Mr. E. PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation). I join in with my hon. friend to ask that this grievance should be remedied by the proper authority. I desire to make a remark which seems to us of some importance. The French members do not enjoy the privilege of questioning the witness in their own tongue, before the various committees of this House, whether the Railway Committee or the Banking and Commerce Committee or Public Accounts Committee. They would not be understood. Every committee should be provided with stenographers and translators, which would allow French members to speak their mother tongue. I have nothing to add. I hope due regard will be given to the desire so earnestly expressed by the French Canadian members of this House. I hope the hon. Prime Minister will see his way clear to grant our request. I have enough confidence in him to think that he will heed the movement undertaken this day, and that he will be able to give satisfaction to all the members for the province of Quebec.

Mr. J. C. WALSH (St. Ann's, Montreal). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I wish to add one word to what has just been stated.

As an English-speaking member of this House I must state that I have a real grievance vs. somebody, and here is the reason why: Although my riding is not immediately interested in this matter, there came from one of my constituents a request for a copy of the speeches delivered yesterday by my French colleagues, and I was unable to comply with his demand. I was compelled to write that I could not be agreeable to him for the time being as I did not have at hand a report of those speeches.

As I stated before, there lies a real grievance. I do not wish to blame any one in

particular, but I do not think that the fault lies with the French reporters who are, I must say, very intelligent and very painstaking. Besides the objection raised by our French-speaking colleagues I believe that we the English-speaking members are bound to protest against this state of affairs.

A. VERVILLE (Maisonneuve). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I had not intended taking part in this debate, but as the hon. member for Montmagny (A. Levergne) mentioned the name of a gentleman with whom I am personally acquainted, I mean the appointment of Mr. P. M. Draper as superintendent at the Printing Bureau, I wish to make a few remarks on the subject matter. In the first place, I must state that Mr. Draper is not superintendent of the Bureau, and I will say moreover that the fault does not lie with him if the French printing is not delivered as expeditiously as would suit the hon. members of this House. I am aware of the great difficulty, which has almost always existed, of taking on French printers at the Bureau. It is usually contended that there is no vacancy and insufficient work. The present discussion proves the necessity of increasing the staff of French printers. I am also aware of the fact that some of the chief officers of that institution do not pull together and that that state of things should be brought to an end as soon as possible, not only in the interest of the French language, but of the English language as well.

The head of that department is the Hon. R. W. Scott, and he is very hard of access to the members of this House who may have grievances to lay before him. But I have great confidence in the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who will undoubtedly lay our claims before his colleague. I hope a quick remedy will be applied to the state of things now prevailing at the National Printing Bureau, and if French printers are needed they will be easily secured as I know of thousands who are actually idle.

The Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it is a very regrettable matter indeed which the hon. member from Beauce (Dr. Beland) has brought to the attention of the House. Three of the French speeches delivered yesterday have not been recorded in 'Hansard' with the balance of the report of that sitting. The responsibility must lay on some one and this must be found out as well as the cause for this unusual state of things. It must be found out whether or not the French reporters sent their copy to the Printing Bureau in the proper time, and for this matter the Debates Committee of the House is the proper channel to investigate. On the other hand whether or not the Bureau is at fault lies with the government to elucidate. If I am not mistaken, it is contended that the copy from the shorthand notes was delivered this morning at 7 o'clock. In this case, it would be hard to hold the Printing Bureau responsible for the delay, since the 'Hansard' is supposed to be distributed in the House at 8 o'clock a.m., so that members coming here may peruse it between 9 and 10 o'clock. At all events, I am pleased that the question was raised before the House, and the government will spare no pains to see if the National Printing Bureau is at fault.

J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Debates Committee, I must thank my hon. friend from Beauce (Dr. Beland) for affording us an opportunity to bring to the attention of this House the defects which exist, and which must be remedied, spare no pains to see if the National Printing Bureau is at fault.

It happens that these speeches are sometimes printed after the others and here is the reason for this delay: We have only two French reporters and, as in yesterday's case, for instance, despite their skill and competence, they were almost physically unable to send their copy to print at an earlier hour than they did. I got this information from one of the English reporters on 'Hansard.' I do not mean, however, by this remark that their number must be increased. As to the appointment of a French superintendent at the Printing Bureau, I must say that the question was raised more than once before the Debates Committee. But this committee, Sir,—and I call more specially the attention of the right hon. the leader of the House to this point—does not seem to enjoy enough powers. It sat very little in the past three years, except for the appointment of its chairman. Its reports were few, and the reason seems to be that there exists a misunderstanding between the Debates Committee and the Committee on Internal Economy of this House. This difficulty should be settled as soon as possible.

Now, I notice that there are numerous complaints vs. the manner in which the French 'Hansard' is handled. The French version is only delivered to us two or three weeks after the debate has taken place; it follows that this publication is almost useless. Thus the speeches delivered on February 6, on an important question are not yet published in French. If the report of the House lost much of its importance in late years, it was owing to the fact that we have departed from the real object of the 'Hansard,' of the 'Hansard' such as we understood it when first established, that is the publication from day to day of the speeches such as they were delivered. This version was only revised

for the purpose of correcting fault in grammer.

You would be surprised, Mr. Speaker, if I were to lay before you some of the alterations tendered in to-day to the printer under the name of corrections. Entire pages are added, while whole half pages are struck out, and later on, on reading the bound Hansard there will not be a true report of the utterances delivered in this House. Time is required to make these changes and the result is that the revised edition only comes out eight or ten days later. The translation is made from this revise, and this explains how it is that the French 'Hansard' is only published two or three weeks after the speeches are delivered. I hope the government will see fit to lend a helping hand to the Debates Committee in bringing about the reforms which are so urgently needed.

As has just been stated by my hon. friend from Two Mountains (Mr. Etheir) who is also a member of the committee, we can almost do nothing, having been deprived of most of our powers. Whether it is due to the chairman or to other members, the Debates Committee seldom puts in a report, and at all events, the matter is worth while being looked into.

I must offer my thanks to the hon. member for Beauce. It is fair that such questions as these are brought from time to time to the attention of parliament, in order to fix responsibilities.

STEAMSHIP SUBSIDY TO FRANCE.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House will on Friday next resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to enter into a contract for a term not exceeding ten years with any individual or company, for the performance of a steamship service between a port or ports in Canada and a French port or ports, on such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council deems expedient, and to grant therefor a subsidy based upon a minimum service of eighteen round voyages a year, and a subsidy therefor not exceeding one hundred thousand dollars, and so in proportion for a more frequent service.

He said : His Excellency having been informed of the subject-matter of this resolution commends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding for the first reading of Bill (No. 57) respecting a certain convention between His Majesty and the President of the French republic.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John). Mr. Speaker, we have frequently heard the statement that there is no sentiment in business, but certainly in a matter of this kind I can very well realize that there may be some sentiment, because we have here a rapprochment with a country with which a large number of the members of this House are closely identified, whose language they speak and in whose history and traditions they are warmly interested, so that naturally among one section of the members of this House there would be a sentiment in favour of any treaty with France. I can appreciate any such feeling, for I know that under similar circumstances I would probably be imbued with the same feeling.

Apart from any sentimental feeling, when we come to consider the business aspect of this treaty, to consider it as a bargain which has been made between France and Canada, one can hardly examine the treaty without coming to the conclusion that it should be called rather a convention or treaty to facilitate the imports of French products into Canada than a reciprocal arrangement whereby the products of each country would find an equal advantage in the ports of the other. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) himself has practically confessed to that condition of affairs, because he has told us that the benefits which may accrue to Canada would appear rather in the future than at present. That is how I think it strikes the statesmen of France themselves, because in the few reports that I have seen of the transactions in the French Chamber of Deputies of France the only criticism made of this treaty was that possibly the lower tariff on the item of boots and shoes might cause the importation into France of such a large quantity of boots and shoes as to imperil some of the manufactories of those articles in France. We can hardly consider that as a strong objection, because the duty on boots and shoes under the French general tariff is to-day only about 10 cents a pair, and the value of shoes imported by France from Canada last year was only $441. This is hardly worth considering, so that if we take into consideration the fact that this is the only criticism made by French statesmen upon this treaty, we may take it for granted that those who negotiated this treaty on behalf of France are certainly very well satisfied with the bargain they have made.

Our imports from France last year for nine months to March 31 were $6,679,349, while the exports to France from Canada for the same period were $1,409,572. Taking that average for the twelve months it would make the imports for the year $8,905,798, while our exports would only amount to $1,879,429. If we are to accept the statement that was laid before this House during this session, that the amount of imports over exports was the amount of profit made

on these exports in foreign countries, these figures would indicate that we have been doing a very flourishing and successful trade with France, a trade which has given us great profit, a profit to the extent of 500 per cent. I think the statement I have just made is sufficient to show that that theory will hardly pass muster as a correct theory with regard to the effect of excess of imports over exports. This treaty is calculated to increase the great disparity which now exists between our exports to France and our imports from France, for the very reason that we have been giving to France special terms, much better terms than are given under the intermediate treaty on these very articles which France is especially adapted to produce, which she manufactures and exports to a very great extent and which we may call specialties of that country. Of what do they consist? They consist of such articles as fish packed in oil, sardines, sparkling and still wines, pharmaceutical and chemical preparations, proprietary medicines. On pharmaceutical and chemical preparations, proprietary medicines, laces, embroideries, velvets, silks and ribbons, which the French people manufacture and sell very largely, France is given a large reduction in our tariff rate. Then, French books of fiction are accorded a reduction of 40 per cent and French magazines get a reduction of 50 per cent, while I cannot find any mention of books in schedule A, so that we do not know on what terms Canadian books and magazines are admitted to the French market, although I suppose we must infer that they are given no special privilege. As opposed to these special terms which are given to France on her own particular industries and manufactures, the principal products of Canada which are the products of the farm —live stock, poultry, wheat, grain of various kinds, cattle, horses, the products of the fisheries, fresh and dried fish, and the products of the forest—are not given any privilege which is likely to develop trade in them between France and Canada. On wheat and other grains we have absolutely no advantage given to us; they are subject to the French general tariff which applies to every nation in the world in the same degree that it applies to us. We are, therefore, absolutely cut out of this treaty as regards our principal lines of export. On horses over five years of age a duty of nearly $30 is exacted in France, and on colts the duty is about $10. The tariff exacted by France for Canadian cattle is nearly 2 cents per pound live weight.

An hon. MEMBER. Is that the minimum?

Mr. DANIEL. That is the minimum. The French tariff on steers and bulls is from $18 to $20; on preserved meats in tins and extracts of meats it is 2½ cents per pound including the tin. Although we exported no cheese to France last year the duty remains at over 2 cents per pound; on butter, 2 cents per pound; on fresh fish, 2 cents per pound, while on dried fish, strange to say, the duty is 4 cents a pound, which one would think is almost as much as the article is worth. The duty on cowhides is over 2 cents a pound, and it is 11 cents a pound on the uppers of boots or shoes, not varnished. Therefore, so far as these agricultural products are concerned, we get practically no benefit because the duties that still remain are so high that I do not see where we are going to reap an advantage. Speaking of the duties on sparkling and still wines having been reduced, I might recall to the memory of the Minister of Finance that when in the debate on the address the leader of the opposition stated that the duty on champagne was reduced the Minister of Finance told him he was mistaken. I have not seen any correction of his assertion yet made by the Minister of Finance, but there is no doubt in the world that the 30 per cent ad valorem duty was taken off under this special tariff, and I think I am correct in saying that the duty on champagne was reduced by that much. With reference to proprietary medicines, we imported them from France last year to the value of about $40,000. On our side we have not the privilege, if it may be considered a privilege, of exporting one single dollar's worth of proprietary medicines to France nor will France allow any of these medicines to enter her country. In that respect France shows more concern than does Canada for the health and pockets of her people, for I might direct the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that under this treaty that well-advertised remedy which is said to have saved the valuable life of that well-known statesman, the Hon. John Costigan, will be absolutely prohibited from entering France, and its operations, if I may use the term, will be confined to the senators and people of Canada. That seems an anomaly since our Canadian statesmen advertise it as one of the greatest remedies under the sun.

Mr. FIELDING. It is so good that we must keep it as a monoply for ourselves.

Mr. DANIEL. As to absinthe, which receives special favours in its admission into Canada under this treaty, I wish to refer to it because I believe it to be a very deleterious article and one which this government might very well refuse to admit into Canada under any circumstances whatever. The 'New Universal' encyclopedia describes absinthe as follows :

A liqueur much used in France, prepared from alcohol mixed with volatile oil of wormwood, oil of anise and other ingredients. It has peculiarly intoxicating effects which are due to the oil of wormwood, the state resulting from the use being very different from the result of alcohol poisoning. Trembling,

vertigo, fearful dreams and epileptiform convulsions are among its severest consequences. Absinthe drinking is among the most dangerous forms of stimulation yet invented, the more so because its immediate consequences are usually more agreeable than those of alcohol.

I think the government might draw the thin red line through that word to the advantage of the country, saving our people from one other means of getting headaches, and weakend nerves, opportunities for which we have already in plenty in this country without importing another one from France.

There is another matter to which I shall only refer in passing, because it will probably be dealt with more at length later on; that is, the effect which the reduction of the duty on light wines will have on the wine industry of this country. I understand that one-third of the whole product of the grapes in Canada is turned into wine; my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) who comes from a part of the country where grapes are largely grown, says that the proportion is even larger. The reduction of duty on light wines will certainly have a deleterious effect on this industry.

Another important feature of this treaty is that the importations into this country from France as well as the importations into France from this country must be direct. There are some who do not take a favourable view of this feature; but to my mind that is the one respect in which the two countries have come out equal, the one gaining no advantage over the other—the only point in which our side have not lost, but simply held their own. I imagine that France insisted on having all importations from Canada go direct, or otherwise be subject to an extra tax; so that our negotiators could do nothing less than say in reply, if that is the case, we will give you certain reductions and certain privileges in our market provided French goods also come to us direct. It has been objected that if that happens there will be no competition in the winter time and no competition by sea. So far as the railways are concerned, if these products come by way of the Intercolonial, we have already heard time and time again that there is no railway in Canada on which the rates are so low as they are on the Intercolonial. I had the opportunity a year ago of showing that the rates from St. John say to Toronto were less than the rates to the same place from either New York or Boston. So that so far as railway rates are concerned, there is nothing in that argument. With regard to the rates by sea, as the steamship lines are subsidized by the country it appears to me that the government will have full control over the rates, and will be able to put an embargo or any undue enhancement of them.

As regards other objections, such as probable delays from snow storm, I think they need only to be mentioned to be thrown aside. A couple of years ago there were heavy snow storms on the line of the Intercolonial Railway; last year the railway lines in the Northwest were blocked by heavy snow storms; this year the province of Ontario has had a similar experience, such places as Toronto and Ottawa having been for days without a train in or out. These climatic occurrences are to be found in all parts of the country, with about equal frequency.

Another objection made was that perhaps resentment might be occasioned by discrimination. Well, Sir, you cannot have a tariff without discrimination; tariff means discrimination. But to my mind the tariff is not a discrimination against any other country, but is a discrimination in favour of our own. Under these circumstances, if discrimination so called is made, I do not see why it should not be made in favour of our own country. Take the example of the great country to the south of us. When the United States commenced housekeeping it consisted of a few states, scarcely more in number than we have of provinces at the present time. These states had a smaller population than we have at present and they were scattered, each having its own individuality, with desires adverse from those of every other state. What was the action of the United States? Among the first things they did was to put an extra duty of 10 per cent on all goods brought into that country in foreign bottoms, no mattter where they came from. That duty was put on in the latter part of the 18th century, and remained on the statute-book down to a very few years ago, if it is not there still. I could very well understand that at a time like that those interested in importing into the city of New York might very well say: this will not do; we are not large enough; we have no lines of our own; we should wait until we are larger and greater. But that course was not taken. The duty was put on, and that policy has continued from that time to this. So that at present there are plenty of lines running into the United States, and they have, by their policy of protecting all their interests—their agriculture, manufacturing, shipping interests and their ports—made themselves such a powerful nation that they have become in a sense the wonder and admiration of the whole world. Out of their great superabundance they are able to go into the markets of the world and compete on even terms against the greatest free trading nation in the world. We can therefore take as example that country, which began largely as our own did, which is similarly situated, and which notwithstanding the various and conflicting interests of its many component parts, has always acted from a national standpoint, has always protected

its own interests, and has consequently developed into a powerful nation. The United States have had a single eye to their own interests regardless of the interests of any other country. Away back as far as 1823 they took it into their heads to impose an import duty of $3.75 per ton on French goods brought in French bottoms into the United States. They did not ask France what she thought about it, nor did France ever pass any resolution of non-intercourse on that question. Coming down to later times, it is not many years ago since the United States acquired Porto Rico. When they did so they brought Porto Rico under their navigation laws. By doing this the United States cut off a very large part of the shipping business of our maritime provinces, but they did this without consulting our interests. Take the law which they passed, and which came into effect on the 1st July, 1906, with regard to the Philippine Islands. I would here take the oportunity of reading the principle clause in this statute, so that this House may understand how very stringent it is :

> Be it enacted that on and after July 1, 1906, no merchandise except supplies for the army or navy shall be transported by sea under penalty of forfeiture thereof, between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the voyage, in any other vessel than a vessel of the United States: But this section shall not be construed to prohibit the sailing of any foreign vessel between any port of the United States, and any port or place in the Philippine Archipelago, provided, that no merchandise other than that imported in such vessel from the same foreign port which has been specified on the manifest as for another port, and which shall not have been unloaded, shall be carried between a port of the United States and a port or place in Philippine Archipelago.

Another clause in the same statute provides :

> That after July 1, 1906, no foreign vessel shall transport passengers between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, either directly or by way of a foreign port, under a penalty of $200 for each passenger so transported and landed.

There you have a coasting voyage of about 7,000 miles, and that is the way the United States looks after its shipping interests and the interests of its ports ; and I do not know that the United States ever found it necessary to find fault with any other country for following its example. It is of equal importance that we should give every possible assistance we can, directly and indirectly, to our shipping interests. That interest is to-day a declining one. In 1874 we owned 1,158,363 tons of shipping. That went on increasing until 1879, when it reached the amount of 1,332,094. After that it began to diminish and has kept diminishing, until, in 1906, all the shipping we had under our register in Canada was 654,179 tons. That record carries its own lesson. While wooden hulls have had to give way to steel and iron, that is not the sole reason of the decline. Another reason is that the building of ships has never received that encouragement from this government and parliament which it should, and which it will be necessary for it to receive if it is ever to amount to anything and if we are ever to increase our tonnage either on our great lakes or on our sea coasts. Another indirect advantage of benefiting our shipping interests would be the assistance we would thereby give our own ports. I do not see any argument that can be made for assisting by our tariff foreign ports and railways when we have ports and railways of our own. So that looking over the whole treaty, and taking everything into consideration, we must come to the conclusion that France has got very much the better of the bargain. France reaps a large and present advantage, while we have to look to the future for anything we may get. There is nothing in the treaty, so far as I can see, to cause us to congratulate ourselves on getting anything out of it at present. At the same time, I make this reference to direct importation, either into our country or into France, because I think it well to emphasize the importance of doing all we can for our own vessels and railways and ports. In the short history of Canada it has already been demonstrated that free open ports all the year around are of vital interest to any country, and more especially to this ; and I have no doubt that, as the years roll by, history will repeat itself and show us again that the possession of these ports is vital to our very existence as a nation. One of the best means to build up these ports is by increasing their business. In this respect, Canada has simply held its own, while, with regard to the other matters, I think the gentlemen of France have got the better of our friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur). But perhaps the next time he may do a little better for Canada.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto). The details of this treaty are a mere matter of working out, but I wish to deal generally with the salient features which, it seems to me, are well worthy of comment. In the first place, it appears to me that very much of the benefit to the people of this country through the small preference which has been accorded to certain products of Canada will be neutralized because of the onerous conditions which attach to certain main features of the treaty. The margin of preference accorded to French products is very small, almost infinitesimal in some cases, and were it not for the important features of the treaty, I do not know that

the people of Canada would be very much concerned in it. It appears to me that what the manufacturers, merchants, shippers and other business people, as well as the public at large, most require is performance and stability of tariff arrangements. I am sure the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will agree with that—that what those engaged in manufacturing, or those of embarking in manufacturing, most need is a tariff not liable to be altered except on certain occasions and on certain well understood principles. When the tariff now in force in Canada was going through this House, it seemed to me that it was calculated to cause a feeling of unrest in the manufacturing and business community because of the variety of tariffs. We have the preferential tariff; we have the intermediate tariff; we have the general tariff. And now, under the operation of this treaty, we are to have a new tariff applying to a certain number of articles, which articles are taken from the general tariff and put in the schedule of this treaty, and it is provided that France should be entitled to the benefit of this particular preferential tariff with regard to these select items. All this makes the tariff less permanent. But, not satisfied with this, the promoters of this tariff, add a schedule—schedule 'C' it is called—which I think, is called a special tariff, and which provides special duties on certain enumerated articles—ten in number, I think. So, we have the new tariff applied to a certain number of things and we have the further special exceptional tariff provided for in schedule 'C,' which, to my mind, is more important than all the items contained in schedule B or the general preferential tariff, because contained in schedule 'C' are a number of items now being manufactured in Canada which are accorded a special reduction according to the provisions of that treaty. In addition to the uncertainty thus created, because of these exceptional tariffs, we find the effect of the treaty is to introduce the favoured nation clause, so that some thirteen countries can claim the same benefit that France takes under the new tariff as well as under the particular duties provided for in schedule 'C' of this treaty. Surely this must have the effect of unsettling trade conditions in the country. Where the same article is accorded different treatment when it comes in from any of thirteen different countries from that which it is accorded when it comes in from any other part of the world, and different even from that accorded under the British preference, you create insecurity which, sooner or later, must have a serious effect upon the industries of the country.

We find that the application of the general intermediate tariff is a matter of order in council—it is an order in council tariff. As pointed out by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) the wonder is why it was not applied to France by order in council. The government does not see fit to do it in that way, but that does not alter the fact that this is an order in council tariff. I think that the benefit to be secured by the people through this tariff, especially by the people living in the western portion of the Dominion, is not at all commensurate with the disadvantages which the unstable condition of tariff involve. I do not think the treaty under consideration is calculated to secure the stability and permanence of tariff which is so important in the interests of the people.

I regret that I cannot agree with my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) with regard to the port feature of this tariff. Before I make a few remarks on schedule 'C,' let me point out that paragraph 8 of this treaty provides as follows:

> To enjoy the benefits of the aforementioned tariff advantages, products originating in France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China, shall be conveyed without transhipment from a port of those territories or from a port of a territory enjoying the preferential tariff or intermediate tariff into a sea or river port of Canada.

Now, that certainly confines the benefit of this tariff to importations coming in at a sea or river port. I have seen, within a year, vessels unloading at the harbour of Toronto that had shipped their cargoes in the old country. There is a growing trade on the great lakes—especially now that vessels upon the lakes are being increased in size—direct between the ports on the lakes and the ocean ports in Britain and continental Europe. I cannot think that it was intended by the promoters of this treaty to shut out imports that might come direct from a French port to a port in the great lakes; but, as the treaty is drawn, such imports would certainly be excluded from its benefit. Now that we are deepening our canals, now that we are spending so much upon our highways, now that there is so much talk of the Georgian bay canal and further improvement of the St. Lawrence route from the great lakes, there should be no exceptional treatment in favour of sea and river ports. Whatever advantage is given should be extended to all ports, whether on the sea, on rivers, or on the great lakes of this country. I apprehend that that feature of it will be important, and as I read paragraph 8 the preference cannot be accorded to any goods that have been transhipped from a port enjoying the preferential tariff. I may be wrong on this but I would ask information from the minister. Take for instance a shipment of goods going from any French port to Liverpool, according to my reading of Article 8 of the treaty, if the shipment is transhipped it is debarred from the privileges of this treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. I think my hon. friend is mistaken. Goods may be shipped di-

rectly either from a French port or from a port enjoying the preferential tariff. Take, for instance, Liverpool, the port mentioned by my hon. friend. French goods going from France to England may be transhipped or even stored there if their identity is preserved. If there is proof of origin, they could be sent from English port to Canada by a hired steamer.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. That is not the language.

Mr. FIELDING. I think it is.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Nothing can be plainer than the language of paragraph 8 :

To enjoy the benefits of the aforementioned tariff advantages, products originating in France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China, shall be conveyed without transhipment from a port of those territories or from a port of a territory enjoying the preferential tariff or intermediate tariff into a sea or river port of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. 'Or from a port of a territory enjoying the preferential tariff,' that is England.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I quite concur in the construction the minister puts on the words he cites, but I use the words in the treaty, 'without transhipments.' If the goods are transhipped they are not entitled to the benefits of the treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. I entirely disagree; I think the language is just the opposite.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. If they are transhipped they lose the benefit.

Mr. FIELDING. If they are transhipped after they leave England.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. At any time, there is no restriction on the word 'transhipped.'

Mr. FIELDING. That was not the intention, and with all due respect to my hon. friend, he will see it does not bear that construction.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I have read it over as a lawyer, not as a business man, and it seemed to me that that was the strict meaning of the words.

As to the port-to-port features of the treaty, I submit that this is not the time to enforce this policy nor are the goods which will come under the provisions of this treaty such goods as should be subjected to the port-to-port requirement. We have neither ocean nor land transportation facilities sufficient to give proper competition or a proper service to enable this policy to be successfully applied. I am informed that there is now but one line from France to Canada, running between Havre and St. John. Two boats of this line land at St. John in seven weeks. I understand that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries proposes to further subsidize some alternative route, either from Havre or another French port, which shall be more frequent and faster. We have not now adequate transportation facilities from the winter ports in Canada to the western sections of the country to justify that policy.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that this government is now subsidizing a line from France?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. This line is subsidized to the extent of $120,000 a year. The service, however, is admittedly wholly inadequate; it is practically a monthly service. That service may be improved, but even if it is, I submit that we would still not have proper facilities for the carriage of freight between France and the western portions of Canada. There will not be sufficient transportation facilities to give competition or an effective and efficient service for the western part of Canada until the National Transcontinental Railway is completed. The right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), speaking last session in reference to a similar proposal, moved by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), plainly said that the time had not come for the application of a port-to-port clause regarding the preferential tariff. The application of his remarks is very wide, and in order that I may not misrepresent him, I shall quote an entire paragraph. At page 4326 of 'Hansard' he said :

But I look upon this motion as a completion of the policy which we inaugurated four years ago when we resolved to construct another transcontinental railway from the Pacific to the Atlantic ocean. When this railway is in operation, as by the terms of the contract it must be in operation in the month of December, 1911, then will be a fitting time to adopt this policy. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would not be disposed to agree altogether with the motion of my hon. friend if it is intended to apply it in the month of May, 1908: it will, however, fittingly apply in 1911 when the transcontinental railway will be completed.

Before moving an amendment the right hon. gentleman completed his remarks by saying :

But the proper time would not be in 1908, the proper time would be when our new railway is in operation.

The right hon. gentleman gave very cogent reasons in his speech for not adopting that clause a year ago—want of proper competition, proper facilities and so on. I apply all he said then to the existing condition to-day in regard to the French treaty. The service is inadequate both by land and sea. It does not afford that competition which the public are entitled to get. It seems to me that whatever benefit is going

to be derived from the reduction of duties on goods imported from France, that benefit in so far as people living in Toronto and the west are concerned, will be reduced to a minimum and I prophesy that merchants in these localities will not take advantage of this treaty. The goods and articles which are coming in from France are the very last things which should be restricted in the manner in which this treaty restricts them by a port-to-port clause. We all know that the bulk of the importations from France are goods of a fancy nature, millinery, gloves and articles of fashion which are in fashion to-day and in a month are not in fashion. We know that wholesale millinery men and dealers in goods of French manufacture and origin bring their goods direct into this country ordering them by telegraph, and receiving them by express. The millinery openings are in the spring of the year. Shipments of these light goods from France come in the winter season and they have to be quick in their transportation, otherwise the season is lost. A week or ten days make a very great difference to the merchants in respect to these goods. Merchants in the west, who deal in French goods, will continue to bring them in by New York, they will pay the extra duty and they will get no benefit from the reduced duty. They will continue to pay the ordinary customs rates because they cannot get their goods in sufficient time. We cannot pretend that in this country we are as sure of winter transportation from St. John and Halifax as we are from New York. We know that the American, the White Star and other lines will ship goods from Paris to New York at the same rate that lines running to Canada will ship them at from Liverpool to Montreal, St. John or Halifax, so that, by getting the goods direct through New York you are getting them at the same rate but with greater expedition. We all agree with the desire to make our ports national ports. We all agree with the desire to make all the avenues of trade and commerce that serve the people of this country Canadian avenues. While I am not arguing against this condition of affairs for ever I say that to-day is not the time to put this imposition upon these goods, because we do feel that these are the very last goods which should be so handicapped or upon which this restriction should be so imposed. At the present time we have only one line of railway practically serving the ports of St. John and Halifax. The Intercolonial Railway, I suppose, is a competing line in a sense but in this House the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself referred to this as being a one line condition until the transcontinental railway is completed. There are merchants in portions of the country where they do not have these two great lines passing by their doors and where they are not able to get shipments over them. The Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway are the two lines having connection with these ports but in western Ontario the Canada Southern occurs to my mind which traverses the whole southern peninsula of Ontario and that is a line which has no connection with a Canadian seaport. It does not seem to me that an unfair discrimination will exist against those who were shut off from a line having direct connection with a seaport town.

I desire to refer for a moment to some opinions, better than my own, because they are the opinions of men who are to-day in business which are affected by this treaty. I have here a letter from what, in my opinion, is the largest wholesale dry goods house in Toronto. The writer says :

> The proviso that the shipment must be directly from a French port to a Canadian port will, for the present and until there is a more frequent shipping service do away with a great deal of the apparent benefit of the treaty.
>
> We also at present bring many lines f.o.b. Liverpool. This advantage will be done away with under the treaty.

That particular gentleman takes the same view of the treaty that I have taken to-day although without any conference with him. That has reference to the language of article 8. I have a letter from one of the largest shipping houses in Canada with agencies abroad, both on the continent and in all the large cities in Great Britain.

After referring to the disadvantage of the present treaty the writer says :

> In addition to this, there is the great delay to wholesale houses, particularly the millinery men, to which I have already alluded, and I feel satisfied, and my opinion has been strengthened by conversation with wholesale millinery men, that rather than run the risk of having their goods unnecessarily delayed during millinery openings, they will feel inclined to bring their goods via New York ports and pay the additional duty.

With the permission of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) I will read a part from a letter from this same gentleman addressed to himself protesting against this clause of the treaty. This is a part from a letter addressed to the hon. minister on the 15th of January last. Speaking of the port feature the writer says :

> This is commendable as inducing trade direct to our own country but at the present time shipping facilities being inadequate, it would be deferred until such time as a first-class steamship service could be inaugurated between France and Canadian seaports. As you are aware the present facilities are quite inadequate to cope with the situation and the expenses of transporting French shipments via boat or by rail to Liverpool or London are such that an increased cost of four or five per cent would be added to the present rate of freight, and already the terminal facilities at Montreal and Quebec are being taxed to such

an extent, particularly last summer, as to cause the greatest delay in handling these, and I am fully satisfied that the wholesale millinery houses throughout Ontario would rather pay the full rate of duty than run the risk of having their spring and fall shipments delayed by the slow steamers direct, or the chance of missing connections by having them brought via London or Liverpool.

This firm handles the shipping for a large number of importing houses and this is the opinion that the writer expresses for the firm and for himself.

Mr. PATERSON. Has the hon. gentleman any objection to giving the names of his correspondents ?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. No I have no objection. This firm is W. Wingate & Johnston (Limited). Mr. Kerman who wrote the letter is the managing director of the company. They have agencies at London, Liverpool, Southampton, Glasgow, Manchester, Birmingham, Sheffield and Paris, and their Canadian office is at Wellington Street East, Toronto.

Mr. PATERSON. Is it a shipping firm ?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. A shipping firm.

Mr. PATERSON. A forwarding firm—not traders ?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. No, but Mr. Kerman states that he has had interviews with traders and merchants whose goods he handles.

Mr. PATERSON. What were the other names, if you have no objection, of the parties whose letters you read before ?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I do not care to mention these names. Now, the information which I have received on this question has come to me entirely voluntarily on the part of those who sent it, and so I did not seek information from the Toronto Board of Trade, but I understand that a memorial has been sent by that body to the Minister of Finance protesting against this feature of the treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. The statement of the hon. gentleman is perhaps correct. I received several communications on the subject but I cannot recall at the moment from whom they were received.

Mr. A. C. MACDONALD. I have been told by the officers of the Toronto Board of Trade that they have memoralized the government in that direction.

Mr. FIELDING. It is correct if they say so.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Now, this is a matter of national importance and one which should not be viewed from any local standpoint. I do not think that the port of St. John or the port of Halifax or the port of Montreal should be alone considered in this matter, which after all is a question of the greatest good to the greatest number of the people of our whole Dominion. It is from that standpoint I wish to treat it. I have a letter here from a Montreal importer which says :

As Canada is presently situated, to my mind the application of the principle referred to, namely, that the benefits of the treaty shall only apply upon products carried by a direct line between a French and Canadian port, is not sound. To say the least, it is premature and against a satisfactory working out of the very object sought by the treaty itself. If we had a reasonable amount of competition in this direct carrying trade it would appear to me very differently.

The time is not ripe for insisting upon this direct shipment feature of the understanding. Sentiment is no justification for taking away from trade any legitimate advantage of competition.

The establishment of one line from a port in France, or to a port in France, is to my mind practically the establishment of a carrying monopoly.

It is I think unnecessary for me to dilate on this question, because every hon. member in this House knows that where carrying facilities are restricted to one or two lines of steamers, a carrying monopoly is almost invariably the result. We all know that the steamship companies will charge whatever the traffic will stand, and the general opinion is that the steamship line, or the two lines which in the future may be plying direct from France, will take practically the whole benefit of the French treaty by their increased transportation rates. As I have said, the experience is that the carrying companies will charge what the freight will stand, and the freight will stand just about the difference between the old tariff and the new; and so the steamboat companies will exact practically all the benefit that the purchasers of these goods in Canada might otherwise derive.

Mr. LOGAN. That argument would not apply if the interpretation of the Minister of Finance is correct that the restrictions will not apply to goods shipped via an English port.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I contend that even if the Minister of Finance is right in his statement, the freight—and I have the facts here to show it—the freight from French ports to Liverpool is as great as the freight from Liverpool to Canadian seaports, and even if the carrying companies are allowed to tranship at Liverpool they will charge as much from French ports to Liverpool as from Liverpool to Canadian ports. Therefore, our importers will have the increased rate to contend against even if they are accorded the privilege of transhipping at Liverpool. When the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) spoke on this question, he told us that from 75 to 80

per cent of the Montreal merchants were opposed to this proposition, and if the Montreal importers and shippers and merchants are opposed to it, how much more numerous will it not be on the people of the west. I am well within the mark when I say that the majority of the goods that are affected by this preference and which will be bought by Toronto merchants, will be bought as they have heretofore been bought and without any attempt to take advantage of this treaty, because the burdens of the port-to-port clause are equally as great as the benefits of the reduced rate.

Mr. PATERSON. Has any one written to the hon. gentleman stating that he would rather do without the treaty at all if this clause remained in it.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Yes, and I have read two such statements to the House. In the first complaint I read, one was particularly directed to the point just mentioned by the hon. minister, and the other contained this statement which is entirely apart from any transhipping arrangement:

The proviso that the shipment must be directly from French port to Canadian port will for the present and until there is more frequent shipping service do away with a great deal of the apparent advantage of the treaty.

Mr. PATERSON. Do away with a 'great deal of the advantage of the treaty;' that is the expression used there.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. When this treaty was discussed by the House some time ago it would appear from the statements made by the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) that this particular feature was designed to give certain advantages to people living in eastern Canada. I regret that the negotiations of the treaty should have been approached in that spirit. I would rather hope that there was no intention to sacrifice the interests of the west, and that the treaty had been entered into with a bona fide desire—mistaken though it be—to benefit all Canada rather than any particular place in Canada. It would appear from the statements of the Minister of Marine however, that the treaty was apparently designed to benefit the port of Montreal, because in an interchange of remarks with the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) at page 1460 'Hansard' the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) said:

I am sorry to find that some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House were trying to obtain opinion in Montreal against this policy one which was calculated to benefit Montreal especially and all our river and ocean ports. I take it that my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) has been trying to discover objections, and I am surprised that a representative of Montreal should endeavour to make a case against a provision which was designed to benefit Montreal especially.

Later on he said:

Well, I am interested to learn that my hon. friend has been trying to get the people in Montreal to pronounce themselves against this treaty, or that clause of it which is designed to be so beneficial to Montreal.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) was one of those who negotiated the treaty, and it would appear from this statement of his, to put it mildly, that there was a direct intention to benefit the port of Montreal without considering the claims of the people who live further west and who have not the advantage of living in a seaport. The hon. gentleman must remember that although we do not all live in seaport towns we should be entitled to equal rights. I had hoped that no intention would have entered into the minds of the negotiators of the treaty to advance the interests of people living in a certain section of the country to the detriment of the interests of others; the Minister of Marine went further; he was speaking of the clause in the customs tariff which permits the government to pass an order in council restricting the goods under the British preference to those entering by Canadian ports—that is the amendment moved by the Prime Minister last session, to the motion of the hon. member for Cumberland, and the Minister of Marine said:

It is true this clause of the Customs Act has not yet been put into force, but we expect that it will be put into force before long.

The hon. minister, speaking for the government, says that it is the intention of the government to put into effect before long, which I assume means at an early date, the clause that at present is in the tariff permitting the government, by order in council, to restrict the importation of British goods to Canadian ports. The Prime Minister last session stated most emphatically that the country would not be ripe for the enforcement of that clause until 1911, because the transportation facilities would not be completed until that year; but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries states this session that that clause will be enforced before long. I am dwelling upon this, because it seems to me that it would be most unwise and injurious to the country as a whole if the government, without consulting parliament or the country, should bring into force by order in council a provision requiring all goods coming from Great Britain to enter by Canadian ports in order to enjoy the advantages of the preferential tariff. It appears that we have an order in council tariff, and now we are about to have order in council rates. What security will the merchants of this country have if a tariff can be enforced against them over night and the channels of transportation can be opened or closed over night? I think the merchants of this country would regard such an act with disfavour and alarm; and in view of the statement of the

Minister of Marine and Fisheries that that provision will be enforced before long, I desire to bring this matter to the attention of the House and the country. I hope the government are not going to use this French treaty as the thin edge of the wedge. I do not think the merchants of Ontario and the west are very much concerned about the change of 2½ or 5 per cent which this treaty makes, but they are concerned about this from-port-to-port clause as possibly the preliminary to applying a similar clause to goods coming to Canada under the British preference. In this respect Canada is very differently situated from France. France is so much surrounded by water that she has many harbours on both the Mediterranean and the British channel, and it is very natural for her to insist on her ports being made available for all her importations. Canada is very differently situated, and it makes no difference to France whether we insist on this provision of the treaty or not. Indeed, she would prefer not to have shipments of goods from France confined to enter by Canadian ports, because if importers were free to bring French goods by New York or other American ports as well as by Canadian ports, there would probably be a larger sale of these goods. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that the United States had insisted on this from-port-to-port clause. In that respect, however, the United States are very differently situated from Canada. They have a much greater line of sea coast than we have, and their ports are not subject like ours to the rigours of winter. For these reasons, I think the benefits which we are to derive from this treaty will be more than counterbalanced by its drawbacks and disadvantages. I quite concur in all that has been said about the importance of opening up trade connections with other nations of the world; and there is perhaps none with which we have a greater desire to trade than France, with which both Canada and Great Britain have much in common. At the same time, we are doing business in our own shop, for our own advantage. Again, it would be a very serious matter for our merchants to be deprived of the bonding privilege in the United States. It is no answer to say that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, and that if we lose our bonding privilege in the United States they lose theirs in this country. I do not think such a policy of retaliation would be wise or prudent in the estimation of this House or of this country. The bonding privilege is of great value to us, as it is to the United States. I do not wish to stretch that consideration too far; it is only an incident, while the other considerations I have urged ought to be sufficient to induce the government to reconsider this article of the treaty. In this matter the Minister of Marine and Fisheries seems to think that the interest of Montreal is the only one to be considered; but the west is growing more rapidly than the east, and its interests should be seriously considered. If it is intended to keep this from-port-to-port clause in the treaty, then I think the provision should be extended, not only to ocean ports and river ports, but to ports on the great lakes. We hope and believe that as a result of the large expenditures that we are making to open up our great avenues of transportation will result at no distant date in direct communication between our great lake ports and the seaports of Europe, so that vessels may load at Port Arthur, on Lake Superior, and pass directly to the ports of Great Britain and other European countries.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). Mr. Speaker, I think the greatest necessity for this parliament to-day is to appoint a commission to report upon the expedition of business by the different railroads of this country. If we had such a commission it would be shown to my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) that goods can be shipped even from the old port of Halifax over the government system of railroads, which the hon. gentleman to-day has passed over rather cavalierly, to the city of Toronto in as quick time as they are being shipped from the city of New York to Toronto. After the most careful inquiry, I have come to the conclusion that it is a great fallacy to suppose that the people of Toronto have a fast freight service from the city of New York. Last session, in a few remarks I made on a kindred subject, I showed that the actual time of transporting from Halifax to Toronto goods which had come by the steamships 'Virginian' and 'Tunisian' was some hours shorter than the time from New York to the city of Toronto. And after all, this restriction, if you must call it such, only applies during a few months of the year. It only applies after the St. Lawrence is closed, because up to that time you do not have this long haul from Halifax to Montreal. The very goods my hon. friend mentions, namely, millinery goods, are largely imported during the fall months for the fall openings and would not be carried from St. John and Halifax, but would go direct to Quebec and Montreal. My hon. friend says we should legislate for the whole country. But that is what the government has done. This treaty will benefit the national life of the country. It is a declaration to the French republic that we have ports in Canada and do not require to depend on American ports. I quoted in a former debate the statement of an English exporter who explained, that although he had been ordered to ship the goods to Canada in December via a Canadian port, he had sent them by New York because, he wrote, all the Canadian ports were frozen up. That is an impression which has to be

removed. Last year we incorporated in our tariff, on a motion I had the honour of making, that goods from the motherland, in order to enjoy the preference, should be brought through Canadian ports, this provision to take effect at a time to be fixed by order in council. We did not bring that into force at once, but left it to be brought in force by order in council. It establishes, however, the principle that imported goods, to get a preference under the Canadian tariff, should be brought in by Canadian ports. Surely we were not going to incorporate that in the preferential tariff dealing with the motherland and then deal with a foreign country and not incorporate the same principle? I do not want to localize this matter. It is of no more benefit to me than it is to a resident of Toronto that this clause should be in the treaty. It may benefit St. John, Halifax, Montreal and Quebec, but I represent none of these constituencies. But in as much as it benefits Canada as a whole, and I represent a Canadian constituency, I desire to support the government in incorporating this principle in our treaty with France. But whence comes the objection? Can this be the old Conservative party, whose slogan used to be Canada for the Canadians, which objects to this treaty? Apparently their policy at present is Canada for United States ports. What does the bringing in of goods to this country by Canadian ports mean? It means the building up of our ports; it means additional traffic for our railways; it means better transportation facilities; it means increasing traffic to our great government railway which costs us so much every year for its maintenance. This is a national question, and the opposition should be the last in the world to combat the idea of Canada for the Canadians and Canadian ports for Canadian trade. That is the policy of this side anyway. I promised my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, who is going to follow me, that I would not take up much of the time of the House, because we are unfortunately both compelled to be absent this evening. I shall, therefore, not extend my remarks and shall merely conclude by saying that the arguments of my hon. friend, at the very best, can only apply to the small amount of goods imported during the winter months from France, and that will only affect two or three cities in the whole Dominion. Apart from that, this treaty is beneficial from a national standpoint, a railway standpoint and a national port standpoint. I would like very much, if I had the time, to go into this question of the transportation of goods over our railways from the east. I propose during this session to ask the Minister of Railways to either refer this to the Railway Commission or appoint an independent committee of this House to gather the evidence and show how quickly goods can be brought to the interior of this country from its extremities on the east.

Mr. KEMP. What do you want a committee for? We are bringing goods by St. John at present.

Mr. LOGAN. Why then does the hon. gentleman object to the present treaty? He seems to be satisfied with the transportation via the city of St. John, so that this part of the treaty does not affect my hon. friend so seriously after all. There exists a misconception regarding transportation facilities from the east to the west. I support this treaty because it embodies the principle I have always contended for, the principle of legislation for the whole of Canada, of encouraging a Canadian spirit, and developing trade through Canadian ports.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I do not propose to follow my hon. friend in the discussion of the resolution which he introduced some four or five years ago and which, I think, was unanimously passed in this House, but which has nevertheless not yet been put in practice by the government. If that policy is so extremely important and valuable to the interests of the country as a whole, how does it happen that the government, which my hon. friend supports through thick and thin, has not yet seen fit to put it into effect?

I would not desire to take any part in this debate before considering the Bill in the Committee of the Whole House except for the somewhat curious statement made both by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister outside the House and by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) within the House as to some remarkable advance in respect of treaty making powers which has been wrought by the negotiation and consummation of this treaty. The right hon. gentleman at Toronto in October last used this language:

> It has long been the desire of the Canadian people, if I mistake not, that we should be entrusted with the negotiation of our own treaties, especially in matters which affect trade. The long looked for reform has at last come to be a living reality, and as I told you a moment ago, without revolution, without any breaking of the old tradition, without any impairment of our allegiance, the time has come when Canadian interests are entrusted to Canadians. Just within the last week a treaty has been concluded with France which affects Canada alone and which has been negotiated by Canadians alone. True it has been done with the full assent of the British Crown, the full assent of the Foreign Office, who have interposed no objection at all, but on the contrary have told us 'it is a matter which chiefly concerns you, therefore take the management in your own hands and have the treaty which you want to have.' The treaty has been completed. It is not for me to say what it has been or what it is, but I think I can say it will be found reasonably

satisfactory for the producers and for the farmers of Canada and for the manufacturers of Canada also.

My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries took in this House an even more extraordinary view. It can be found in 'Hansard,' but I have not now the time to quote it. He took the position that a revolution in respect of our treaty-making powers had been effected and something had been accomplished which never had been before. I should think that hon. gentlemen on that side would not be very proud of their treaty-making record. Four of them went to Washington, with one British ambassador. They failed in their negotiations, broke off these negotiations, referred back to the foreign office in Great Britain the subject of the Alaskan boundary which they were not able to deal with satisfactorily. An arrangement was arrived at under which an arbitration was held, and after it had been held, they themselves were the first to condemn the British government with respect to the appointment of arbitrators. If any territory has been lost to Canada since 1867, it has been lost under the administration of these hon. gentlemen, and every foot of territory added to Canada since that year has been added when they were not in power.

Let me point out to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that, when he speaks of this long-looked for reform of 1907, he uses language remarkably inconsistent with that which he uttered in this House in the debate on the address in 1903. For, on that occasion, he expressly stated that our political relations with Great Britain and the empire needed no improvement, that they were all that we could wish; and in the same speech he expressely stated that we had not the treaty-making power. I have his words under my hand, but I have not time to quote them in full. But, if those words meant anything, they meant that we had not the treaty-making power and did not desire it. But now, it would seem, according to the right hon. gentleman, a great reform has been accomplished. Well, let us see. That reform seems to have been accomplished in this way: my hon. friends the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) went to Paris and negotiated a treaty under the superintendence of the British government. After the negotiations had been completed, the results were referred to the British government and the Board of Trade, as every treaty negotiated by Canada in the past has been referred. Why, as ar back as 1865, practically the same procedure was adopted, except that, in those days, Canadians were not, as they afterwards were, nominated as plenipotentiaries on behalf of Great Britain to negotiate treaties. Any one curious in these matters may refer to a despatch of the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to the Colonial Secretary in 1865, in which, after dealing with the negotiation of treaties between dependencies of the empire and foreign countries, he laid down certain rules. I merely give an abstract of the letter, but the whole can be found in House of Commons papers, 1873, volume 49, page 42:

Her Majesty's ministers will assist colonial delegates, having first examined their instructions from their government.

This assistance will be rendered through British ambassadors.

The same procedure will be followed as is adopted in negotiating commercial treaties on behalf of the United Kingdom.

Proposals must be submitted to the British government, and especially to the Board of Trade, to ascertain how far any such proposals might be made to foreign countries consistently with the general treaty engagements of the British Crown.

These are the principles laid down in 1865, and they have not been altered very much since, except that as far back as 1873, when Sir John Macdonald went to Washington, Canadian plenipotentiaries have been appointed to conduct such negotiations. The whole subject is dealt with in Todd on Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies, pages 268-269. At page 268 I find the following:

Sir Charles Tupper was appointed in 1883, also in 1888, co-plenipotentiary with imperial representatives to conduct negotiations with Spain, likewise in the latter year to negotiate with the United States; and again in 1892-3 to regulate commercial relations between Canada and France respecting customs tariffs.

Now, let us look at the illustrations for a moment. In Spain, in 1888, Sir Charles Tupper was co-plenipotentiary with Sir Clare Forde. He conducted the negotiations with the Spanish government himself. He was in the United States in 1888 with Mr. Chamberlain and Sackville West; in France in 1892-3, he negotiated the French treaty. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) declared that some revolution has been wrought as Sir Charles Tupper did not conduct those negotiations alone, while the negotiations for the treaty under discussion were conducted by the Canadian representatives alone. I would point out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) that Sir Charles Tupper did conduct the negotiations alone, so far as diplomatic service was concerned. The only assistance he had was from Sir Joseph Crowe, commercial attaché. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not seem to understand very well the status of a commercial attache, or what position Sir Joseph Crowe held on that occasion. What status did Sir Joheph Crowe have? That of a diplomat?

Mr. BRODEUR. I simply took the report made by the Marquis of Dufferin, in which he stated that the negotiations had been

conducted by Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Joseph Crowe.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the first place, Sir Joseph Crowe, let me inform my hon. friend who does not seem to be aware of the fact—was commercial attaché for the whole continent of Europe, except Russia, having headquarters at Paris. But a commercial attaché is not a diplomat, and does not take charge of the legation or embassy. I made inquiries on this subject, and I must say I am astonished that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur), particularly after the diplomatic experience he has had, does not seem to be aware of the true position of affairs. In the absence of an ambassador, the next senior diplomat is in charge of the embassy. He is nominally the counsellor of the embassy. The naval and military attachés and the commercial attaché also, are merely technical officers, and, unless specially ordered by the foreign office, would never be in charge of an embassy. The secretary of an embassy might be ordered to perform the duty of commercial attaché temporarily, and, of course, in his capacity of a diplomat, but not in his capacity as a technical officer, he might find himself in charge of an embassy in the absence of his senior diplomat.

So, except in the case where the secretary of the legation happens to possess technical knowledge and to perform also the duties of a commercial attaché, he is not promoted to the charge of an embassy and has no authority to take charge of an embassy except by direction of the foreign office. As my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) reminds me, the Marquis of Dufferin was then in Paris. Sir Joseph Crowe was commercial attaché at Paris for the whole continent of Europe, and was not filling a diplomatic position in the negotiations, but was merely assisting Sir Charles Tupper with his technical knowledge, just as the officers of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries assisted them on the occasion of the recent negotiation of the treaty we are now considering—and just as the expert officers from this side, no doubt also gave their assistance to Sir Charles Tupper on the occasion when he negotiated the treaty in 1892-3.

Now, with respect to Sir Charles Tupper's negotiation of this treaty, the documents in possession of this government will show that an order in council was passed on March 27, 1879, as follows:

The Committee in Council have had under consideration the circular despatch from the Rt. Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies under date of the 21st January, 1879, inclosing copies of an announcement which has been published in the London 'Gazette,' relative to the notice given by the French government to terminate the commercial treaties now in force between Great Britain and France.

The Hon. the Minister of Finance, to whom the said despatch with inclosures has been referred, reports that he is informed that a fresh treaty between these countries is now being negotiated and it appears to him, therefore, that it is extremely desirable that steps should be at once taken to secure the consideration of the interests of the Dominion in any agreement which may be arrived at, and therefore recommends that Your Excellency be requested to inform the Colonial Office of the desire of the Canadian government in this respect and to endeavour to obtain the consent of Her Majesty's government to the appointment of a Canadian commissioner in connection with these negotiations.

That was in 1879. The reply to that appeal from Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, to the Marquis of Lorne under date January 26, 1879, was as follows:

My Lord,—I have been in communication with the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, upon the subject of the report of the Privy Council inclosed in your despatch, marked 'confidential,' of the 27th May, in which your ministers express a wish to send a commissioner to this country in connection with the negotiations for a fresh commercial treaty with France, when such negotiations shall be resumed.

In reply, I have to inform you that it is not thought desirable to appoint a Canadian commissioner to take part in the negotiation of the treaty, but that if your government desire to send a person enjoying their confidence to advise with Her Majesty's government or with the British ambassador at Paris on any questions that may arise during the negotiations, Her Majesty's government will be happy to give attention to his representations.

That you will observe was in 1879. The British government, in taking that position in answer to the order in council of this government, were in effect reaffirming the position and practice laid down by the Foreign office as far back as 1865. When a departure from that practice was afterwards made there was to a certain extent a revolution with respect to treaty making powers, a new principle was then established in respect to the part which Canada should take in the negotiations of commercial treaties, but that departure was made in 1884 and not in 1907, and it was not secured by the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), or the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur).

That was the condition in which this question stood when Sir Charles Tupper was appointed as High Commissioner for Canada. When he was instructed by the government of this country to open negotions with Spain, Sir Charles took up the matter with the colonial and foreign offices and was able to convince the imperial government of the wisdom of granting to Canada the right to negotiate commercial treaties with foreign countries. The foreign office sent a letter to the colonial office,

dated July 26, 1884, from which the following extract is taken :

If the Spanish government are favourably disposed, the full power for these negotiations will be given to Sir Robert Morier and Sir Charles Tupper jointly. The actual negotiations would probably be conducted by Sir Charles Tupper, but the convention if concluded must be signed by both plenipotentiaries and must be entered into between Her Majesty and the King of Spain for the special object of regulating Canadian trade with the Spanish territories specified in the convention.

It was then that a departure was made from the old practice. When these hon. gentlemen state that they have effected some new departure in 1907 they are simply stating that which, upon a calmer view of the circumstances, they will find to be absolutely unfounded and supported by any illustration or instance they can bring to the attention of this House.

In a letter to Sir Charles Tupper, dated September 24, 1884, Sir John A. Macdonald said :

You certainly have scored a great point in securing your being united with the British ambassador, not only in the negotiations but the completion of the treaty.

Sir Charles Tupper made a full statement on the subject in 1887, and any hon. gentleman who desires to be acquainted with the facts may refer to the 'Hansard' of that year, Vol. 1, page 396. From that time to the present the question of Canada's right to negotiate commercial treaties has been unquestioned. Canada has been allowed to negotiate its treaties; but when it comes to the execution of a treaty, it must be in the name of the British Crown, which is the Crown of Canada as well as of the British Isles, and for that reason, in 1893 as well as in 1897, the treaty was a treaty between the Crown of Great Britain and the president of the French republic.

In 1893 in like manner Lord Dufferin and Sir Charles Tupper were jointly appointed by Her Majesty plenipotentiaries to negotiate a treaty with France in relation to trade between that country and Canada. The Marquis of Dufferin assured Sir Charles Tupper of his readiness to aid him in every way, and said that Sir Joseph Crowe, an accomplished commercial attache of the embassy, would afford every assistance, and Sir Joseph did afford Sir Charles valuable assistance. It was very necessary for Sir Charles Tupper to have assistance of that kind because he was not as much at home in French as in English, while Sir Joseph Crowe was thoroughly acquainted with French.

I would like to allude in this connection to certain portions of the correspondence and to the parliamentary documents brought down which were not brought out very clearly by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) in dealing with this matter. He quoted various extracts to show that Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Joseph Crowe jointly negotiated this treaty. I have already made it abundantly clear to the House that Sir Joseph Crowe held no diplomatic position; while he might assist Sir Charles Tupper in the negotiations he had not treaty-making powers. If the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) will look at the sessional papers of 1893 ; Nos. 28, No. 11 he will find the correspondence. The sessional paper to which I particularly allude is No. 51 to 51-C and I am quoting from page 21 :

At the third meeting the French commissioners replied to the observations and proposals put forward by the Canadian commissioner in the course of the first and second meetings.

It is not Sir Joseph Crowe who put forward the proposals; he was there to assist the Canadian commissioner, and it was the Canadian commissioner who put forward the proposals.

Similarly in his report dated January 6, 1893, to Sir John Thompson, then Prime Minister of Canada, Sir Charles Tupper used this language :

I cannot conclude this communication without saying that while the negotiations have been carried on entirely by myself on the part of Canada and by (naming the French commissioners) on the part of France, I have received the most cordial support and assistance from the Colonial and Foreign Offices in London and from His Excellency the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava. My obligations are especially great to Sir Joseph Crowe, First Secretary and Commercial Attache of the Embassy, who has given me the benefit of his valuable advice and wide experience in such questions, and who has constantly associated with me in my intercourse with the French negotiators.

Sir Charles Tupper in saying that simply anticipated the words of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance who said in respect of the present treaty :

It is my duty and pleasure to say that each one of these distinguished members of the imperial government and the officials in the several departments gave us their most hearty and most cordial co-operation. We can say the same for His Majesty's ambassador in France, Sir Francis Bertie, and Sir Henry Austin Lee, as the commercial counsellor.

Because Sir Henry Austin Lee, as commercial counsellor, assisted these two hon. gentlemen as plenipotentiaries, is it any the less true that they negotiated the treaty? They do not make that claim, and why should they make the claim that because Sir Joseph Crowe, commercial attaché, assisted Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Charles Tupper did not negotiate that treaty? He negotiated that treaty in 1893 exactly in the same way as these gentlemen negotiated this treaty last year. It is no new de-

parture. It is simply an adherence to the principle for which Sir Charles Tupper contended, and which he had established after he became High Commissioner in 1887, the principle which recognized the right of Canada in future to negotiate her own commercial treaties, reserving supervision to the British Crown in order that its own treaty arrangements might be observed, and which recognized as well, of course, the well understood principle that these treaties must be negotiated in the name of the British Crown. In this particular case what happened?—that these gentlemen conducted the negotiations. They were there, in the first place, without any formal authority, as plenipotentiaries. They went there in July, and they did not receive any authority as plenipotentiaries until the 8th of August. Negotiations had been going on for two or three weeks before any formal authorization from the imperial government was given to them. After the negotiations were concluded what happened? In a letter, dated the 22nd August, 1907, and addressed to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the hon. Minister of Finance says:

Sir,—Referring to the interview with which you were good enough to favour me in London a few days ago, in connection with the commercial negotiations between the representatives of the French and Canadian governments, I have the honour to inform you that, although definite conclusions have not been reached respecting any of the questions under discussion, such progress has taken place in the negotiations as leads us to believe that within a few days we shall be able to submit for your aproval a draft of a treaty.

Exactly as Sir Charles Tupper had submitted the draft of a treaty for the approval of the British government in 1893. In a letter of the 14th August, two days afterwards, addressed to Sir Francis Hopgood, Colonial Office, London, the hon. Minister of Finance used this language:

Dear Sir,—Under arrangements made some time ago between Sir Edward Grey and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, my colleague Mr. Brodeur and I, with the co-operation of the British ambassador, Sir Francis Bertie, have been conducting negotiations with the representatives of the French government with the view of enlarging the scope of the present treaty respecting the trade relations between France and Canada. While the negotiations have not yet been completed, they have advanced far enough to lead us to believe that within a few days we shall be able to prepare a draft treaty which will be acceptable to the French government and which, subject to the approval of the imperial government, the Canadian government will be willing to adopt.

Exactly the same practice as was followed in 1893 in the case of Sir Charles Tupper. What was the answer from the Foreign Office? The answer from the Foreign Office, under the hand of Sir Edward Grey and under date of August 28, 1907, addressed to the hon. Minister of Finance, was as follows:—

Sir,—I was gratified to learn from your letter of the 22nd instant that progress has been made with the commercial negotiations between the representatives of the French and the Canadian governments. On receipt of the draft treaty which you hope to be able shortly to submit to me I will at once refer it to the Colonial Office. It must also be shown to the Board of Trade.

There will be no delay on the part of this department, and I will request the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the President of the Board of Trade to expedite the matter as much as possible.

As soon as their approval is received, your full powers will be sent to you.

I am sir, your most obedient servant,

(Signed) E. GREY.

This is the remarkable revolution which has been heard of all over this country. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House criticised us for saying something about this treaty before the Bill came before the House. Do they not realize that they themselves, before a word of this treaty had been communicated to parliament or to the public, went around the country heralding the extraordinary results and advantages which were to accrue from that treaty? I hope there will be great advantages from this treaty, although, up to the present time, I have not heard very much from the other side of the House which would lead me to that conclusion. I will reserve my remarks in regard to the merits of the treaty until we get into Committee of the Whole House, but let me say that the position of the government in regard to it has appeared to me to be rather remarkable. One would have supposed that when negotiating a treaty of this kind some estimate would have been made as to what the advantages to our trade will be. One would have supposed that the government would say: We will increase our trade with France by $1,000,000, or $1,500,000, or $2,000,000; or that such and such articles will be exported to France in very much greater proportion in future than they have been in the past. Instead of that, the only argument put before the House up to the present time that I have been able to understand or appreciate is simply the argument that we will have the advantage of the minimum French tariff, and that it is a very great advantage in itself whether or not it leads to the export of a greater quantity of our goods in future than has taken place in the past. I trust indeed that our trade relations with France may be improved. The relations between that great country and the British empire are most excellent, and I for one rejoice at that fact, and trust that they will continue so. I desire that our trade relations with France shall be improved. I hope that this treaty may improve them, and when we get into Committee of the Whole House, we

will, perhaps, on certain aspects of that treaty, be able to obtain from the government more definite information than we have had in the past. At the present moment I only desire to disabuse the minds of hon. members of this House and the minds of the people of this country of the idea that there was any wonderful revolution wrought by these gentlemen or that they accomplished anything extraordinary in regard to the French treaty. There has been no revolution. The revolution, if you can call it a revolution—I would prefer to call it an advance or a departure—the departure which was established and which gave to Canada more powers with respect to commercial treaties than she had possessed before, was due to the courage, the genius and the perseverance of that great statesman, Sir Charles Tupper. It was he who made that new departure, which gives us to-day in Canada the right to negotiate our own commercial treaties, although every treaty is signed, and must be signed, in the name of the British Crown.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth). This French treaty is an important matter for this country, and I take a great deal of interest in it, not only as a member of this House, but as a resident of the district which will be most seriously affected by its provisions, and which is the centre of that great industry which is to provide the eggs to make this omelet. The French treaty may be viewed from different standpoints; we should consider its sentimental value if it has any; the material advantages and disadvantages which it possesses, and its moral advantages or disadvantages also, if any. We are all agreed that the ties which connect a large portion of the population of this country with old France are and ought to be of the most kindly character, and that any treaty or any convention or any act of the government which tends to foster the friendly feeling which does exist and always should exist between Great Britain and France should meet with the approval of every Canadian. While that is true, a trade treaty must be looked upon from the point of view of its material advantages or disadvantage. I can easily conceive that a commercial treaty framed on sentimentality might in the end be of very great disadvantage to either one country or the other, because the feeling of disappointment or bitterness engendered by the material losses which it caused might go far to offset any of the assumed sentimental advantages which might accrue from it. The material advantages of this treaty may be divided into two parts: first, with regard to how it affects the revenue of this country, and, secondly, with regard to how it affects the commerce and industries of Canada. There can be only one opinion as to its bearing on the revenues of our country, because the truth is that we lose from $5 to $10 on our revenue for every $1 which the French republic loses on hers. Of course, as the Canadian government has a superabundance of money and has nothing to do with it, there might be no objection to the treaty on the score of its bad effects upon our revenue, but with the enormous undertakings which we have on hand, with $100,000,000 yet to spend upon the Grand Trunk Pacific and with the fact staring us in the face to-day that we are paying 7 per cent interest on borrowed money, and that we are trying to negotiate a loan at a higher rate of interest than we have paid in the past, it seems to me it is bad policy to throw away millions of revenue especially when we consider that, generally speaking, under this French treaty the duties are to be lowered on articles which are chiefly used by people of wealth. It is of course impossible to estimate accurately what the loss of revenue will be, and I do not know on what other basis we can proceed to the calculation than on the basis of our present trade imports and exports. The effect of the treaty may be to increase our imports and exports or it may not, and indeed our experience under the old French treaty has been that in the case of many of the articles included in that treaty and in which we expected to do an increased trade, the imports and exports were not enlarged to any appreciable extent. It is not fair, therefore, to assume that because the French republic agrees to reduce the duty upon a certain number of articles that these articles will be exported from Canada in greatly increased quantities. As I have said, our experience of the old French treaty has been that during the last 10 or 15 years, outside the item of lobsters, which is included in this treaty, the greatest increase in our trade with France was in agricultural implements which were placed upon the maximum tariff. Therefore the only fair way to estimate our gains and our losses is to take the volume of the present trade and base our calculations on that. In the following table I enumerate only a very few items and the figures given will show the loss of revenue upon these few items.

IMPORTS from Foreign Countries that will enjoy most favoured nation treatment for twelve months based on returns for nine months.

—	Special Tariff.	Reduction of duty.	Amount of loss of Revenue.
	$		$ cts.
Silks and velvets	1,047,149	30 to 20 per cent	104,714 90
Ribbons	306,904	35 to 25 "	30,690 40
Laces and embroideries	58,753	35 to 27½ "	4,406 47
Proprietary medicines	1,078	50 to 25 "	269 00
Olive oil	529	20 to 15 "	26 00
Anchovies and sardines	48,864	3½ to 2cts. per lb.	9,772 00
Canned vegetables	2,938	1½ to 1c. "	146 00
	1,466,215		150,024 77
Wines under 26 per cent	42,630	30 per cent and special according to strength	12,789 00
" over 26 "	108,530	30 per cent off	32,559 00
Almonds, shelled	144,542	4 to 2⅔	9,636 00
Nuts, unshelled	91,973	3 to 2 cts.	8,277 00
	1,853,890		
Total loss of revenue on these items			213,285 00

IMPORTS, 1907—Twelve months—From France and Colonies.

—	—	Duty Reduced.	Duty Lost.
	$		$
Silks and velvets	698,904	30 to 20 per cent	69,890
Ribbons	348,644	35 to 25 "	34,864
Laces and embroideries	296,901	35 to 27½ "	22,237
Proprietary medicines	40,000	50 to 25 "	10,000
Olive oil	40,000	20 to 15 "	2,000
Books	56,000	Average reduction 7½	4,200
Anchovies and sardines	34,000	3½ to 2 cts. per lb.	7,000
Canned vegetables	67,000	1½ to 1 "	3,300
Intermediate Tariff Goods.	1,581,449		153,491
Nuts, unshelled	319,423	3 to 2 cts. per lb.	32,592
Nuts, shelled	44,431	4 to 2⅔ "	2,820
Castile soap	97,104	2 to 1 "	18,930
Special Tariff.			
Wines, non-sparkling	17,286	30 per cent	35,185
Wines, sparkling	313,197	Average of 9c. gallon	13,194
		30 per cent	93,959
	2,472,890		
Total loss of revenue on these items			350,171

These combined only amount, on the imports from France, to $2,472,890, and on those from other foreign countries to $1,853,890. Our total imports from France last year were $9,145,885 and from other foreign countries, $4,366,089. It will be seen that these items cover only from 25 to 30 per cent of the articles affected by this treaty. It is true that on the remainder of the items, which come under the intermediate tariff, the reduction of duty in most cases is less than it is under this special tariff; nevertheless, as they comprise from two-thirds to three-fourths of the total trade, the loss to the revenue will no doubt be very considerable. Now, what is the price that France pays for this loss to our revenue, running into millions of dollars? The items which

we exported to France last year, and which go in under the minimum tariff, include practically all the articles we export to France. On these items the loss of revenue to the French republic under the new treaty will be about $125,059.53. I say about, because it is absolutely impossible in some cases to tell exactly what the loss is, because the duties on goods going into France are estimated by weight, and on many of the items, such as agricultural implements, we have no data by which we can ascertain their weight or what kind of implements they were. So we have to make an estimate, and I think my estimate is a very liberal one. On agricultural implements I put it at 12 per cent. I do not think it is as high as that, not more than 10 per cent or probably less; but on the basis of 12 per cent the reduction of revenue to the French republic on agricultural implements on account of this treaty is only $46,292 for nine months. For that reduction the people of Canada are paying over half a million dollars on the selected list of articles, and an enormous amount more on other lines. So that from this point of view it seems to me that this treaty has been an unfortunate thing for Canada. I do not think it should have been thought necessary for us to forego this large amount of revenue in order to get the extremely small advantages which we secure by this treaty. In regard to our exports to France, we are gaining under the new treaty extremely small advantages over what we enjoyed under the old French treaty. Under the old treaty most of the items which we now export to France went in at the minimum rate, as they do under the new treaty. The largest item which we export to France is lobsters—$545,000 worth in nine months. Under the old treaty they went in at the same rate as they do now, so that we have gained nothing in respect to our largest item of export to France. The next largest item is agricultural implements, of which we exported to France in nine months $385,770 worth. These go in under the new treaty at a reduced rate of duty, and this, so far as I can see, is the main advantage we secure from that treaty. The next largest item is cattle, of which only $112,255 worth went into France at the minimum rate of two cents a pound; and it is not reasonable to suppose that a very large trade can be built up with France in cattle in view of the fact that France is itself an agricultural country and grows within its borders in ordinary years everything it requires for home consumption. The next largest item is wood pulp, which goes in at the same rate as under the old treaty, so that there is no gain in that. The next item is fresh apples, which go in under the same duty as before. The remainder of the items are small, not aggregating more than $15,000 or $20,000. So that it may fairly be said that whatever concessions we give under this treaty, whatever disadvantages we get from it, whatever price we pay for it, we are paying for the privilege of getting the Massey-Harris Company's implements into France and other foreign countries. When we turn to the foreign countries affected by this treaty, we find that this feature is very prominent. Our exports of agricultural implements to those foreign countries amount to one half of all the items we export to those countries, having for nine months last year amounted to $465,535. The total exports of agricultural implements to both France and these foreign countries in the nine months amounted to $851,305 out of a total export trade of about $2,000,000, or almost half of our total exports. No one in this House, I am sure, has any regret that the Massey-Harris Company or any other Canadian company manufacturing agricultural implements are able to export them to foreign countries on favourable terms. If we are going to have millionaires, I would rather have them in Canada than in any other country; but when we remember who pays for these, it is well worth our considering whether we can afford to negotiate a treaty the chief advantage of which shall be still further to enrich the multi-millionaires of this country at the expense of the hardy working people engaged in the various industries which will be benefited by this treaty.

Let us for a moment consider the disadvantages which are going to accrue from this treaty to the industries of this country. I find that one of the largest items of our imports from France is canned vegetables—$65,000 worth. Surely the farmers of this country can provide all the vegetables required for canning purposes in this country. Every dollar's worth of these goods that come into this country is going to that extent to take away from the profits and advantages that accrue from a market at home to the farmers of the Dominion of Canada. More than that, these imported vegetables from France—and I think included in that item are probably canned peas—are coloured, disguised and adulterated in many cases to a degree that makes it impossible for the Canadian products to compete with them on fair and equal terms; and if this treaty goes into effect, I sincerely trust that the government will take the most stringent means to prevent the introduction into this country of canned vegetables, or canned articles of any kind —canned fruits are probably included under this item—that will not pass the test of the Adulterated Foods Act of this country. I have small hopes that that will be the case. We have on our statutes a very fair adulterated foods Act but it is absolutely a dead letter. The only result of that Act is that bulletins are issued frequently, printed at the expense of this country, and filed away, and anybody who wants to see

them can do so. Further than that, I fail to see what benefit this country is deriving from the Adulterated Foods Act. On the shelves of every grocery store are articles of food adulterated and no steps are taken to prevent their sale and if those canned vegetables that come from France are treated with the same deference as are other canned vegetables, they will be a great detriment to the Canadian industry of canning as well as to our farmers.

The next item of importance is one which the treaty will damage to a serious extent—the wine industry of this country. The grape growing industry of Canada has become one of very large proportions. During the last few years it has increased very rapidly. In 1903 we had 14,000 acres of grapes planted in Ontario, and it is now estimated that we have an acreage in all probability, of 18,000 or 20,000 acres. These on an average turn out from two and a half to three tons per acre. Various estimates are made of the products. Let me give an extremely conservative estimate. Let me say, for instance, that we have only 14,000 acres of grapes in bearing at present and that the total yield does not exceed 40,000 tons. What are the results? The fruit growers, who have studied the question very thoroughly, have estimated the product at 60,000 tons. But estimating the products of our vineyards at 40,000 tons and the loss at $10 a ton, the amount of loss it is fair to assume would accrue would be $400,000. It must be borne in mind that the price of the grape is set by the price the wine manufacturers pay. These manufacturers consume about one-third of the crop, and the price they pay for that one-third establishes the price for the whole product. During the past season grape growers got the enormous price of one cent and a half a pound, or $30 a ton, which is the best price they have had for many years. At that price grape growing is profitable. I can remember when the price was as low as $12 a ton, but there was then an absolute loss. The industry is now on a good paying basis and is capable of indefinite expansion, but there is no gold mine in it even at $30 per ton since a poor crop occasionally comes along, and as it takes $30 every year on an average for expenses per acre, it will be seen there is no great room to reduce the price and carry on this industry profitably. We have the soil and the climate and can grow to perfection all the grapes this country can possibly require even with a population of from 30,000,000 to 40,000,000. But that industry will receive a blow from this treaty which will set it back for years to come. The duty on French wines, under the first treaty, was reduced. The thirty per cent ad valorem on sparkling wine was taken off and it was also taken off on non-sparkling wine below twenty-six degrees. Our wine manufacturers were able, even with that reduction, to go on paying our growers a satisfactory price, but now when we have this sweeping reduction of thirty per cent ad valorem taken off the non-sparkling wines, which is the kind produced in Canada—those above as well as those below twenty-six degrees proof spirits—and in addition, what is perhaps the most dangerous item in the schedule, namely, ten cents a gallon off the small amount of twenty-five cents a gallon on wine which is of a degree below twenty, that is a reduction which is going to have a very serious effect. That is the degree of strength which the wines made in Canada are nearly all composed of, so that a sweeping reduction has been made on the very article that is made in Canada and which comes into competition with the imported article. If the ministers had agreed to take the duty off some other grade of wine, that would have been better. Or if it was absolutely necessary to secure a freer entry for Massey-Harris agricultural implements, they could have compensated for this by giving a further reduction on some article which did not affect an important industry in this country. But to have picked out such an important industry as this and then selected the very item of all the items in that schedule of wine, that most seriously affects the fruit-growers, seems to me an offence absolutely unpardonable. I estimate the loss at $10 a ton in this way. It takes about, I understand, ten pounds of grapes to make a gallon of wine, and the wine manufacturers estimate the manufacture in this country at about 2,000,000 gallons of wine. That 2,000,000 gallons of wine will be reduced in value ten cents a gallon which amounts to $200,000, that is estimating the quantity of grapes which the wine makers use. But upon the total product of the vineyards, that would amount to $800,000. I do not therefore estimate, when I put the loss at $400,000, that the grape growers will be asked to pay the whole loss. Possibly the wine manufacturers may be able to stand part of it by reducing their profits. Possibly the consumers may find it absolutely necessary to pay the grape growers a portion of their loss, because if the grape growers reduce the price of the grapes by the total loss, which will be $20 a ton, they will bring the price down to such a point that consumption will increase to such an extent as to have the effect of raising the price. Therefore, a fair estimate would be that the grape growers will sustain a loss of $10 a ton of $400,000. That is a big price to pay for the entry of our agricultural implements into a foreign country at a reduced rate. Let us see how the case stands as regards our agricultural implement manufacturers, because if they gain enough by the change, I shall be satisfied. But what is the amount they will gain? The export to foreign countries for nine months is, as I have said, $465,000 and

to France $385,000. A fair estimate of the advantage to our agricultural implement makers in their trade with France will be $46,000 in nine months, or, say, $60,000 in a year. What is it in respect of foreign countries, I cannot estimate not knowing the difference between the minimum and maximum tariffs of these countries. But, assuming it to be as great—though I feel sure it is not—as in the case of France, the total advantage to our agricultural implements would be not more than $150,000 a year. Thus you will see that the gain to our agricultural implement makers is offset nearly three for one by the loss to the growers of grapes of Canada. This is the greatest objection I have to this treaty—that it strikes at two of the natural industries of this country, industries that are carried on with great advantage to the people. It will deal a very severe blow, if not a death-blow, to one important industry, causing a loss which will amount to many times over any gain than can possibly be got through the existence of this treaty.

Now, I know it will be a great advantage to Mr. Harris, who is going to contest the constituency of Brantford, to have this amount of money conveniently drop into his pocket. I know that Mr. Harris will be able to put up a stronger fight than he otherwise might against my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) beside me. Notwithstanding this enormous advantage on the part of his opponent, however, I feel sure that my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) will come back after the next election to represent still the good city of Brantford.

Mr. PATERSON. Will it not help the Cockshutts as well as the Harrises ?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I am told that the Cockshutts do not export agricultural implements to France.

Mr. PATERSON. Do they not? I think you are mistaken.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. There is another feature of this matter that has struck me with great force, that is, how it came to pass that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) did not raise his voice in council against the introduction of these adulterated wines. How does it come that he, the presumed champion of the prohibitionists, sat in council and permitted the admission into this country of these wines at these enormously reduced rates? I marvel that his voice was not stronger in the council. We have always thought of the hon. gentleman, especially when he was down in Stanstead at the last election, as the champion of prohibition. But he sits in council and permits his fellow ministers to open the flood-gates to allow the importation into this country not only of wines, but adulterated brandy—for, I understand, that one of the items permits the importation of adulterated brandy at reduced rates. Even had he been willing to admit pure brandy we might not have been so much surprised, but when he allows the adulterated article to come in at a reduced rate, our surprise can hardly be expressed.

So whether you look at it from the point of view of the loss of revenue or the disadvantage to the industries of the country, or from the moral standpoint, this treaty stands for condemnation. So far as I am concerned, if I have the opportunity, I shall vote against it, holding up both hands. Evidently the Canadian representatives went to France determined to bring back a treaty. When the astute diplomats of France found them in that frame of mind, they soon came to the conclusion that if they treated our representatives nicely, dined them and wined them and took good care of them while they were there, they would be properly able to skin them before they came back to this country. And I am bound to say they did. It will cost us $10 of good Canadian money for every dollar's worth of goods we get under it. This is said to be the first treaty ever negotiated by Canadian plenipotentiaries. Well, all I can say is that if this is a sample of the treaty that Canadian plenipotentiaries are going to negotiate in the future, I, for one, will be in favour of having our treaties negotiated by British plenipotentiaries.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). I think it a great pity that one or other of the ministers who had so much to do with the negotiation of the treaty have not said anything with regard to what has been set forth by my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith).

Mr. LENNOX. They said it all outside.

Mr. LANCASTER. But this is the proper place to say it, if they have anything to say. I am bound to say that my hon. friend from Wentworth has been very moderate in his denunciations of this treaty in the interests of the fruit growers of Canada. Coming as the hon. gentleman does from a county whose main industry is fruit growing, he is very moderate indeed. I should be inclined to go further than he does and say more emphatically that the fruit growers of the Dominion of Canada are practically paying for the sake of having this treaty. At present the bulk of the fruit growing industry is in the Niagara district and the counties of Essex and Kent. But having some knowledge of the province of Ontario, I venture to say that, if this industry were properly taken care of, if it were given any such chance as other industries are given, the whole of southern Ontario in a few years would be employed in growing fruit, including semi-tropical fruits, such as grapes and peaches. Some reason ought to have been given for this enormous

payment, as it were, made by the fruit-growers of Ontario that these plenipotentiaries might come back here with a treaty —some reason should be given why this industry should be called upon to pay the piper. It is very well to say that we want a treaty. I do not know that we want a treaty if it is not going to do us any good. Of course, we want to be friendly with France and with every other nation, but a good neighbour is one who will do his duty to you and does not demand that you should give up your rights for him. Our first duty in treaty-making is to ourselves. In the 'Times' newspaper of London, England, in the issue of February 7, I find the following, headed 'The Treaty with Canada':

The report on the Franco-Canadian treaty of September 19, presented to the Chamber of Deputies by M. Jules Siegfried, member for Havre, in the name of the Customs Committee, has just been issued as a parliamentary paper. M. Siegfried concludes in favour of the ratification of the treaty, as it leaves France free to do as she likes in the revision of her tariffs.

That is what the London 'Times' understands the French people believe the effect of this treaty to be. If we have not bound France at all, why should we be tied by France? Even if we have made a bad bargain, we do not know if we can hold them to it.

He has no doubt that the new arrangement will develop trade between the two countries. French exports will be stimulated by the lowering of the duties on French products. On the other hand, many Canadian products will profit by the French minimum tariff,——

My hon. friend (Mr. E. D. Smith) has said what these Canadian products are—that they are practically confined to one industry.

--but France has agreed to no permanency in the rate of this tariff. M. Siegfried does not believe that the increased sale of Canadian products in France can do any serious harm to French agriculture or industry.

Taking it on the whole, I think he has well said that he may well congratulate himself, and that the increased sale of Canadian products 'can do no serious harm to French agriculture or industry.' Mr. E. D. Smith has given statistics with reference to the importance and extent of the grape growing industry in this country. I have here one of many petitions sent to the Minister of Finance in this matter by local and provincial fruit growers' associations. This is from the Fruit Growers' Association of the township of Louth, in the county of Lincoln. I understand that Mr. Smith has a whole bundle of such petitions, all practically to the same effect, and for the benefit of the House I propose to read this petition from the township of Louth as a sample of the opinion of the fruit growers. The resolution reads:

At a meeting of the Louth Fruit Growers' Association, held in the Grange Hall, Louth, on Saturday, January 11, and at which a large number of fruit growers were present, the following resolution was introduced and passed unanimously:—

Moved by Frank Blaikie, seconded by John H. Brodrick,

Whereas, the members of this association and who are large producers of grapes and who have invested a large amount of money in the planting and cultivation of vineyards to meet the extensive and growing demand for their product by the wine manufacturers for the manufacturing of wine, have learned with alarm of the proposal to allow the entry of a class of wine that will come in direct competition with the standard of wine produced in this country at a greatly reduced duty, and feeling strongly that the business of grape growing in this country is being jeopardized thereby; humbly pray that the clauses referring to the reduction of duty on light French wines be not ratified.

(Signed) A. CRAISE,
President.
A. C. GREGORY,
Secretary.

To the Hon. W. S. Fielding,
Minister of Finance,
Dominion of Canada.

To show the Minister of Finance that there are no politics in this matter, I may say that the mover of this resolution is a Liberal of the old school who says what he means, and the seconder is an old Conservative of the same character. The president of the association is a Liberal of the old school and the secretary a staunch Conservative.

The people of southern Ontario have made grape growing in that region practically what wheat growing is in the Northwest Territories. Destroy the fruit growing industry in southern Ontario and you will reduce the value of the holdings of these people by from 50 per cent to 75 per cent. I have lived in that district for some twenty years, but I can remember farms that were worth at that time $50 to $60 an acre that are now worth $200 an acre because of the grape growing industry, and my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) says that the same thing applies on the north side of the lake. I apprehend that although the Minister of Agriculture is still in the cabinet, we are not going to have the use of wines in Canada prevented. We must take it for granted that we are to have light wines, and if we are to have them every effort should have been made to assist the people of Canada to grow the grapes and manufacture the wines. The class who will lose most heavily by reason of this treaty are the owners of the soil, the growers of the grapes. As Mr. Smith has said, the grape grower must sell from one-half to one-third of his product to the wine manufacturer. If he grew only the one class of grapes, they would all ripen in the same week and he could not market them in a businesslike way, so he must grow a table

grape for general sale and a large proportion of wine grapes for sale to the wine manufacturers. If you prevent the sale of grapes to the wine manufacturer, we would have to use, to a great extent, imported grapes, as the grower would be forced out of the growing of certain varieties. No one seems to have thought of the Canadian grape growing industry in connection with the negotiating of this treaty. It may be that the juice of the French grapes was so good to these gentlemen when they were engaged in the negotiations that they thought that no grape in Canada would have juice worth considering. Had they inquired as to the money invested in the industry in Canada they would have found that there are to-day many people earning their living in that line of industry, with a probability of twice as many unless their business is interfered with as this treaty interferes with it.

Why should we give up $5 to $10 of revenue for every dollar lost by France, and at the same time take that $5 or $10 practically all out of one industry? As Mr. Smith has said, the loss of revenue will be approximately $350,000, and this loss will be at the expense of one Canadian industry. Let them grow wheat in the west, where they can grow it well; let them grow apples in northern Ontario; let them carry on mixed farming in northern Ontario, Quebec, Manitoba and other sections; but when we have a part of Canada—the southern portion of Ontario—where people can make a living on fifteen or twenty acres by grape growing, whereas formerly they required to use one hundred acres to make an inferior living, why should that state of affairs be interfered with simply, as my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) states, for the sake of making a treaty with France? Why should it not be considered that the grape growers and the wine-making industry deserved protection and consideration? There is no answer given, there is no reason assigned for it, and I can only assume that the matter was entirely forgotten. Now, I hope it was not because neither of the two gentlemen who negotiated the treaty was an Ontario man. I apprehend that they are Canadians, that they endeavoured to do what was best, but they might have taken that into consideration, or they might have asked somebody to give them advice in regard to what the effect upon the province of Ontario might be with reference to this matter, and if they thought that there was some reason for making this great sacrifice at the expense of the fruit growers, they could certainly have given us that reason. From the fact that they have not done so, I apprehend that they did not think of it at all, and that therefore the treaty was framed in that way just for no other reason whatever than the hurry and necessity of making a treaty of some kind.

There is one thing that I can suggest. I know it will be said: Well, the bargain is made and this talk of yours and of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) is useless except in so far as you are using it as a condemnation. But, there may yet be some chance to cure the matter by adopting a proper inspection and putting a strict and rigid construction upon the terms of the treaty. If they were to put upon the words they have used in this statute a very extreme construction, or if they were to apply a rigid inspection, it might yet remedy part of the evil. They might say that some of the wines that might come in under this treaty are not within the meaning of the language used. What I mean is that there will be a lot of contaminated, badly made wines, not the pure juice of the grape, such as is produced in Lincoln, or Welland, or at Pelee Island, or at other places in southern Ontario, which will be brought into competition, under this treaty, if it is construed at all liberally towards France, with a lot of very dangerous—I might say poisonous wines, taking the place of and putting out of business the honest wines of Canada. I know that you cannot undo the bargain you have made with France. It is not like a tariff matter where you could move to take the matter out of committee and consider it, as you did in regard to the duty on fruit last year at the instance of my hon. friend from Wentworth who gave you such excellent advice as to the way in which you were going to injure fruit growers in the matter of the tariff. The government might take it out of committee and consider and change it if it were a matter of tariff, but I know they cannot change the wording used because a treaty has another party to it who has to be consulted and I apprehend, that, having made a treaty and such a good one for the French nation France will not agree to change it. But there is a chance yet. If this government wished to do some measure of justice to the grape growing industry of southern Ontario let them put such a construction upon the language, without changing the language of the treaty, that these wines which would otherwise come into competition under this treaty, with the native manufactured wines of Ontario, would be kept out to a great extent. If you are not careful in the way that you do construe it, if you do not put some strict and rigid construction on these words, you are going to have a most dangerous kind of cheap wine come in here, not pure, no virtue in it, except that of cheapness which is not a virtue unless it is pure and you are going to put it out of the power of Canadians to buy their own pure, cheap wines and make them buy adulterated wines from France which are not good for them besides which they are putting out of business their fellow citizens of Ontario who can furnish them with a pure article and at the same time prosper, as they have a right to prosper, in their own country. I

therefore urge upon the government that as they have apparently—accidentally, if you like—carelessly—perhaps I should not say so—at all events, in some way which is at present not quite understandable—done this injustice to the grape growers and the wine manufacturers of Canada, they ought to at least do all they can, by the construction that they put upon the language governing the introduction of these wines which are to be allowed in here at the reduced rates of duty which have been mentioned by my hon. friend from Wentworth, to keep out as far as possible these wines that come into competition with people in Canada engaged in the grape growing industry.

I am not going to take up the time of the House with any more extended remarks upon the matter. It is a very serious matter indeed to the industry I have mentioned. I can only deplore, with my hon. friend from Wentworth, that some consideration was not given to their rights at the time the treaty was made and I am sorry to say that I think the government will find, when the voters in these parts of the country get a chance to say anything about it at the polls, that they will indicate their view when they mark their ballots, in a way that will not be very complimentary to the government unless they do find some way, either by construction or inspection of the wine brought into Canada, to remove the injustice which they have done to this native industry.

Mr. J. C. WALSH (Montreal, St. Anne). Mr. Speaker, I heard my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) a few moments ago, read an extract from the 'Times'. This statement was supposed to have been founded upon a report made by Mr. Siegfried. I have that report in my hands at the present moment. It is a report made in the name of the customs commission charged with the duty of examining the Bill concerning the French treaty. The particular item to which my hon. friend has referred is to be found at page 20 and it reads as follows :

To resume, whilst giving our minimum tariff on a certain number of articles, we preserve absolutely the right to modify our general tariff and our minimum tariff if we deem it advisable, it being well understood that we shall always accord to Canada on these articles the conditions that would be extended to a favoured nation.

It adds, and that is what my hon. friend did not add, that :

Canada shall enjoy the same privilege.

My hon friend has not given the House a complete statement and his source of information has not been correct. The statement was of a nature to lead this House into error had it been accepted without any contradiction.

Mr. LANCASTER. I read all that is in the 'Times'.

Mr. J. C. WALSH. It will teach my hon. friend that the sources of information should be diligently sought for in order that no question may be raised as to their authoritative character. I do not accuse my hon. friend of bad faith—far from it—but I mean to say simply that his statements are not correct as I have shown here by quoting from page 20 of this report. To go farther, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give some additional extracts from this report made by Mr. Siegfried.

Our exports are principally expensive goods and goods of a light nature, such as books and paper, fruit, chemical products, gloves, skins and other things, whereas the importations from Canada are of a totally different nature, consisting of stuffs largely in a raw state and not highly finished in the process of manufacture.

This gentleman further says :

The convention of 1893 has certainly served its purpose and we should not do it the injustice of forgetting the circumstances under which it rendered us service. We cannot expect a treaty which has only ten articles in its schedule to exert any great influence on the commerce of the two countries, but we must remember that if such a treaty did not exist we would have to arrange some other one.

The hon. gentlemen of the opposition who have spoken, have every one of them, asserted that this treaty is one-sided and that it gives advantages to France without securing any quid pro quo for Canada. But the hon. gentleman who makes this report to the French chamber says :

Therefore, from the standpoint of the tariffs, the arrangement now under review gives advantages to France ; and yet it has been the subject of several criticisms.

It will therefore be seen that this same treaty has been the subject of like criticism in France from the French point of view, that it has received in this House. But, my hon. friends opposite have not been sincere in their remarks; they denounce this treaty in every possible fashion but they have offered no suggestion for its improvement, and indeed each one of them contradicts the other which may tend to show that they are not consistent in their criticisms of the treaty. The hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) told us this afternoon that the schedule did not matter to the people of the west, but the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) took a great deal of time and pains to explain the difficulties which the schedule would give rise to and to what extent it was injurious to this country. My hon. riend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) told us that the port of St. John would benefit by the treaty and that the clause concerning direct shipments was a good one, but the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) took an entirely different view.

Mr. DANIEL. I did not refer to the port of St. John; the French Canadian line does not come to the port of St. John but to Halifax.

Mr. J. C. WALSH. But my hon. friend was in favour of giving the advantage to our own ports.

Mr. DANIEL. Oh, yes.

Mr. J. C. WALSH. That is sufficient for my argument which is that my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) was favouring the clause providing for direct shipments while my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) was opposed to it. In view of this, I think one can fairly charge these hon. gentlemen with not being sincere. Now, as to the contention with regard to the diplomatic standing of Canada in arranging this treaty, that after all is more or less a matter of procedure, and has nothing to do with the material advantages which we may gain from the treaty itself. The point in reference to that was raised by the hon. gentleman from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who though he saw in the acts of the ministers who negotiated the treaty an effort to gain some personal or political kudos, and he alleged that treaties had been similarly negotiated at other times, to which the ministers of the Crown answered that this French treaty marked an epoch in the history of our diplomacy. I need not go into the merits of that argument, it is sufficient for me to know that we have a treaty which I believe will benefit Canadian trade. I need only cite the Montreal 'Gazette' to show that the trade of Canada has increased in ten years from $234,000,000 to $571,000,000; we know that our country is making wonderful progress; we know that our fertile plains are being settled and cultivated, we know that production in agriculture and manufactures is increasing and we know that we need markets for these products. It is natural that we should look to France under conditions such as these. We had certain commercial treaty relations with that country before and we knew that the existing treaty was obsolete. We believed indeed that the old treaty restricted us where we should not be restricted; we found that under it we had not been accorded the favoured nation clause; that we did not stand on an equal footing with France as regards this question of direct shipments; that they could raise their duties while we could not do so, and we found also that thirty other nations had obtained certain concessions from France which we were not possessed of. It was natural then that Canada should look to the markets of France for the disposal of the products of her fisheries, of her agriculture, and of her industries. France is receiving imports to the value of 285,000,000 of francs every year. The United States had sent to France $25,000,000 worth of exports including such things as agricultural implements, wheat, carriages, bicycles, fruit, furs, sewing machines, typewriters, leather, lumber, and many other things which we have to sell, and it was a natural thing that Canada should seek to get some of the French trade in these very articles which she has to dispose of. We went to France and we obtained favoured treatment on a limited number of articles, but that is all we required, for we were not in a position to export any other commodities. As a matter of fact some of the hon. gentlemen opposite have been criticising the ministers for having allowed too many articles to be placed on the schedule. It is true that my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) said that the previous treaty with France was obsolete and that it would be necessary to remedy it, but still in his criticism of the new treaty he refrained from suggesting a single article which it would be desirable to include and which was not included. The hon. gentleman seemed to think he had discharged his full duty by simply finding fault. And these hon. gentlemen opposite have been stating that we have received no special favours from France, while as a matter of fact the gentlemen who made their report to the French chamber did not see that there were any advantages either on one side or the other. Let us consider exactly what we ought to obtain in a treaty such as this. On the articles included in it France has given us her minimum tariff and she has given no better to any other nation, while on our side we could not afford to give our lowest tariff which is the British preference. Can we complain that France has given to us just what she has given to other countries with which she has made commercial treaties? Let us remember that if by any chance France was to give Canada a special favour she would be compelled to extend that special favour to the other nations with which she has these treaties, and in the end Canada would enjoy no stability in her relations with France because every year her tariffs with respect to other nations would be changing and we never would know exactly where we were.

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and many other hon. gentlemen during the course of this debate have dwelt upon the unfavourable balance of trade between Canada and France which exists in this country. Their objection is based on the mercantile theory of the middle ages, which consisted in the belief that the most successful trade would show, after many transactions, a money return due from the foreign country to the exporting country. This theory prevailed when money was considered to be wealth. Nowadays, what difference does it make whether we pay for our imports in money or in products, since that money is derived from our export of

products? I see no disadvantage in an unfavourable balance of trade, because I deny the statement that we can derive no advantage from things which we obtain and that it is only the things from which we part that we may derive an advantage; for as soon as our importations exceeded the proper amount, there would be a scarcity of money in this country, our money having to be sent abroad to pay for them, and this scarcity of money would in turn produce a fall in prices, and discourage further importations. Again, let us take the alternative. If prices were low, money being scarce, other countries would buy from us and this demand for our products would cause prices to gradually rise again until there would be an equilibrium.

There are many indirect advantages to be derived from this treaty. It will stimulate dormant energies in our people, and lead to the investment of capital and the development of inventiveness. It will bring them into close touch with other nations, by which they can always learn something of advantage. The hon. member for North Toronto takes exception to the fact that we do not know who our competitors are in the French market. It seems to me that that is of very little consequence. All we desire is to get in there. We know that there is a certain amount of money waiting for us in that market. When we know that we are going to be placed on an equal footing with thirty-five other nations, and that there are purchasers there to buy the goods we bring, it matters not who our competitors are. Again, what matters the difference in tariffs as between Canada and France? Granted for the moment that the difference between our intermediate tariff and our general tariff is somewhat large, and that the difference between the minimum and the general tariff of France is exceedingly small, my hon. friend from North Toronto endeavoured to show that we gave France a great reduction in our tariff. What matters it if we reduce our tariff here? It makes absolutely no difference to France whether we reduce our tariff or not, for the simple reason that as soon as we get into the market of France on the same footing as other nations, we will not be competing with France, but we will compete with other nations, and then it becomes a question of the survival of the fittest. As regards France, it makes no difference to her whether our scale of duties is lowered or not. We protect our own producers, and we protect British producers by the preferential tariff. France cannot compete with them nor with us in our market; but France competes with other nations, and the rate of duty makes absolutely no difference to her.

Some exception has been taken to certain articles and clauses of this treaty. It was only natural for the ministers to provide for possible trade in the future in a treaty which was probably to last for the next ten years. Some of our hon. friends have referred to our exports of different articles, and have contended that the treaty gives us no advantage with respect to them. Horses and cattle were mentioned, although horses are imported into France to the amount of 11,000,000 francs, and cattle to the amount of 9,000,000 francs. If we do not send many horses and cattle to France now, why should we not hope to do so later? Canned meats were mentioned, and the only reason given why they were not exported in larger quantities was that our transportation facilities were not sufficient for this class of goods. That is not a fault in the treaty, but in our system of transportation, which may be remedied. Fish was also mentioned; but we send fish from British Columbia to Boston; why should we not send it also to France? France has no fish, while we have the finest fish products in the world, and why should we not hope later on to build up a trade in fish with France? The same is true of cheese. There may be difficulties in regard to that. The hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) referred to cheese as a product which could not be exported to France at present, and I find from the compilation of the Montreal 'Gazette' that the reason for that is that we cannot keep up with the home consumption. We may be able later to export coal, when we have sufficient labour to produce it. Then, with regard to agricultural implements, notwithstanding the statement that it may be advantageous to the Massey-Harris Company to send these goods to foreign nations, it is advantageous to Canada also, and we hope we shall continue to have that advantage. Reference was made to fruits and to the fact that we have not adequate facilities for exporting them, that we need more ships with cold storage compartments, and so forth; but we ourselves import fruits from Italy which we can use to advantage, and the United States sent last year $200,000 worth of fruit probably greater distances than we would have to send ours; and our fruits would be sent by a more northern route. Reference is also made to our grain. We have the granary of the world; we are in a position to supply all other nations; and because there happens to be no difference between the two tariffs of France on grain, I see no reason why grain should not be provided for in the treaty as a measure of precaution.

My hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) attacked the ministers for reducing the revenue and tried to show that this country is going absolutely to ruin because as he claims something has been done detrimental to our wine producing interests. Well, I think my hon. friend is wrong in his premises. He might just as well attack the government for having granted the

British preference, which has made still greater reductions in our tariff and which has by no means been followed by the ruin he anticipates from the present instance. We have had the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) and the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) endeavouring to show that because the duties have been lowered on certain classes of leather from 17½ per cent to 15 per cent, on ribbons from 35 per cent to 25 per cent, and on millinery, our manufacturers in these lines are going to be ruined because they will not be able to withstand the foreign competition, but after dilating on this question they proceeded to argue that no such result could possibly follow because the clause in the treaty requiring direct shipments to come through Canadian ports was absolutely going to fetter this trade. Well, the view I take is that it is not ourselves but the other fellow whom we are fettering. Our ministers, although they were not asked by the French ministers to insert that clause in the treaty, took a page from the French book and had it inserted. In this they did simply what the United States continually does as regards direct shipments to its ports whenever possible and what the French government also does in like circumstances. I should say that it is rather to the credit of our ministers that they had sufficient foresight to take a page from the book of France. Our hon. friends took up the position that because we made this restriction in favour of our own ports, we should be met with reprisals. Again they took the pessimistic view. Perdition and ruin were facing us on every side. They say that the United States will undertake reprisals, but if they do, it can only be because they stand to lose by this clause, and what they are going to lose we are bound to gain. Besides reprisals are of two sorts. We may injure the United States directly or indirectly. A man in business who enlarges his own trade is no doubt thereby doing some injury to his neighbour who is competing against him in the same line. But he is not thereby attacking his neighbour. He may draw trade away from him, but he is not attacking him directly, and no man has reason to find fault with another for trying to increase his own business. That is all we are trying to do. If incidentally we happen to injure our neighbours the United States, we are sorry for them, but the gain we experience will no doubt to a certain extent alleviate that sorrow. No doubt, however unsatisfactory that may be to my hon. friends opposite, their loss will be to our advantage. But how can my hon. friends maintain that this clause affecting direct shipments is going to divert trade from its natural line? I should say that it will have just the opposite effect. Why, this country is spending millions yearly to send our trade down the St. Lawrence and through our ports in the lower provinces, and in doing this we claim that we are sending it along its natural lines. It matters little to me what port our policy may benefit so long as it be a Canadian port and so long as our trade is thereby sent through our own arteries. How can my hon. friends reconcile the position they take on this matter with their support of steamship subsidies? It would be foolish to pay these subsidies unless for the purpose of bringing trade through our own lines, and if thereby we are diverting it from its natural channels, our hon. friends should oppose any policy which will promote the development of our own railways and our own waterways. But the fact cannot be denied that our St. Lawrence route is the most natural and the most feasible route and that everything that we can do to prevent trade from being diverted into foreign routes is to the advantage of the country at large. Let us then do all we can to have our imports and exports pass through our own Canadian ports and thus follow the example set by the United States with regard to their own ports. But my hon. friends say that we have an insufficiency of carriers and they ask how then are we going to handle this trade. It seems to me that they are putting the cart before the horse. It seems to me that the first thing to do is to supply the trade and then we may rest assured that the carriers will follow. It is not a question of building carriers before we have freights in our ports to warrant the expenditure on their construction. What country is going first to build carriers and then wait for freights? The cargoes must be on our docks and then the carriers will come to take them away. In fact when there is an insufficiency of carriers, that indicates that our commerce is increasing, and instead of being an argument against taking every step to still further increase it, it ought to be an argument to the contrary. Let the trade grow and we can make our minds easy about the supply of carriers. To my mind this French treaty is a very hopeful beginning. It will give us an opportunity of building up a very profitable trade between two countries, and I think it is a source of congratulation for every Canadian that our ministers, although they were dealing with keen-witted Frenchmen, were able to meet them on their own ground. We must not always consider outsiders abler than our own men. I do not deny that distance lends enchantment to the view; I do not deny that a country with a greater population may be expected to produce a greater number of great men than does Canada. But Canada may fairly expect to develop men as great as those in other countries. In fact, she has already done so. Where, for instance, shall we look for a greater inventor than Bell, to whom we owe the telephone? There is no reason to belittle our own men in order to give greater

prominence to those at a distance. Especially is such a thing to be deprecated when it takes the form of such attempts at belittlement as that of hon. gentlemen in this House when they speak of pæans of praise, and jubilations of the party press from coast to coast, and the floating of red bunting. The red seems to have aroused these gentlemen to increasing anger. But what seemed to worry these hon. gentlemen most was the acclamation with which the people greeted these ministers when they returned. The people instinctively felt that the position of Canada had been improved, and their insight into the real facts of the case enables them to turn aside the point of a specious argument, such as those we hear from critics of the government in the discussion of this treaty.

Mr. E. PAQUET (L'Islet) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, Canada, that immense country separated, on the one hand from Great Britain by the expanse of the Atlantic, and on the other from Japan by the waters of the Pacific, possesses the greatest agricultural, forest, mineral and maritime resources. The peoples who have built up confederation descend from the two most illustrious races of the Christian era, and have achieved unexpected success in Northern America. We have established and developed our transportation system in order to increase our home and foreign trade. Under the vigilant and fostering eye of Great Britain, we have conquered the right to regulate our custom tariff, and, in a certain measure, to conclude our own trade arrangements. We are anxious to open up new channels for our trade, new markets for our products. I have considered with care the recent Franco-Canadian treaty. That trade convention is not perfect, but I believe its effects will be to develop in quite a large measure our trade relations with France, our old mother country, whose noble deeds are recorded on every page of modern history. That new tariff will favour the opening up of new ocean routes, as well as the coming in of French capital and French immigration. France has granted trade facilities to many European nations; but on the free soil of America, Canada has been one of the first to enjoy the privileges of the French minimum tariff. I am happy, moreover, to acknowledge the striking recognition of our fiscal autonomy implied in the concluding of this treaty. Between the years 1608 and 1760, the French Canadians were intimately associated with the commercial glory and the financial calamities of France. Between the years 1760 and 1845, the Canadians were practically cut off from any intercourse with the French nation. In 1845, F. X. Garneau published his history of Canada, an imposing monument in honour of the French Canadian nationality. In that philosophical and historical work, the author made known our origins, our feelings, our energy, our fight for political freedom, our business talents, and made a deep impression on the minds of French thinkers, writers, economists and statesmen.

Messrs. H. Martin, Ampère, Rameau were moved at reading this great historical work of Garneau, and visited Canada. But it was thought desirable to strike the minds of French business men as well, in order to bring about closer trade relations with France. Accordingly, in 1855, Canada sent representatives to the Paris universal exposition, where we obtained awards worthy of a great nation. Let me quote the following words from C. Robin :

From a business standpoint, Mr. Taché, the representative of Canada at the Paris exposition, has very ably set forth the advantages which both countries may reap from the establishment of continued trade relations, and that campaign will bear its fruits. The fine products exhibited by Canada are sure warrant of that.

The French authorities were desirous of knowing what were our resources, our various products. They lost no time in sending to Quebec Mr. de Belvèze, commander of La Capricieuse, for the purpose of establishing trade relations between France and Canada.

The outcome of Mr. de Belvèze's mission, writes Turcotte, was the establishment of a general consulate in Canada and the amendment of the French tariff so as to permit the introduction in France of lumber and ships from Canada. In 1859 the Baron Gauldrée-Boilleau came to Quebec in the capacity of French consul general. Heretofore, France had not been in the habit of buying Canadian products, and the small quantities of goods which she supplied to Canadians reached us in a roundabout way.

Mr. H. Fabre, our representative in France, wrote on the date of October 1, in the ' Paris-Canada ':

The first attempt at trade conventions between Canada and France date back to 1858. A draft treaty was then worked out between Mr. Gauldrée-Boilleau, consul general of France, and Mr. Galt, Minister of Finance, and is thus contemporaneous with the establishment of the French consulate of Canada.

Sir A. Chapleau made a special study of our financial and trade relations with France. He substantially contributed to the successful conclusion of the commercial treaty signed in 1893 and ratified in 1894. That treaty was an important one. Mr. Fabre writes :

On taking Mr. Galt's place as High Commissioner of Canada in England, Sir Charles Tupper resumed the negotiations which brought about the treaty of 1893-94, still in force. Those who might be tempted to find that treaty rather narrow should not forget that at the time it was not possible to obtain more, and that, after all, it was a decisive step in the direction in which the present

negotiators, Messrs. Fielding and Brodeur, have achieved complete success.

However, that agreement of 1893, concluded and ratified by statesmen of whom our country is proud, could not be of very great benefit to our farming community. In fact, under that agremeent only such farm products as had already undergone some manufacturing process could be exported, such as canned meats, condensed milk, preserved fruits.

A few weeks ago, the 'Bulletin de Paris' devoted to Canadian trade and progress a valuable page wherein our business activity was expounded. I shall quote the concluding lines of the article :

The share with France takes in this Canadian commerce is unfortunately not in keeping with our past relations with that colony, which at one time was ours. The bulk of Canadian exports to France consists in lobsters, agricultural implements, apples, live stock and peas. On the other hand, fine woollens, silks, diamonds in the rough, gloves, fancy canned goods, jewellery, automobiles, make up the bulk of our exports to Canada. It is still therefore the luxuries which we are the most likely to supply ; but greater efforts would be needed, and particularly more advertising, to enable us to obtain in Canada that hold on the trade which the sympathies of its inhabitants would ensure to us.

I shall now quote a few figures relating to our trade with France. They illustrate the headway made since 1894 :

Our total trade with France—	
1898	$ 5,000,613
1906	9,788,078
1907	10,903,671
French exports to Canada—	
1898	$3,975,351
1905	7,059,139
1907	9,145,885
Canadian exports to France—	
1898	$1,025,262
1906	2,120,091

The recent treaty grants the privileges of the French minimum tariff to several Canadian farm products :

Live cattle, horses, meats, fresh and salted, eggs, cheese, butter (salted), honey, lobsters, potatoes, fruit, vegetables, forage. Among the forest and mineral products which are to be admitted under the French minimum tariff, we may mention rough lumber, square lumber of a certain thickness, splints, ores, sewing machines, agricultural implements, river boats of all sizes, of wood, manufactures of asbestos, mica in sheets or flakes, articles in mica.

What are the products which we export in large quantities? I shall mention the following :

Fiscal year, 1906—	
Live stock	$ 1,306,448
Cereals	44,845,783
Hay	1,529,941
Metals and ores	35,013,945
Butter	7,045,539
Cheese	24,433,169
Eggs	495,176
Wood and manufactures of	43,331,511
Agricultural implements	2,495,104

Among the products which we exported to France in 1906, I note the following :—

Live stock	$164,330
Cereals	224,022
Metals and ores	372,601
Agriculural implements	293,536
Wood	97,670

For many years past France has adopted a national protection policy, and under the treaty ratified in 1894, we did not have access to the French market for the sale of our products of the farm, forest or mine.

France is one of the greatest commercial countries in the civilized world, and I have reason to believe that this new treaty will open a new era in the history of our trade relations with the old mother country. Our farming, lumbering and mining industries have unlimited possibilities before them in our young country. Our forests are well wooded, productive, and the object of a good deal of interest. Canada is also well provided with mineral wealth.

Statesmen in France and Canada, as well, have endeavoured to overcome all difficulties, and to pave the way for a commercial agreement, by means of mutual concessions advantageous to both countries. Thanks to the energy, the capabilities and the pregnant activity of the Canadian nation, thanks to the favourable treatment which will be extended to our products, thanks to the fine quality, variety, excellence and beauty of our productions, we shall surely find a large outlet for our goods in France, where, in 1901, imports aggregated 4,714,000,000 francs. Let me mention what the purchases of France amounted to from various countries, in 1901, according to la 'Revue Statistique,' of Paris, issue of September 22, 1902 :

	Francs.
France's imports from the U. S.	481,000,000
" " Germany	417,000,000
" " Belgium	386,000,000
" " Great Britain	667,000,000

Why should we not have our share in that trade ? In 1903, France imported from the United States 2,910,367 dollars' worth of agricultural implements, while, in 1906, she imported from Canada only 293,536 dollars' worth. In 1903, France imported from the United States 2,132,366 dollars' worth of wheat, while, in 1906, she imported from Canada for only 244,022 dollars' worth of cereals. Thanks to the favourable treatment which our goods will enjoy under the new treaty, we will be in a position to compete with the United States on the French market.

In 1901, the imports of France from the Argentine Republic amounted to $71,000,000. Why should not our exports to France reach

that figure ? Our agricultural and forest wealth is on a par with that of the Argentine Republic. I have enough faith in the capabilities of the Canadian people to be satisfied of our aptness to compete successfully with the people of South America on the French market.

Among other French products which will be admitted under our intermediate tariff, I notice medicinal preparations, patent medicines and articles for antiseptic surgical dressings. In 1906, these imports reached the amount of $227,432. The farming community and the labouring classes will not reap much benefit from the reduced rate of duty granted on imports from France. In order to show the usefulnes of this trade convention, let me quote these words of Mr. H. Lorin :

Bordering on the United States we have Canada, a country in which France should take a special interest among all others in North America, since within its limits the descendants of the French settlers of the eighteenth century have attained prominence, and are the only prolific race in that country barring the Irish. As a matter of fact, out of a total of 5,000,000 people in that country, about 2,000,000 speak our tongue and still keep a fond remembrance of the old mother-country. Such a community seems to offer very favourable conditions for our economical expansion.

I attach the greatest importance to article VIII of the convention :

To enjoy the benefits of the aforementioned tariff advantages, products originating in France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China, shall be conveyed without transhipment from a port of those territories or from a port of a territory enjoying the preferential tariff into a sea or river port of Canada.

To enjoy the benefits of the aformentioned tariff advantages, Canadian products shall be conveyed without transhipment from a Canadian port or from a port of a country enjoying the French minimum tariff to a port in France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China.

That clause, which has been so warmly discussed, is necessary, in my opinion, to ensure the future developement of our country. Let me quote the following words :

By allowing French goods shipped to Canadian ports to come under the favoured treatment clause, the Canadian shipping industry will be stimulated, new ocean routes will be established between France and Canada, we will become more independent of the United States from a commercial standpoint, and the prosperity of our Canadian ports will be ensured.

Such is also my opinion. The development and improvement of our means of transportation between France and Canada will be the necessary outcome of that treaty.

I am in favour of article VIII of that treaty, but in order to increase our trade with France, this government, the boards of trades and exporters will have to develop transportation facilities between France and Canada. Our government will assist in the development of the Franco-Canadian route by granting a contract to companies intending to promote our trade.

We have made great sacrifices for the purpose of improving our seaports, as well as our great national highway, the St. Lawrence. Our signal system has reached a high point of perfection, and the number of lighthouses has been increased. In order to better ensure the safety of navigation on the St. Lawrence, powerful lights and gas buoys have been provided. A requirement that should now be looked after, is the building at the foot of the old city of Champlain of deep water wharfs with all modern facilities. The government, on the other hand, should not delay building at St. Joseph de Lévis a dry dock to meet the needs of the shipping community. I must congratulate my friend from Lévis on his efforts towards insuring the success of this national undertaking.

The unceasing efforts of business men both in France and Canada will henceforth be the only condition necessary to bring about satisfactory results. The enacting of the preferential tariff clause in favour of British goods seems to have had considerable effect on the development of the Anglo-Canadian trade. To meet the requirements of our trade with England, new means of transatlantic transportation have been provided and developed. Let me mention here those magnificent steamers of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which are a credit to the business capabilities of our young Dominion. I am in keeping with the teaching of our past history when I say that the granting of a favoured treatment to imports from France will have the effect of considerably increasing our trade with that country.

Then again, the increase of our trade with England and the development of the transportation facilities between Great Britain and Canada have had the effect of bringing here a larger number of immigrants from the mother country. In 1902, we received 14,739 immigrants from the British Isles; in 1906, that number had reached 91,263. In my humble opinion, an increase in the number of French immigrants will follow the development of the trade between the two countries. French Canadians are anxious to induce French capital and French immigration to come to this country. Extensive commercial intercourse is a valuable aid towards this end.

Our commercial agents in France should be more active. They should establish in the cities shops for the distribution of our

products of the farm, the forest and the mine. These products should be distributed broadcast throughout the French country districts. When the French people are better acquainted with the fine quality and the great variety of our products and our resources, they will be more inclined to invest their money with us. The Banque Nationale has just established a branch in Paris, a fact which is very encouraging.

Mr. H. Fabre often writes in the 'Paris-Canada' concerning the increasing interest taken in the affairs of Canada by the various classes of French people. A broader insight into the resources and the economical conditions of Canada will do away with many prejudices concerning our country. We are going to effect a radical change in the French manner of thought, and presently desirable French immigrants will come in larger number to try their luck with us on this Canadian soil. They will lend us a hand in the development of our young Dominion, in the working out of our agricultural forest and mineral wealth. They will be animated by a broad spirit of humanity, and will respect as we do the representatives of the various races who come here in search of liberty and comfort.

A few weeks ago the 'Orange Sentinel' protested with violence against the coming of French immigration to Canada. According to that paper, there is a conspiracy on foot to settle in the new western provinces groups of French and Roman Catholic people. I regret that such an appeal should have been made to religious and racial prejudices; I regret such utterances, which are of a nature to sever or relax the bonds of the 'entente cordiale' between England France and Canada.

France should be proud of our efforts to become more prosperous and powerful. Canada should rejoice at having an opportunity to improve its trade relations with a people whose progressive spirit has startled the world. The sons of old Gaul and those of Great Britain have built up on the shores of the Atlantic and on those of the Pacific, in the valley of the St. Lawrence, about the great lakes and through those immense western prairies a superb monument; the Dominion of Canada. And it is now incumbent on us to complete it, with the help of the younger generations of these people and that of desirable immigrants. That building has justice and liberty for its foundations, and these have been cemented with the blood of French Canadian heroes and of English-speaking loyalists.

It is natural that I should have a special liking for Frenchmen. In that old mother country, where the highest degree of civilization has been attained, we are in a position to obtain immigrants of the agricultural class, strong, vigorous, virtuous, industrious people, who will be devoted to Canadian interests.

Let me in conclusion quote these words of Mr. Fabre:

> Is it not towards France that we should first of all turn our eyes when desirous of developing outside relations? Had we made another choice we would have seemed lacking in deference toward her; and she, by rejecting our offer, under the circumstances, would have shown herself untrue to all her traditions. Sentiment, old country remembrances, cannot but make themselves heard above all other appeals in the course of such negotiations, and to-day, owing to the 'entente cordiale,' we are at liberty to conlcude all nature of understandings.

Mr. H. S. BELAND (Beauce) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the remarks I wish to make to the House concerning the French treaty, let me heartily congratulate the hon. member on the eloquent speech he has just delivered on that subject.

Hon. gentlemen in this House who have criticised the stipulations of the French treaty, underrated their probable effects and sought to diminish the importance of such an achievment in the minds of the House and of the country at large, have all agreed on two points. They contended in the first place that in the matter of our right to negotiate our own commercial treaties, we had not made any advance; and in the second place, they expressed the opinion that the practical results would be nil.

They thought fit to contend, in the first place, that the negotiations which went on in August and September last, between our Canadian ministers and the representatives of the French government, have in no way differed from those carried on in 1893, and in which Sir Charles Tupper played a part. They thought fit to contend that in connection with the conclusion of the former treaty with France, the Dominion government had been left as free as on this last occasion from any interference on the part of the home government.

However, only those utterly blinded by prejudice will deny that on this last occasion the right of Canada to regulate its own tariff has been more fully and more plainly recognized. It is only by degrees, I will admit, that this change has been effected; but the great move, the decisive step, was taken when the Laurier government, in 1897, set forth their policy of preferential trade with England.

The mother country, once this bold move had been made by Canada, found itself obliged either to offer to the colony preferential treatment for its products in the British market, or else to admit practically that Canada was free to look elsewhere for preferential treatment.

England being, as we all know, a free trade country, most foreign products, whe-

ther manufactured or not, are admitted without paying any customs duty; and to meet our proposal of preferential trade, she would have been obliged to impose duties on imports from foreign countries, while Canadian products would have continued to come in free.

It is not my intention just now to discuss, but merely to state, what was the course followed under the circumstances by the mother country. In a question of such great import to her from the economic standpoint, England carefully refrained from modifying in any way the policy adopted and followed by her from time immemorial. Of course, a very strong feeling was given expression to in official and governmental spheres of the mother country in favour of granting greater liberty to Canada as regards the regulation of its tariff. And that feeling developed; it asserted itself when the time came for Canada to enter into negotiations, with a view to concluding a trade agreement with France, in August and September last.

Now, what occurred in the course of these negotiations? The mother country, through its ambassador at Paris carefully abstained from taking any active part in them, and let our representatives, that is the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to see without any outside interference to these commercial interests which were specifically our own.

I cannot help wondering, Mr. Speaker, why hon. gentlemen on your left, endeavour to shut their eyes to this remarkable development in our colonial existence, which, in my humble opinion, is the confirmation before the whole world, of the idea set forth the other day by the right hon. leader of the House, in the midst of speeches delivered by hon. gentlemen on the other side: That Canada is a nation. I contend that our friends on the other side, in endeavouring to belittle the true meaning of such an event, are not playing the part of loyal Canadians.

It would be useless and childish to contend that the negotiations, in 1893, were carried on exactly on the same lines as in 1907. The letters written by Lord Ripon, Lord Dufferin and Sir Charles Tupper himself, are proof to the contrary, and show clearly and peremptorily that, in 1893, the negotiations were conducted by Sir Joseph Crowe, who represented the British ambassador, and who was constantly present while the negotiations were going on. On the contrary, in 1907, Great Britain's ambassador, at Paris, was content with introducing our Canadian representatives to the French government and henceforth did not put in an appearance until called upon to put at the bottom of the treaty the seal of the imperial government.

Hon. gentlemen on the other side have also thought fit to belittle the possibilities of an extension of our trade resulting from such a treaty. It is not my intention to present any elaborate disquisition on the purely commercial aspects of the convention; but simply to draw the attention of the House and of the farming community, whose representative I am more particularly in this House, to the benefits which are bound to accrue to the latter from the stipulations of this new treaty.

On looking more closely into these stipulations, we notice that most farm products will henceforth be admitted into France at a reduced rate of duty. Among these products some will be particularly favoured. For example, salt meats, canned meats, live stock, poultry, cheese, butter and wheat will, under that arrangement, be exported to France in much larger quantities.

It should not be forgotten that France buys from foreign countries every year about 2,000,000 dollars' worth of live stock, 600,000 dollars' worth of poultry, 2,000,000 dollars' worth of salt meats, 9,000,000 dollars' worth of cheese and 37,000,000 dollars' worth of wheat. It is only reasonable to suppose that, being henceforth on a footing of equality with the most favoured nation on the French market, we shall have a larger share of those purchases.

Let us take cheese particularly. The Canadian farmer sells that product principally in England, and it may be well to note that we are supplying already four fifths of the cheese imported into Great Britain. In other words, the British market is far from being unlimited, and it may not be very long before we have to busy ourselves finding out some other outlet, not merely from the fact that we are already supplying England with nearly the whole of what she imports, while our own output is increasing all the time and the population of Great Britain remains the same, but also, and above all, because competition is getting keener from year to year.

The high prices now paid for cheese are a strong inducement to other countries, which have not until to-day engaged in its manufacture on a large scale, to do so. They are now about to compete, or getting ready to compete in that field with older producers. Should the British market fail us, wholly or in part, should the British consumer no longer buy from us four-fifths of his imports of cheese, but only, say, two-thirds of it, the French market will be open to us, and there might we send that important product. What I have said concerning cheese is also true, although to a less degree, concerning bacon, butter, poultry and live stock.

My intention in beginning these remarks was merely to call the attention of the farming community to the advantages that they will probably—I might say surely—derive from the new treaty, but I cannot resume my seat without briefly alluding to

a list of products that will hereafter be admitted on the French market with a rebate of about 30 per cent, I mean asbestos and its products.

I was particularly happy to hear the other day the hon. member from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) expressing his opinion that these products would be largely benefited by the dispositions of the new treaty.

The richest deposits of asbestos are to be found in Canada ; they are in full operation in the counties of Beauce and Megantic, and more particularly in the townships of Broughton and Thetford. These deposits are reputed to be inexhaustible. I am confident that before many years, thanks to the wise enactments of the commercial agreement now under discussion, a wonderful industry in these products will be established in this country. Then the thriving and hardy population of these townships in Beauce and Megantic counties, with the thousands of others attracted in the region to participate in the development of that great industry, while enjoying the means of providing for their families, will have a further proof of the solicitude of the Laurier administration for the farmers and labourers of this country.

Certain newspapers and even members of this House appear to see in this treaty a new impetus to French immigration. The only immigration from that source that would be highly desirable would be that of the French countryman. But the French farmer or countryman, does not emigrate, or hardly does so.

In the first place the population of France being stationary—if not on the decline—the people there does not feel the necessity of sending the overflow of its population to foreign countries. Secondly, the French peasant excels in the practice of two very valuable qualities : frugality and thrift. He is easily satisfied and is not possessed of adventurous dispositions. Added to that, that with the one exception of Japan, from what we were told the other day by the Postmaster General, France is peradventure the country where the love of the native land has sunk its deepest roots in the hearts of her inhabitants—a sentiment that will prompt a Frenchman to live in straitened circumstances, even in poverty in his own country, rather than enjoy ease or even luxury abroad—and we will have the reason of the limited resources of French immigration. And, as I am reminded by the Postmaster General, there is also the conscription. More than that, the aim of the French government is to direct towards French colonies all French emigration, limited as it is. At all events, more intimate commercial relations and a direct service by steamers between the two countries cannot but have a stimulating influence on French immigration to Canada.

Another more tangible consequence of the new treaty will be, I have no doubt, to strengthen between the two great elements of the population of this country the bonds of cordiale entente that exist on the other side of the Atlantic between England and our old mother country.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). It is almost a matter of form to discuss the new treaty which has been negotiated with the French government; as the Minister of Finance has stated it is unalterable and therefore it may be futile to point out the defects in it. It is unfortunate that in these matters we should be tied down before we have an opportunity of looking into what has been accomplished. The House is now called upon to ratify the treaty which these hon. gentlemen have negotiated at great expense, and which has been heralded throughout the country as a great achievement. No perceptible advantage to Canada has yet been shown. It is, of course, very difficult, in examining the schedules before us, to ascertain what the results will be; we will have to await developments of trade, both export and import, before we can very well see just what has been accomplished; but I think it is plain to all that injustice is going to be done to some industries. That cannot be gainsaid and I think the Minister of Finance has admitted that in his remarks. We have been told that we are receiving advantages on 153 articles and giving advantages on 110. That sounds very well until you come to examine the articles concerned, and then you see that, after all, numbers count for little. If you examine the 153 articles on which these hon. gentlemen claim they have obtained an advantage, you will find that the chance for doing business in 75 per cent of them is infinitesimal; in fact, I question if more than 10 per ceut of the articles enumerated will lead to any great development of Canadian export trade. It is true that we have to-day a government who value a dollar bought as much as a dollar sold. The wonder is that they should have taken any care to get us any advantage on any particular articles, holding that view. If export trade is of no advantage, why have they gone to the trouble of even naming the 153 articles in which we are supposed to do an export trade. If you look at the figures of the trade of Canada with France, as set forth at page 40 of the further memoranda in connection with the convention of 1907, you will find nothing very encouraging in our present trade with France. Take, for instance, the last five years given here, the trade was as follows :

Year.	Exports of goods, Produce of Canada, to France.	Imports from France.
1904..	$1,539,462	$6,206,525
1905..	1,479,999	7,059,139
1906..	2,110,444	7,667,987
1907 (12 mos.)	1,746,184	9,145,885

It will be seen from these figures that we are buying from France at the present time between $4 and $5 for every $1 we are sending there. This is naturally to be expected with a government that places so little value on exports that they negotiate a treaty which promises to make this difference even greater than it is now.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) mentioned one item, omelets. He told us that some eggs must be broken for every omelet. That is apparently a truism, but what we on this side of the House object to is that he breaks the egs and has no omelet. There is no omelet visible at the present time and the eggs as usual have been taken out of Ontario's basket. It is strange that the Finance Minister particularly should single out Ontario when there is anything to be given away—and he seems to have a special grudge at my good city of Brantford. A short time ago a cutlery industry went down that could have been saved by a little encouragement in the tariff; later on binder twine also got a whack and now it is the wine industry. The question is asked: Where was the Minister of Customs? I am sorry to say he is not taking much interest in what affects Brantford or he would have put in a word as he well could and should.

Mr. PATERSON. My hon. friend is forgetting that the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) said that the only article in reference to which Canada had secured any advantage was the article of agricultural machinery, made by the Massey-Harris Company of Brantford. He forgot about the Cockshutt Plow Company and all the other industries there, and yet the hon. gentleman is complaining.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. If the hon. gentleman wants to make a speech he can have the floor shortly. I will take up the point to which he refers before I conclude. In the meantime I wish to point out that the Finance Minister has singled out an industry in Ontario of considerable importance, which has its headquarters in Brantford. He said it was an industry of very small moment if it was one at all. I think he minimized it more than was justified by the facts, and I venture to say that if he does any stumping in the Niagara district of Ontario and all through western Ontario, the advantages he has secured in the French treaty will not be one of his main arguments to induce voters to cast in their lot with this government.

I propose to give a few facts and figures in connection with the wine industry. I am not myself a great wine consumer nor do I recommend others to consume it, but if gentlemen do drink wine they may as well use Canadian wines, all things being equal. I am not advocating the cause of the wine-growers nor am I here by request of the wine-growing industry or the fruit growers, but I have here a statement which will convince the Minister of Finance that this is not such a small industry as he presumed it was when he said the wine industry was a very small one. The document speaks for itself, and which I shall read.

Memorial from the wine growers of Canada—Presented to the government January, 1908.

The Wine Growers' Section of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, comprising among their number practically every wine manufacturer in the country have learned with alarm of the proposal to reduce the tariff under the new Franco-Canadian treaty on certain grades of French wines. As the proposal, if adopted, can only result in serious if not fatal injury to an important branch of native industry, the undersigned beg respectfully to submit for your serious consideration the following facts:

A young and growing industry.

There are in Canada at the present time about a dozen important establishments engaged in the production of wine from the fresh grape. A conservative estimate of the capital employed places the amount of $1,000,000 besides several millions invested in vineyards, with hundreds of growers interested in the production of grapes for the wine industry.

Its relation to the fruit growers.

Grapes are one of the most profitable crops fruit growers can raise; first by reason of the fact that they are practically a sure crop every year (not being nearly so susceptible as other varieties of fruit to extremes of temperature and to excessive moisture or dryness), and second, by reason of the prices they command. Fifteen years ago Concord grapes could readily be bought at $12 per ton. To-day they are regularly worth $25, though during the past year they have sold as high as $35, and choice Catawbas and Delawares as high as $60 per ton.

This steady advance in price is due in a very large measure to the demand created for grapes by the wine manufacturers. The establishment of wineries at different points throughout the fruit areas has opened up profitable markets for the farmer at his very door and has at the same time enhanced the value of his vineyards. With a protective duty of 2 cents per pound in his favour he has been encouraged to increase the acreage under grape cultivation until to-day there are said to be about 20,000 acres under grapes in the province of Ontario, worth at the very least $400 per acre. It is safe to say that fully 80 per cent of the product of this acreage is used for wine purposes. The enterprise of the Canadian wine manufacturers has, therefore, been a boon to the Canadian fruit grower. Together they have developed in a comparatively few years an industry of no mean importance, and one which is capable of far greater expansion if accorded a fair protection against the giants of specialized production in France.

Handicaps to Canadian wine industry.

That it needs protection and needs it badly is apparent when one considers the handicaps

under which the Canadian wine industry has to labour:

1. The southern grape grown in France contains so much saccharine that the wine made from it does not need to be sweetened artificially. The northern grape grown in Canada has much less saccharine, and this deficiency must be made up by adding sugar in the proportion of a pound and a half to two pounds for every gallon of grape juice. Including the duty this means an item of from 7 to 1 cents per gallon in the cost of production which is forced upon the Canadian while it is spared the Frenchman.

2. When it is a case of fortifying the wine the Frenchman has a tremendous advantage. In France and all other wine producing countries except Canada the wine producer is allowed to fortify his wine with spirits free of the revenue charge, whereas the Canadian producer has to pay the full revenue charge on all the spirits he uses for fortifying.

3. Productive labour is fully 50 per cent cheaper in France than it is in Canada. This means a further advantage possessed by the French manufacturer.

4. The production of wine in France being many hundred times greater than it is in Canada, the French manufacturer can afford to take a very much smaller margin of profit.

Competition under the proposed treaty.

Under present condition French wines can hardly be said to come into competition with native wines in the Canadian market. The French still wines now being imported are dry wines, known as clarets and sauternes, whereas 95 per cent of the product of Canadian factories is a sweet wine. Very little of the latter runs as high as 20 per cent proof spirits, and the specific duty of 25 cents per gallon on everything up to 26 per cent proof has been sufficient to retain the home market in sweet wines for the home manufacturer. But if, as is now proposed, the duty on French wines testing up to 20 per cent proof is lowered from 25 cents to 15 cents per gallon, and sweet and artificial French wines are allowed to come in at the reduced rates, practically all the wine made in Canada will immediately be subjected to competition which it cannot for a moment withstand. Enjoying, as he does, so many advantages in other ways, and with a through freight rate from Havre to Toronto equal to the rate from Toronto to Montreal, the French manufacturer will be able to market his wine in Canada at a price lower than the Canadian manufacturers' cost of production, and still make a profit.

Conclusion.

Without hesitation we submit that the proposed tariff will deal a serious if not fatal blow to the Canadian wine industry, and with it to the grape growing interest with which it has surrounded itself, unless it is limited in its application strictly to natural wines made from the fresh grape that have not been artificially sweetened and fortified.

Now that is, in brief a statement of the case from the wine growers standpoint. I wish to point out that when the hon. Minister of Finance affects the wine industry he affects not only the men engaged in that industry with the large amount of capital they have at stake, but he affects every fruit grower in the province of Ontario. He is going to injure not only that immense and increasing industry, one in which a large number of fruit growers are interested, but he is going to do something which will affect every farmer more or less in our district because they all grow fruit to a greater or lesser extent and whatever adversely affects the price of grapes will be reflected upon small fruits such as peaches, plums, pears and everything of that sort because the more the price of grapes is reduced so much more will the consumption be, and the tendency will be to buy grapes in preference to peaches, plums and other articles because the competition would be so keen that grapes would be the very much cheaper article of fruit. Therefore, it will not only reduce the price of grapes but of all small fruits. They are naturally very much liked and we are blessed by providence with having in Ontario one of the best grape growing districts in the whole world. There are no grapes that I know of grown outside that have the quality of those grown in the Niagara district particularly and what applies to the Niagara district applies all through from Niagara to Detroit with greater or lesser force. Where the Finance Minister affects one industry he affects the price of fruit from top to bottom and every fruit grower will be more or less affected by the reduced price at which grapes will be sold. This is a very serious consideration and I infer that my hon. friends, who had a very good time in France, if we read the reports correctly and who spent a large amount of money in negotiating this treaty, will have comparatively little advantage to show for it in actual results. I venture to say that if this had been a Nova Scotia industry instead of an Ontario industry the hon. Minister of Finance would have hesitated to sacrifice a capital so great as that engaged in the grape growing industry or a capital so great as that engaged in the wine industry. But it is the custom of this government to hit Ontario—it is strong and able to stand it—to hit them hard and to hit them hard every time. That is what is being done by this government in regard to the Niagara river which they propose to take out of the hands of the Ontario government where it has been for thirty years and place it in the hands of the government down here. That is what is being done in regard to the militia policy which seizes upon a large amount of land in Ontario and takes it without 'by your leave'. In whatever way you look at it the province of Ontario can go to the dogs as far as this government are concerned as long as other provinces will stand at the back of the government. Then the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) said that in negotiating the treaty they had special regard to the port of Montreal. I have

no spite against the port of Montreal, I have many friends there, we look upon Montreal as the banner city of the Dominion, but when the minister makes the statement that they had special regard for one city of the Dominion in making this treaty I think he went a good deal further than was judicious and that he made a remark that will not be favourably received throughout the Dominion of Canada. Montreal is a great city, we are all proud of it, but we are not willing to acknowledge that it is the whole of Canada and he should not be permitted to sacrifice the interests of Ontario or any other part of Canada for the sake of Montreal. I do not know whether the minister intended to convey that idea but that is the way the remark sounded to me when he said they had special regard for the port of Montreal in negotiating this treaty. I do not see why Montreal should be singled out for such a preference. This treaty is supposed to be in the interests of the Dominion. But when you look at it you find that the industries that are hit by it are those in Ontario. The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) has said: Well the Cockshutts will be favourably affected at any rate. I do not know that that will take anything off the edge of my criticism of the treaty. Whether my personal interests may be affected or not I am not prepared to say. They may or they may not.

But when it comes to a matter of principle, I am not prepared to say that I would ask the wine industry or any other industry to be sacrificed because agricultural implements are going to be admitted into France on a little more favourable terms than they were before. I trust I am not so mean-spirited as to ask that the advantage be given to an industry in which I have an interest to the detriment of other industries which are to be made the eggs in the omelet, as the Minister of Finance put it. Let us look at the items in the Canadian schedule to see what our chances of doing business with France in these articles are. One of the very first of these items is horses, and on horses France exacts a duty of thirty dollars per animal, and you can imagine how many horses worth one hundred dollars we will send to France if we have to pay thirty dollars duty on each. Then, on every ox that goes to France there is a duty of twenty dollars, and it will be seen that, both in the case of oxen and horses, the French tariff is prohibitive. There are possibly half a dozen or a dozen items out of the whole 153 on which we can hope to get any advantage in the French market. My hon. friend from St. Anne's (Mr. Walsh) told us amongst other things on which we would get an advantage in exporting to France was clover seed, but I happen to know a little about clover seed, and I can tell him that we are to-day importing clover seed from France. Under the benign influence of the Minister of Agriculture and his Seed Bill the export trade of Canada in clover seed has become almost nil, as I pointed out would be the case when the Seed Bill was before the House; and to-day, instead of exporting clover seed, Canada is importing largely from the United States and from across the ocean. Ontario grows nearly all the clover seed grown in the Dominion, and as Ontario has to supply the wants of the other provinces before she can export, there is very little chance in the near future of her doing business with France in this article. I am free to admit that agricultural implements appear to have received an advantage under this treaty, and it may be that the Massey-Harris and other large firms will be able to increase their output. They are entitled to that, and I do not begrudge it to them, but I do not think that the Minister of Finance is justified in going out of his way to hit any other industry for the benefit of the agricultural implement industry. For my part I will not forego the grand principle of 'Canada for the Canadians' for the mere sake of giving an advantage to that industry or to any other. Now, if you look at schedule 'B' which contains the French articles on which Canada gives an advantage, you will find they are of a very different character from the articles on which Canada receives advantage, and that they already come into our market in considerable quantities. They include canned meats, canned poultry, game, extracts of meat, fluid beef, soups of all kinds and cheese, an immense quantity of which of the higher grades, such as Roquefort, we now import from France. And, although I have not the figures before me, I venture to say that in the matter of cheese, which is one of the main products of Canada, we are probably to-day importing more from France than we are exporting to France. Then, in the case of preparations of cocoa and chocolate, it is well known that the higher qualities of these articles are made in France and that Canada is a large importer of them. Then comes item 72 of the schedule, 'garden, field and other seeds,' and that item is of considerable importance, because there is included in it alone probably two hundred or three hundred various kinds of seeds that are to be admitted into Canada at reduced rates. In like manner, with regard to items 78, 81 and 82, some of our Canadian industries are going to suffer. Take item 78, 'florist stock, including palms, ferns, rubber plants, gladiolus, cannas, dahlias and peonies'; that will hit the constituency of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), where there is a very important flower growing industry. In item 81, 'trees, apples, cherry, peach, plum, quince and all kinds of small kind of fruit trees'; that item in the treaty is going to be an injury to the nursery raising business of Canada, which has been so successful for the past twenty-five years. The cheap labour of France and their method of raising this nursery

stock will make them successful competitors with the local nursery concerns. Thus I might go on and take almost every item in that list in schedule 'B' and point out that every one of them refers to an article in which France will do a trade with Canada. To-day we take four dollars' worth of imports from France for every dollar's worth we export, and the result of this treaty will be that in the very near future we will be taking ten dollars' worth of imports for the one dollar's worth we export. There is nothing very smart about that. Anybody can give away a thing, but it takes statesmen and diplomats to negotiate a treaty that will be of advantage to a country. I fear that this government, with the halo that came about them in allowing them to negotiate a treaty, have been so charmed with the new toy that they have rushed ahead and given the French people almost everything they wanted. The French people have a historic reputation for being fair in trade and an old Chancellor of the Exchequer of England away back in the good old days when Great Britain was protectionist once wrote:

> In matters of commerce the fault of the Dutch
> Is giving too little and asking too much;
> With equal advantage the French are content,
> So we'll clap on flat bottoms just twenty per cent.

If the French are content with equal advantage, why should you give them a great deal more? There is no gainsaying the fact that on ten items of this list of 110 they will do more exporting to Canada than Canada will do to France on all the 150 items. With regard to lobsters, of course the hon. gentleman had a view to the fishing industry down by the sea. But France was already taking nearly all the lobsters we had, I think rather more than we wished to spare, because we have hardly enough for the home market. I see that lobsters are about the largest item that we export to France to-day, amounting to about one-third of the total export of $1,500,000. France is taking our lobsters without any concession; therefore I contend that that item is of no advantage to us whatever. When you examine the various items of this treaty you will find, almost without exception, that they are not going to be of any great advantage to Canada. Except in agricultural implements and in one or two farm products, there is not one in regard to which we have any chance of enjoying any particular advantage in the market of France. Of course, it is too late in the day for us to cry about this, for the Finance Minister tells us that these items, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, cannot be changed no matter how disadvantageous to us we may think them; but I think the Finance Minister should not readily sacrifice an industry so important as that to which I have referred. If nothing else can be done, the least that can be expected now is that the Finance Minister will allow the spirits required for the fortification of these wines to come in free of duty. At present, as is pointed out in the document which I have read, our wine growers have to pay the ordinary duty on these spirits, whereas in all other countries spirits used for the fortification of wines are admitted free. I trust that the Finance Minister is going to take that into consideration. I have heard, not on the floor of this House, but in rumours, that such is his intention, and I think that the very least he can do is to give the wine growers of this country an assurance that that will be done in the near future. It is the only salvation, apparently, that is going now to be extended to them. I understand that the province of Ontario last year, according to the government returns, grew no less than 30,000 tons of grapes—the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) said 40,000 tons—and the crop was said to be an excellent one. We have nearly always a good crop of grapes in Ontario, no matter what the season is. The document I have read places on these an average value of $40 a ton, which means a total value of $1,200,000 for the grapes at first hand. If you affect the price of these grapes to the extent of $10 a ton, which is a very moderate estimate, the loss on this one item will amount to $300,000 per annum, and this loss will be borne by the fruit growers, who have already great disadvantages in the way of transportation and other things to contend with. This one act, therefore, is going to hit a large section of our population in western Ontario, and the Finance Minister should not belittle an industry which is looked upon in our part of the country as one of the very best and as deserving every encouragement at the hands of this or any other government. The fruit growers look upon it as a legitimate enterprise. It is one of the oldest in the world, and I do not see why it should be singled out for competition with France, which stands foremost in the manufacture of wines, in order that foreign wines may come in and supplant our native wines in our own market. But on wines above 26 degrees proof I understand that 30 per cent comes off in addition to the 10 cents per gallon. Whether that is the case or not, it is evident that the wines manufactured in Canada are going to be very severely hit by this treaty, and, as the wine-making industry is one in which the province of Ontario is very much interested, and in which my own town has a large factory and much invested capital, I thought it only right that I should place before the Finance Minister the facts and figures which have been given to me and which I believe to be reliable. As I understand that the

various items embraced in the schedules will come up in committee later on, and there will then be an opportunity to deal with them in detail, I will not discuss them further at this late hour of the night.

Before taking my seat, I wish to refer to the matter of transportation. I took occasion during the debate on the address to speak on the subject, and I do not know that I have since modified my views from anything I have heard. Under the British preferential tariff goods are free to come in by United States ports as well as Canadian ports. Although the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) introduced a resolution, which received the approbation of the government, in favour of requiring these goods to come in by Canadian ports in the future, that has not been done. I suggested that we should begin with the mother country, and give her the first advantage, if there is an advantage. I do not want to be ungenerous in any respect to our provinces down by the sea. I have always been willing when in trade, in which I was engaged for many years, to give the preference to our Canadian ports. I always almost entirely gave these ports the preference. I think that Canadian merchants should bring in their goods by Canadian routes. We cannot hope to have first-class steamers unless we patronize our own routes. What is the use of calling for fast steamers if Canadian passengers will give the preference to the American lines by way of New York and Boston? We should on every occasion always endeavour to travel and send our goods by our own Canadian lines. But it appears to me that the negotiators of this treaty went a little fast when they put in this as one of the conditions of the treaty. It does not affect Canadian steamship lines and Canadian ports alone but our railways through every section of our country. I am especially in favour of encouraging Canadian railways. When I made the statement in this House that I did the other day, an hon. gentleman opposite said I was advocating the interests of American against those of Canadian ports. Not at all. I would like to see all our goods sent by Canadian ports, but this treaty will operate unfairly against Canadian railways, at present enjoying a profitable trade via American ports. I cannot therefore approve of that particular feature in the treaty. Whether or not the freights will be materially affected will be of very litle moment because I am confident that our imports from France are going, under this treaty, to materially increase. There are very large items in which we will see a large increase of imports into Canada. If that be the case, it becomes us to say whether or not this treaty, which has been negotiated amidst such a flourish of trumpets and in such a blaze of glory, is going to do what is expected. I am confident that there are items in it which certainly could have been very much improved; and if we are going to negotiate other treaties in the future, we should have trained diplomats sent out to represent us. I am very sceptical regarding the ability of this government to negotiate treaties after the experience we have had of their negotiations with Japan. I see the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) smiling, but he must know that in this respect they have not been a success so far, and that that treaty which they negotiated with Japan will be a source of trouble to Canada for a good while to come. We let that go through far too easily, and that is one reason why we should not be too quick now and why we should hold up this treaty until we understand it thoroughly. We do not want any clause such as that which was sneaked through in our treaty with Japan. I must say that I am not in accord with my hon. friends on the other side when they attack that old institution the Senate even if it does knife the Conservatives every time. It is an old established institution of whose utility I have never had any doubt if it will only use the power at its disposal. One of the worst day's work the Senate ever did was when they passed that Japanese treaty. If the clause in that treaty, which has created so much trouble, had been examined in the light of the facts which have since been disclosed, we would not have had the feeling that is now rampant in British Columbia. We would have had that treaty fairly examined and found out what was the matter with it, but there was only one man in this House who saw the danger, the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy) and he did not point it out as strongly then as he has done this session. All he did was, in a conversational way, to carry on a dialogue across the floor with the First Minister, and we let that treaty go through. I myself did not catch at the time the point that the hon. gentleman was making. I therefore am averse to our letting any more treaties go through before we understand them thoroughly. The negotiations carried on by this government with foreign governments have not been hitherto so successful as to warrant our asking for more powers in the way of treaty making at present. What we require is a skilful, trained diplomatic corps to represent us abroad. We have not in this country the trained statesmen they have in France. There they have men who are on the qui vive on every point and who have decidedly outwitted our hon. friends opposite in this French treaty. As far as I can judge they have by it got from $5 to $10 from us for every dollar we get out of it. The future alone can tell who will be right, and this treaty is to be on our books for ten years, but I make the prophecy that for every $1 we get from that treaty we will pay $5 to France. Of course

my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) does not agree with me because in his opinion, every dollar we buy is as good as every dollar we sell. But in that I do not agree with him; and I think that the people of this country, if this government goes on in this reckless fashion it is now doing, will come to the same conclusion. We had $121,000,000 against us of a balance of trade last year. The hon. the Minister of Customs said that $9,000,000 of that consisted of settlers effects, but that leaves $112,000,000 to be accounted for. That is a pretty respectable item to be grappled with. Only five short years ago there was a balance in our favour of exports over imports, whereas to-day we have a balance of $121,000,000 against us, and this new treaty will further increase that great discrepancy. And it does not comprise alone France, but thirty-five other countries are going to reap somewhat similar advantages. When you figure up the advantages this government are getting, as compared with what we are paying, we shall see that we are getting by far the worst of the bargain. The articles of the treaty and its schedules do not justify the great acclaim with which our ministers were welcomed back to this country. They were received with the blowing of trumpets and the waving of flags, but I think the people will soon begin to realize the false step we have taken. I am sorry to see the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) beautifully sleeping while I am depicting the glories that hailed him when he came back to our shores. I am willing to let the future decide as to whether the treaty will be of advantage or not, but so far as Ontario is concerned, a valuable industry is going to be sacrificed and a number of others badly hit, and the advantages we will derive will be scarcely perceptible. It woud have been much better to have continued under the old treaty, doubtful as that was, until we got something better than what has been brought down by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). As this matter is apparently to go into Committee of the Whole, I will not speak at length or attempt any close analysis, but will deal only with general considerations. The remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite have been mainly in the direction of fault-finding in relation to this treaty ; they have not stated what they intend to do in the matter. If they are to take a course at all approaching the logical course, they must vote against the treaty.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. May I ask the hon. gentleman if there is anything we can do? The Minister of Finance has told us that this is inevitable.

Mr. PATERSON. If the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Cockshutt's) arguments have convinced the majority that this is a bad

treaty, it is the easiest thing to vote it down.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. We can't convince that majority.

Mr. PATERSON. That is the hon. gentleman's misfortune. But nobody can prevent him casting his own vote in accordance with his speech ; and we will watch and see what he does. Of course, the provisions of the treaty made in this way cannot be altered, but the whole was made subject to the ratification of the parliament of Canada for the very purpose of allowing my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) and those like him to pronounce their verdict, not as the hon. gentleman has done by speech only, but in a more effectual way.

I do not know that I should have spoken but for the fact that the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) went so far out of his way to drag in the name of a gentleman not concerned in this matter at all——

Mr. COCKSHUTT. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) put in another name.

Mr. PATERSON. Whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt) put the hon. member for Wentworth up to it or not I do not know, but——

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) insinuate that I——

Mr. PATERSON. I insinuate nothing.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I thought the hon. gentleman's statement covered an insinuation. I can only say that I have had no word with my hon. friend (Mr. E. D. Smith) on the subject at all.

Mr. PATERSON. That is well. It would have been very inconsistent in the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt) if he had had. I did make reference to a firm which bears his name, but with which, so far as I know, he is not connected or very slightly connected. But if these hon. gentlemen are to emphasize the case of agricultural implements and to drag in the name of one firm, stating, almost broadly, that the Minister of Finance had negotiated a treaty for the benefit only of the Massey-Harris people, I thought it was unworthy of him, and especially to bring in the name of a gentleman who is nominated as an opponent of my hon. frend from Brantford, and to speak of this treaty as putting money into his pocket that would enable him to make a stronger run in the constituency. I interposed to point out that the agricultural implement industry, which, everybody seems to admit, will be benefited, is one of the largest manufacturing industries of this country. It is by no means confined to the Massey-Harris concern. There is a firm in Hamilton probably employing more men than the Massey-Harris people employ. There is an industry, as I suggested, bearing the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Cockshutt's) own name, which

also is interested. In my own town there are other plough manufacturers. There are the Frost & Wood people; there is another firm in Ingersoll, and others in other places. This manufacturing industry, besides supplying our own wants, exports half a million dollars a year. And because one of the political opponents of hon. gentlemen opposite is connected with this industry, they make this discussion an occasion of insinuations against him. The hon. member for Brantford said that under this treaty, negotiated by the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), who comes from Nova Scotia, everything was given away so far as Ontario was concerned, and that had not the Minister of Finance been from Nova Scotia such a treaty would never have been made.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. That is not the remark I made. I said that this large industry, the wine industry, would not have been sacrificed as it is.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, perhaps I may put it this way—that if the Minister of Finance represented an Ontario constituency he would not have made this treaty.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. That would be more like it.

Mr. PATERSON. That is a sectional view—not only a mistaken, but a hurtful view. But it is also an inconsistent view, considering that the hon. member for Wentworth declared that the only Canadian industry to be benefited under this treaty is an industry which is located in the province of Ontario. What is the use of confining the consideration of the matter to asking whether we have a foreign trade in this or in that? The way to consider this treaty is upon the broad basis of whether Canada will be in a better position with the treaty, or whether she will be in a better position without it. If it tells for the interest of Canada, it should be supported; if it tells against the interests of Canada—'greatly to our detriment,' as the last speaker (Mr. Cockshutt) said—it should not be approved by this House.

Now, we want to do a foreign trade, for, in many things, we not only have enough to supply our own market, but we have a surplus for sale abroad. France offers a market of over $300,000,000 for goods on which we gain concessions under this treaty. What are these concessions? They run an average of from 25 per cent to 33 per cent off the French tariff. On the other hand, we give them concessions on some articles, the average of which I believe will not be above 12½ per cent to 15 per cent. In respect of these articles in which France offers this large market, Canada is put in the same position as the most favoured nation with which France deals; and if they give more favourable treatment than at present to any other nation, that more favourable treatment is at once to be extended to Canada. So that, in the competition for this $300,000,000 of trade Canada has a fair field as against the world. It is up to the Canadian manufacturer, the Canadian farmer, the Canadian producer, to do the work that will secure that market.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose that of that trade $100,000,000 was in cattle, what good would it do the farmers of Ontario if the duty on cattle were still high enough to exclude our cattle from that market?

Mr. PATERSON. But cattle are being imported into France.

Mr. SPROULE. But if we cannot reach the market with the cattle——

Mr. PATERSON. But, for instance, here are the figures which show that 164,000 dollars worth of cattle over a year old were imported into France.

Mr. SPROULE. How many horses would we send in at $30?

Mr. PATERSON. How do others do it if we cannot?

Mr. SPROULE. But if the duty against us is still sufficient to shut us out——

Mr. PATERSON. But the Frenchman might make the same complaint about the duty you have against him.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister (Mr. Paterson) said that there was a reduction of 50 per cent on their duties, whereas we made from 12 per cent to 15 per cent. They must have got the best of it.

Mr. PATERSON. If they took off 33 per cent and we took off 12 per cent, they get the best of it. Is that what the hon. gentleman means?

Mr. SPROULE. But the hon. minister means 33 per cent off the duty, not that the article is admitted at a rate 33 per cent lower.

Mr. PATERSON. I mean that in both cases the reduction of duty would be about one-third on the average. On some things in the French tariff it is 50 per cent and on some less, 25 per cent or 20 per cent. The average difference would be about one-third off their duty.

Mr. HENDERSON. How much would that be off the duty on the article?

Mr. PATERSON. Whatever the duty happened to be it would be one-third less.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. What is the average duty then on dutiable goods?

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot tell that, but I believe that the average duty on dutiable goods would be as low as ours. But I speak without full knowledge in that matter. The point to be considered is that under this treaty you have secured a chance for $300,000,000 worth of goods that are purchased by France of which I believe $150,000,000 of like products and manufactures are pro-

duced in this country. You may have all the market you want at home, or you may have a part of your market in England, Germany or the United States, you go where you can do best with your goods, but where you were at a disadvantage was that other countries could send goods into France at one-third less than you could. That has been wiped out and Canada is to-day on a par with other nations.

Mr. BLAIN. What articles does the hon. gentleman expect Canada can export to France under the new treaty?

Mr. PATERSON. Trade will have to be developed; we can tell that in time. I expect we will do a great deal by and by.

Mr. LENNOX. In the sweet by and by.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, in the sweet by and by, in the products of the farm and of the manufactories. I believe that we will ship fruit to France, the product for which hon. gentleman say we are destroying the market.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. What kind of fruit?

Mr. PATERSON. Pears, peaches and apples.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Does the hon. gentleman know that France is the very heart of the pear industry and that the French are entirely exporters of pears?

Mr. PATERSON. Does he not know that they also import these fruits?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Not pears.

Mr. PATERSON. Do they not? Look again. Evidently the hon. gentleman was wrong in some things; let him examine the French imports and see whether they do not import a great deal more of these articles than we import.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. If they do, it is not from western countries, not from countries in the same zone; they may from countries further south.

Mr. PATERSON. Did the hon. gentleman expect that Canada could go over there and obtain lower rates than any other country had got?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. No, but the minister said he expected we would export pears to France. I said that France exports pears to the very markets that we do.

Mr. PATERSON. Very well, you will meet them there. It would not be a heavy item, but I say in a general way I would not be surprised to see our fruit go into the French markets.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. He said pears, which is absurd.

Mr. PATERSON. I mentioned different kinds.

Mr. PATERSON.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. What other kind?

Mr. PATERSON. I am not answering questions now. If the hon. gentleman would bend his energies that way—and he has been an exporter—probably he would be able to find out that there is a market there for him.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I have not been able to find it out yet.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman behind him lectures us because we have not a German market for apples.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. He is right.

Mr. PATERSON. He is right? There is the same thing in France and we have the French minimum tariff and can send the goods there.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Would the minister say the tariff is any better than it has been for the last 15 years, since 1893?

Mr. PATERSON. I might say by way of parenthesis that I was amused to hear the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) reading over the items on which we have lowered the duty, many of the articles being articles that have been coming in for the last 15 years at the same rate under the old French treaty.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I have looked up the returns and I find table fruits, apples and pears, 3,500,000 francs.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Will the hon. gentleman say how many of these were pears and where they came from?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman said there were no pears, but this shows there were.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I did not say 'no apples.'

Mr. PATERSON. When there is the whole question of a market of $300,000,000 why should our time be taken up with bickerings about pears? What has that to do with it? Take the broad general principle. There is $150,000,000 of that $300,000,000 of articles either produced or manufactured in Canada, and if we have a surplus of them and France is the best market we can send them to France and send them in on as good terms as any other nation. We could not do that by 33⅓ per cent until this was accomplished. Hon. gentlemen say: Where is the duty on grain, on wheat, flour, oats, peas, barley? There are large importations of these into France, they say, but there is only the maximum tariff. True, but do hon. gentlemen not see that the United States may go to France and make an arrangement that they could have a minimum duty on wheat, oats, barley, and all that our farmers produce. If they did that and we were under the maximum rate we would

have no chance in that market, but if Uncle Sam goes to France to make a bargain and succeeds in getting a reduction on the products of the forest, field and manufactory, we get whatever he gets, or what any other nation gets, and there is the wise thing. Hon. gentlemen opposite laughed when this convention was first introduced and said: Oh, you have enumerated articles there on which you are to get the minimum tariff, but there is no minimum tariff. They laughed as if that was something absurd. There is not a better feature in the tariff than the very fact of putting in these articles with that clause in the treaty which provides that if France grants lower rates of duty on any article mentioned there Canada is to have the same duty. It was statesmanship; it was foresight. If the ministers had viewed it as hon. gentlemen opposite do this would not have been done, and not doing it would have been a very great blunder indeed. I ask that this question be looked at in a general way. The government, or rather these two gentlemen, have negotiated a treaty which places us on the best footing in the market of $300,000,000, of which at least $150,000,000 are articles produced and manufactured in Canada. Whether our manufacturers and our producers will bend their energies towards that market depends upon themselves. The government has done its duty; it has placed them on an equal footing with every other nation, and for my part I believe that Canadian brain, Canadian muscle and Canadian energy will take advantage of that treaty and there will be a largely extended trade with France.

Mr. J. A. DUBEAU (Joliette). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I do not intend at this late hour to delay the House very long; but I cannot let this discussion come to an end without saying a few words on the French treaty which the government has submitted to this House for ratification.

I have taken great pleasure, indeed, in listening to the sincere, as well as energetic remarks uttered by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Paquet) on this question. He has been sincere enough to state that he had reason to believe that this new treaty was going to open a new era of prosperity in the history of our commercial relations with the former mother country. On the other hand, I was rather surprised when, immediately after him, I heard the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) stating that there was nothing new in this French treaty. My hon. friend from L'Islet deserves congratulations for his statement—and I quote his own words—that under the kind protection of England we have conquered fiscal and commercial liberty. I altogether agree with that statement. The negotiation of this treaty I consider as an assertion of our autonomy in commercial matters and an evidence that Canada has really become a nation. The desire expressed by Sir Wilfrid Laurier a few years ago to the correspondent of the London 'Daily Mail' that we should be allowed to negotiate ourselves treaties relating to Canada only, has evidently been complied with without any revolution, even without any special legislation, but by virtue of that authority so forcible in British countries, precedent. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, at the time the treaty was negotiated between France and Canada, Sir Francis Bertie, British Ambassador and plenipotentiary in Paris, circumscribed his action to his introducing the Canadian ministers to the official representatives of the French Republic. He did not attend to the negotiations, but simply signed them when once they were concluded. Canada has every reason to be satisfied with the treaty concluded by Messrs. Fielding and Brodeur with the French government, because that treaty is a great deal better for Canada than was the one concluded, in 1893, by Sir Charles Tupper and the British Ambassador in Paris. In fact, under one clause of that treaty we were bound to extend to France, without any kind of return for the same, all of the advantages to be conferred to every other nation we might eventually enter into negotiations with. Under the old treaty the balance of commerce was really too much against us. Our exchanges were in the proportion of four to one in favour of France. Last year our exports to France amounted to $2,000,000, and our imports from that country were $8,000,000; therefore, the difference was too great. Our farm products, which represented the greatest part of our exports, were not benefited by any perceptible advantage. Hereafter, our farm, fishery, forest and mining products will be admitted under the French minimum tariff.

We are obliged to put France in the same position as the most-favoured nation, but, on the other hand, she is bound to confer the same advantage unto us. In order to get the benefit of this treaty, French goods have to be shipped directly and so must our goods get into France through a direct route. Direct transportation being made compulsive tends to afford protection to our own ports. As our exchanges with France cannot be carried through American ports and get at the same time the benefit of this treaty, we may entertain hopes of seeing new steamship lines established between France and Canada or foreign steamship companies come back to our country. The 1907 treaty will be a great deal more favourable to Canada than was that of 1893, which covered only 29 items, many of them being of very small importance to us, while the list of items included in the new treaty is a great deal longer. France extends her minimum tariff to at least 152 Canadian products, and Canada is admitting under her intermediate tariff 98 French

products, besides ten other items coming under a special tariff. In order to allow you to fully appreciate the treaty recently concluded between France and Canada, I may be permitted to quote the opinion of the Retailers' Association of Canada which, in an address tendered to the hon. Minister of Marine, on the 5th December, 1907, stated through its secretary, Mr. J. A. Beaudry:

We have looked into this treaty and may state without any uncertainty that when put into practice it will bring forth the anticipated results and that its effect will be the promotion of our trade, as 'it will facilitate the sale of Canadian products in France,' and encourage the consumption in Canada of products that do not come into competition with our national industries.

Now, here is another opinion about this Franco-Canadian treaty; it is given by one of the most prominent importers in Canada, by a friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, ex-Mayor Laporte of Montreal, a member of the firm of Laporte, Martin and Company, who stated on the 3rd December, 1907, that the new commercial treaty between Canada and France will be most profitable not only to our country, but to France as well. Here are his own words:

I would not be surprised, in fact I expect, as a result of this treaty, to see 'the volume of our exports doubled within two years.'

Such was the opinion expressed about the new treaty by the ex-mayor of Montreal. On the other hand, this treaty was met with a kind welcome from leading papers. The 'Globe' said this:

The benefit of the intermediate tariff is extended to 98 items of French trade. These items are so diversified that the results to be derived from the treaty will be felt by all classes in Canada. Canadian consumers will be benefited by the full advantage of the changes. The reductions obtained on the French tariff will be of considerable advantage to agriculture and other productive industries in Canada.

'La Patrie' had this to say:

The French goods enjoying a preference are not such as we generally produce ourselves and cannot, therefore, come into competition with our own inland trade. This convention shows a very great improvement as against the 1893 treaty. Perfect reciprocity in commercial preferences is clearly expressed this time. It approves also section 8 respecting direct transportation of products.

'La Presse' approves more particularly section 9, which provides that the working of the tariff will be under the supervision of agents appointed by the Canadian government instead of British consuls and agents. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted this treaty has been concluded, as it is intended, first, to bring about a considerable increase in our commercial relations with France, and contribute towards the development of the 'entente cordiale.' And this last result is not the least in importance, because if there is a country in the world where the 'entente cordiale' is greeted with rapture, of course, it is Canada. The hon. ministers who have negotiated this treaty deserve our congratulations and, I repeat, I have been delighted when the hon. member for l'Islet stated that our Canadian statesmen had endeavoured to remove the difficulties, to clear up the roads in order to give our country the benefits of an advantageous treaty.

Mr. J. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a few words on this important question of the French treaty, especially at this late hour of the night. I shall not go back into the details already given by hon. members who have spoken before me, particularly by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). However, there is one question that is rather important because it has been discussed by every member of the opposition, and it is the only one I intend to consider for a few moments.

My hon. friends opposite cannot or will not understand that this treaty has been concluded in such conditions as to mark a great step toward the solution of the problem of our commercial autonomy, and the conclusion evidently to be drawn from that fact is that, according to their pretension, such is not the case, and from their persistency in ringing the changes about the same thing, that if on the contrary such is the case, it is a far-reaching accomplishment the benefit of which must go to the government. For my part, there cannot be any doubt as to the affirmative. Admissions have been made even by hon. members opposite that were such as to remove any doubt on that point.

I have listened attentively to the speech delivered this afternoon by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), and I think I have understood from his statements that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. W. S. Fielding) and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. L. P. Brodeur) had been appointed by the imperial government as the only plenipotentiaries for the negotiations of this treaty. And it is the fact that they have been the only ones invested with such powers that marks a great step towards our commercial atuonomy, because it was the first time such an event occurred—and I say this with all due deference to my hon. friends opposite who, in their sustaining of the contrary, quote the case of the treaty concluded in 1890 when, they say, Sir Charles Tupper was the only one invested with full powers. Unfortunately for them Lord Dufferin's report to Lord Roseberry and a letter from Lord Grey to the Marquis of Ripon prove quite the reverse in giving evidence that the negotiations of that treaty were also par-

ticipated into by another plenipotentiary, Sir Joseph Crowe, who was an Englishman. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in stating that we have witnessed this year an important event we have reason to be delighted as Canadians. To what I have said shall I add the testimonial of Conservative papers which, on the coming back of the hon. ministers, acknowledged the fact asserted by myself, namely, that the special circumstances under which the negotiation of the 1907 treaty were carried, do constitute an act of commercial autonomy.

I can even borrow from my hon. friends opposite the corroboration for my statements. In a great speech delivered in this House on the 5th December, 1907, a speech my hon. friends have set much importance upon, the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. T. Chisholm) said as reported in page 264 of 'Hansard':

For almost the first time in the history of Canada, we were in a position to discuss a question of this kind properly in this House. Formerly, when treaties were made between Canada and foreign countries, we always had some British nobleman, or some great jurist or other prominent Britisher, as part of the commission. Now, we have had a treaty directly negotiated by two of our own ministers, two of our experienced ministers, and two men in whom I myself would have had considrable confidence. They must, I think, receive credit for all that is good in this treaty; but, for once, we have them in the position that they must take the blame for all the bad points in it. Formerly, when a treaty was negotiated the members of the government, whether Conservative or Liberal, have been able to put the blame for the faults of the treaty on the British member of the commission,—he was made scapegoat for any mistakes, while the government always took the credit for the good points in the treaty.

Now, in these matters the government must get the credit for all the good points of the treaty, and must for once take blame for all the bad points.

It could not be put in a more explicit way, and these words show the accuracy of our statement that this is the first time Canada is allowed to negotiate with foreign countries. In his speech, the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Chisholm) seems to have threatened the government with heavy responsibilities, but I think the government can easily face those responsibilities, especially when we take into account the immense benefits to be derived by the country from this treaty as compared with the treaty concluded in 1903.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. We will proceed with the same measure.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 21, 1908.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to an article which I saw in yesterday's evening 'Citizen' on the third page and which is repeated in this morning's 'Citizen' on the ninth page. It reads as follows:

Colonel Talbot too had 75 applications for coal lands in the Northwest.

Before the Public Accounts Committee Mr. H. H. Rowatt, chief clerk of the Interior Department, was examined by Mr. Barker as to grants of coal areas to C. F. Caldwell and others. It appeared that Colonel Talbot, M.P., had secured a number of grants for various parties, and witness understood that he represented the German Development Company. Colonel Talbot in all put in 75 applications.

The balance of the article does not concern me. I have only this to say that in that word 'too,' in the heading I see a little bit of malice. I do not know how it came about. I am not going to weary the House by discussing the article or the intention of the article. It is not often that I ask favour.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. gentleman is speaking to a question of privilege?

Mr. TALBOT. Yes, it is a question of privilege. It is not often I ask any favours from my friends on the opposite side of the House but in this particular instance I would consider it a very great favour indeed if they would investigate the whole matter and give me also the privilege and advantage of being heard as a witness. That is all I have to say and I would appreciate it as a great favour if my hon. friends would simply do that for me.

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Brandon). Mr. Speaker, I have a word to say on a question of privilege. My attention has been called to an item in the 'Montreal Star' of last evening. It reads as follows:

Edmonton, Alberta, February 20.—In addressing a public meeting of Conservatives last night, Dr. H. L. McInnis made public the names of the officials of the Imperial Pulp Company, of Winnipeg, which came into the limelight at Ottawa in connection with the

recent timber limit exposures. The president resides in Edmonton, but Mr. McInnis would not reveal his name. The managing director is Hon. Clifford Sifton; the secretary, William Sifton; and the secretary-treasurer, a Miss Jones, a stenographer in Toronto. The doctor, in the course of his address, gave instances of graft in the disposal of timber limits in the west.

I find in the Ottawa 'Citizen' of this morning what is practically a reprint of this item. I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not the managing director or an officer of the Imperial Pulp Company and I never have been. I am not a shareholder or a stockholder in the Imperial Pulp Company and I never have been. I have no interest directly or indirectly, by myself, or by, or through anybody else in any shape, form or manner in the Imperial Pulp Company.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH moved :

That the order for the introduction of a Bill to amend chapter 28 of the statutes of 1907 in amendment of the Railway Act be discharged.

He said : The proposed amendment will come properly in a Bill on the subject to be introduced by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham).

Motion agreed to.

THE PLAINS OF ABRAHAM.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Tuesday next to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the sum of three hundred thousand dollars ($300,000) be appropriated towards the preservation, in a suitable manner, of the historic battlefields of Quebec, in connection with the tercentenary of the said city of Quebec.

He said : His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, approves of the same and recommends it to the attention of the House.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS.

On the orders of the day being called,

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the orders of the day are called, I would ask the Minister of Railways if he has any information to give to the House with reference to the Leblancs and their alleged interference in the provincial election in New Brunswick.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I may say that I have some news, if not information. I wired, as I promised, to the general manager of the railway and I was informed by him that one of the Leblancs, the travelling agent, who lives in New Brunswick, had been in that province over Sunday and had returned to his work in Quebec. I received another telegram from the general manager saying that the other gentleman, Leblanc by name, was absent from duty, but he did not know where he was or if he was working in an election. I wired to the general manager to inform the Intercolonial Railway employees, including Mr. Leblanc, that while they were all at perfect liberty to use their franchise as citizens with the utmost freedom in whatever way they wished, we did not want the employees of that railway to take active part in election contests, either Dominion or provincial. I have not heard from him since.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my hon. friend will not lose sight of it.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would like to call the attention of the First Minister to a return brought down in answer to a resolution of the House with reference to cold storage at St. John. A number of important letters have not been brought down, some 10 or 15 I should judge from what information I have, amongst them is an important memorandum said to have been entered into between Mr. Macoun and Mr. Williams, of St. John, at the dictation of the Minister of Militia and Defence. That was sent to the late Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) inclosed in a letter, but it was not brought down. It is a rather important part of the papers and I would like to have it looked up. The other letters are more or less important, but I could get along without them. At the same time I wish to give notice that on the first opportunity I shall bring this up in the House.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). There never was such a memorandum entered into by my instructions. The statement is utterly foundationless. I never saw such a paper and never gave any instructions for such a paper to be made.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a difference of testimony.

Hon. SIDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I would ask the hon. member to say what letters he means?

Mr. FOSTER. Chiefly letters that passed between Mr. Williams and the late Minister of Railways or that department.

Mr. EMMERSON. No public letters passed between us.

Mr. AMES. I would ask when we may expect the various documents in connection with timber limits ordered on February 10.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The documents in question have been with the Secretary of States for some time. I have been expecting them every day.

Mr. AMES. May we expect them on Monday?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot answer that. We receive an order from the clerk of the House and until we receive that order we have no authority to take action in regard to documents. As soon as we receive that order the documents are sent over to the Secretary of State and in due course are forwarded by him for presentation to the House. These documents are all ready for presentation and it is merely a matter of routine being gone through.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox and Addington). An order was passed on December 11 for papers in connection with the salary and travelling expenses of the Governor General and the general expenses of government house. I believe this comes under the Public Works Department.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). So far as returns called for from the Public Works Department are concerned, instructions have been given to hurry them along as rapidly as possible. The returns called for are very voluminous and we have no room in the department for additional clerks; we are employing only the regular staff and I am getting the work done as rapidly as possible.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. One would think these returns ought to come down with some relation to the order in which they were passed by the House. It is a long time since this was passed, and it should have been laid on the table long ago.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Would the Minister of Public Works hurry a return with reference to the Office Specialty Company? It is only a short matter of bookkeeping.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Instructions have been given to prepare the returns in order. One was ordered by the hon. leader of the opposition and the hon. member for Algoma, which I am informed will take one clerk one whole year to prepare.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works might give a short return of progress from the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend that everything is going exceedingly satisfactorily.

THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 57) respecting a certain convention between His Majesty and the President of the French republic.—Mr. Fielding.

Mr. BERGERON. I think the Minister of Finance was asked, that the French measurements which are expressed under the French decimal system in the treaty should be given in our system of measurement so that we might be able to make a comparison.

Mr. FIELDING. I think every request that was made has been complied with except that we should express the French duties in ad valorem, and which request we were not able to comply with.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one request which does not seem to have been complied with and that is for the average ad valorem rate of the French minimum duty on all imports under the minimum schedule

Mr. FIELDING. That is not available; there is no French blue-book which gives that information.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not possible to have the importation of all articles into France under the minimum tariff and the duties collected on those articles? If we had this we could make out the average duty ourselves.

Mr. FIELDING. I gave instructions to have that prepared if possible, but I understand a distinction is not made in French customs returns between the minimum and general tariff. The total duties collected are given but they are not divided in the manner suggested by my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER The information is so obvious that it is almost impossible to think it cannot be obtained.

Mr. FIELDING. The French method of levying duty being entirely different from ours the question of ad valorem does not arise. They make no distinction between the minimum and the maximum.

Mr. BERGERON. In item 128 schedule 'A,' referring to woods in the rough, the expression 'sixty centimetres' is used. If this were put in English we could understand it.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend will find that his desire is met if he looks at the pamphlet entitled 'further memoranda.' I will send him over a copy.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are we to go over the treaty clause by clause? We will have to do it some time and perhaps it will be convenient to do it now.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no objection to reading the treaty clause by clause if that is required.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER then read the treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that the fullest liberty of legislation with reference to tariffs is under this treaty reserved by each country, that is, that the French chambers have a perfect right to take articles from the minimum tariff and put them on the general, or vice versa, even those articles in which under this treaty Canada has access to the French market—that France has a perfect right to make any changes she pleases in her tariff, and Canada has exactly the same right. Is that true ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is correct, with the qualification which no doubt the hon. gentleman had in his mind. France grants to us the benefit of her minimum tariff on a large list of articles, that is, the minimum tariff as it is now and as France shall have the right to change it from time to time; and reciprocally Canada grants to France the advantages of our intermediate tariff on a list of articles, that being the intermediate tariff as it is now, or as Canada may from time to time change it. To that extent both countries are reciprocally free to change their tariff. But in schedule 'C' there are a few special articles on which the duties are fixed, or, as the French say, consolidated. That was also the case in the treaty of 1893. These rates the parliament of Canada has no power to change. But subject to that special list of articles, the minimum tariff of France and the intermediate tariff of Canada each country retains full liberty to change from time to time.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to some articles in schedule 'C.' France enjoys a lower rate than the British preferential rate. Is any legislation proposed to remedy that inequality ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, the Bill provides that every reduction accorded to France in this treaty shall apply to the whole British empire, except in cases where a larger reduction may have been granted under the British preference. But if there are imported from Great Britain articles which under the preferential tariff would bear a higher rate than the rate on similar articles expressed in this treaty, then the reduced rate specified in the treaty shall apply to Great Britain and the British empire generally.

Mr. FOSTER. So that with reference to certain articles at least, we can no longer say that there is British preferential treatment, France receiving equal treatment with Great Britain ?

Mr. FIELDING. There have always been articles as to which Great Britain had no preference, and in those cases there is no departure in this treaty. We have not given Great Britain a preference from time to time on everything.

Mr. FOSTER. Great Britain has a preference on everything over all foreign countries except on spirits and the like of that.

Mr. FIELDING. And tobacco and cigars.

Mr. FOSTER. Except on excise articles. But now you have taken a step further, have you not, and there are some other articles on which Great Britain will not have a preference.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, there are some special articles. For instance, on books the British rate was 5 per cent, and we have provided in this treaty that books in the French language imported from France shall bear 5 per cent; but as books in the French language are not likely to be imported from Great Britain to any extent, there will be no great disadvantage to her in that.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister made any calculation as to what preference Great Britain will now have upon the range of goods on which a diminution of duty is granted to France? France gets the intermediate tariff on a large number of items; she also gets under schedule 'C' equal duties with Great Britain on a number of articles on which there was formerly a preference, greater or less to Great Britain. This preference will of course be diminished by the amount of the reduction granted on goods coming from France. Has any calculation been made to show what the preference to Great Britain on that class of articles will now really be?

Mr. FIELDING. There has been no average taken. It would be necessary to take each article point by point and ascertain the effect of the intermediate tariff on each.

Mr. FOSTER. A calculation could be made on the whole.

Mr. HENDERSON. We all understood, when the British preference was given to its fullest extent, that it was one-third off the general tariff. I think the minister should be able to say how much he thinks that one-third is reduced with reference to France and the other countries which will have the benefit of this treaty. Would it be reasonable to say that the British preference would be cut in two ? Possibly the officers of the department who have had this matter under consideration could form some opinion. I think it would be interesting to the country to know to what extent we are now giving a British preference.

Mr. FIELDING. The rates of the intermediate tariff are not new; they were all set forth a year ago and as was then pointed out, there was a material reduction in the British preference. The hon. gentleman's question could only be answered by taking each item. The memorandum furnished to hon. members gives the detail of every item. For instance, there is item 567—fabrics, manufactures, wearing apparel and ready-made clothing, on which the general tariff was 35

per cent, the intermediate 25 per cent and the British preference 30 per cent. In that case the intermediate and the general tariffs were the same, 35 per cent and the British preferential rate 30 per cent, a difference of only 5 per cent. I take that as an illustration. Every item would have to be examined in the same way.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Finance has very shrewdly taken an exceptional case, in order, I suppose, to create a favourable impression. So I do not think that the case cited can at all be an illustration. I see the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) smiling at the shrewdness of his colleague in selecting such a peculiar case as an illustration.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend does me too much honour when he refers to my shrewdness. I simply took the first item on a page and pointed it out as an illustration. Let me now, in order to be fair, take the second item, No. 570, on page 17 of the documents, the item of mats : the general tariff rate is 35 per cent, the intermediate rate is 30 per cent and the British preference 25 per cent. Consequently, France gets the intermediate rate. In that case the difference of 10 per cent is cut in two.

Mr. HENDERSON. So that practically the British preference is reduced from 33⅓ per cent to 16⅔ per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. On that particular item and many others.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is that a fair sample of the whole?

Mr. FIELDING. They vary.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid the British preference will not amount to much under this.

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not know what the British ambassador will think of it when he comes from the United States to Canada and finds we are treating the British so very cavalierly as we appear to be by this resolution.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend's observations should ever reach the British ambassador, he will find that his criticism is not just, because there is a large number of gentlemen in England who rather hold that Canada is not bound to keep the preference up to a given rate, but is entirely free to make the preference what she wishes from time to time.

Mr. FOSTER. Not entirely free. There were some rather pregnant remarks made by the right hon. the First Minister at the Imperial Conference this year, in which he assured the representatives of the empire there assembled that a very substantial and permanent British preference had been secured and would be maintained. But this matter is somewhat more important than my hon. friend acknowledges. It would seem to be of first importance that the Finance Minister, when he asks parliament to ratify this treaty, should be prepared to give us full information as to how it affects previous policies and previous currents of trade, and one very important question is as to how far it cuts across that policy which my right hon. friend so strongly took up, and has so bravely championed since, of a large, wide preference to the mother country and British colonies. My hon. friend will recollect that they began with 25 per cent.

Mr. BERGERON. 12½ per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. The legislation was to come in force at two respective periods, and 12½ per cent was the preference at each period. But 25 per cent was the principle laid down. Afterwards, in a generous outburst of loyalty to the British Crown and British dependencies, that was raised to 33⅓ per cent. That has been the basis of my right hon. friend and his party since then. That has been the real and substantial preference on which they have taken their stand. It is of some importance then to know how far that has been cut across and what has been the result, because, taking this French treaty into consideration, we have not only to take into account the goods that come from France and the cutting down of the British preference so far as that import is concerned, but also some twelve or fifteen countries which have the most favoured nation treaty clause and therefore come under this treaty. It is of great importance that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) should have his officers make the calculation and give the results to this House before he asks us to ratify the treaty, so that we may know what will be the condition of British preference now. Let his officers take the imports of last year, and on that basis make the calculation as to what will be the effect on the British preference of the lower duties as regards France and the most favoured nations. It would be an easy matter to find out just how the British preference would be affected and determine whether it still retains its 33⅓ per cent or its original 25 per cent or is cut down to one-half of 25 per cent. We should know exactly how it stands. The Finance Minister has not performed his duty in not giving us that information.

Mr. FIELDING. I have so often failed in my duty to the satisfaction of my hon. friend that I cannot expect to please him in this instance.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you not think it is reasonable?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I do not. In the early part of the debate my hon. friend asked for heaps of information, a great deal

of which was not necessary for the discussion. Nevertheless he thought it necessary, and we produced it. Now he wants more information, and if I bring that down he will want still more. The zeal of my hon. friend on behalf of the British preference is interesting, but it is rather novel to find on that side the British preference championed as it is.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. FIELDING. We have been more accustomed to hear it attacked. The hon. gentleman's complaint seems to me rather strange. He has all the information before him. He has every item in this tariff set forth in detail, showing what is the British preference, what is the intermediate tariff, what is the general tariff and what is the rate of duty under this treaty. What more does he want? He thinks that I should discover whether there has been any reduction on the British preference at 33⅓ per cent. It would have been strange had I given instructions of the character he mentions. When the House a year ago adopted the intermediate tariff it made a reduction on the original 33⅓ per cent preference. All my hon. friend has to do is to turn up the tariff of last year, and he will there find item after item set forth in which the British preference is materially less than 33⅓ per cent. The information he desires is already in his possession. We have set forth all the items point by point, and any hon. member who desires to know how the treaty is going to affect the British preference on any given article has simply to turn to the printed sheets.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has not met the whole question. He says we knew what the intermediate tariff was a year ago. Quite true, but we did not know whether France was going to get the benefit of that tariff in one or ten or a hundred articles. Since then he has made an arrangement with France by which a very large number of articles from that country come under the intermediate tariff. That is a situation quite different from that of a year ago. Does my hon. friend confess that he and his colleagues, when they undertook to negotiate a treaty with France which would settle their policy for years, did not inquire how that treaty was going to affect their settled doctrine and policy of British preference, and that they negotiated that treaty without having bothered their heads at all as to how it affected the policy of this country, as laid down by the right hon. gentleman himself, in the matter of preference to Britain and her colonies? That is an amazing confession. It seems to me you would hardly have a confession like that made in any house of parliament when a great treaty was being discussed. It seems to me that the very first duty of our ambassadors would have been to find out how the proposed treaty affected existing conditions. You are making a treaty with France, you are putting her on a favoured basis, you are giving her treatment she did not enjoy before on a large variety of articles. You are doing more than that, you are allowing Japan to come in under the most favoured nation treatment, and with respect to certain articles, on which you have allowed France the benefit of the intermediate tariff, Japan will have great advantage. More than that, you have allowed ten or twelve more favoured nations besides Japan the very same reduction under this treaty.

Yet the minister who carried on the negotiations and who asked us to ratify the treaty confesses to the House that he has never made the mark of a pencil in calculation, nor has he consulted any of his experts to find out how that will affect the general trend of trade. I supposed that we had set out on a policy of distinct and substantial preference to Great Britain and the British colonies. My hon. friend says that he has not heard that policy championed on this side of the House. Well, his hearing must be dull, or his memory bad. I will not carry that any further. It is sufficient for my purpose to state that the hon. gentleman himself, and the premier, and all the other members of the cabinet, have plumed themselves, in Britain and in every part of Canada, upon their practical British preference. But they have entered into a treaty giving to France and ten or twelve other countries a distinct diminution of duties, in some cases even below the intermediate tariff duties thus materially affecting the amount of preference that Britain and the colonies enjoy. For instance, I should think that it might have struck my hon. friend as worth while to consider the effect of such a section as this in schedule 'C':

> Embroideries, not otherwise provided; lace, not otherwise provided; collars or collarettes in lace and all manufactures of lace; netting of cotton, linen, silk or other material, not otherwise provided, 27½ per cent.

I find that the intermediate tariff on that item is thirty-two and a half per cent. But France gets a reduction of five per cent below the intermediate or ten per cent below the general tariff and only two and a half per cent above the preferential rate to Great Britain. In some cases, she even gets better than the British preference. And all these things taken together must affect the currents of trade and have a special bearing upon the preference which I had thought, up to the present time, was especially dear to the hon. gentlemen opposite. We are entitled to know how this will affect the British preference.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. Foster's) remarks may have a little force with regard to the items in schedule 'C,' but no others. And these items are very few. The most important is one in

which, I take it, Great Britain is not concerned—wines. Silks are the only other item of importance, but we get our silks also from other countries. But the hon. gentleman seems to forget, when he asks what effect this is going to have on the British preference, that this was a subject the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) need not have concerned himself very much about. Why? Because the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) himself and all the members of the House had laid down the limits within which the Finance Minister might act. When we adopted this tariff last year, the effect upon Great Britain was considered. The fact that there would be a lowering of the preference to the extent of the difference between the general and the intermediate tariff was known. But the House accepted that. The Minister of Finance made his arrangement under system, except so far as regards the items in schedule 'C,' and with regard to these, as I have said, the hon. gentleman's remarks have some pertinence.

Mr. FOSTER. It is all pertinent as to the information we require.

Mr. PATERSON. No, because that information was had, or should have been had, last year. At that time we deliberately adopted the resolution that we could afford to lower the British preference to the extent of the difference between the intermediate and the general tariff, and under that, the commissioners acted. Of course, the House has not pronounced upon the matter so far as the items in schedule 'C' are concerned and, as to these, the effect upon the preference may still reasonably be considered by the House.

Now, I would like to give, as well as I can offhand, an answer to the point raised by my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson.) If he consults the tariff, he will find that in the general tariff items of twenty-five per cent, thirty per cent or even thirty-five per cent, as a rule—I say as a rule, but, of course, there are exceptions—are reduced by two and a half per cent. On the article on which the duty is twenty-five per cent this two and a half per cent reduction would mean a ten per cent cut in the duty; on the article at thirty per cent it would mean seven and a half per cent. In a very few cases there is a reduction from the thirty-five per cent duty of five per cent, which would be a reduction of fourteen per cent. My own judgment is that, taken in the gross and attempting, as I say, to answer offhand the question of my hon. friend the effect of this treaty will be to reduce the British preference to twenty-three and one-third per cent from thirty-three and one-third per cent. I do not think that any definite answer can be given before the trade is commenced.

Mr. FOSTER. Take it on last year's trade.

Mr. PATERSON. But you cannot tell what the effect will be. For instance, take the case of wines—I confine myself, as I have said, to articles under schedule 'C,' which, I think, are the only legitimate subject of inquiry—the change in the duty on this article does not affect Great Britain, nor will the change with regard to silk, as we do not import silks from Great Britain. There is only one item, that of embroideries and laces to which the hon. member (Mr. Foster) has called attention. But take the whole of schedule 'C,' and I think the changes under it will not affect to any great extent either British interests or Canadian interests. Perhaps, there may be some effect in the case of wine, so far as Canadian industry is concerned, but not so far as England is concerned.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am glad at least, of the admission of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) that some information has not yet been furnished that should be given. But his remarks, when he speaks of the action of the House last year with respect to the intermediate tariff, only serve to becloud the issue. The intermediate tariff, when it passed this House last session was a purely academic matter. It could only come into operation by order in council.

Therefore it would have been impossible at that time to discuss these matters because we had no definite proposal before us with respect to the trade of any particular country to which that intermediate tariff would apply. The government has now brought that tariff into operation. It undoubtedly cuts down the preference to Great Britain to a very considerable extent. What we asked in the first place was a statement from the government as to the extent to which that preference is cut down. Undoubtedly that could have been prepared upon reference to the trade returns of last year by comparison of the preferential tariff with the intermediate tariff, in so far as that trade was likely to be affected by the present treaty with France. It seems to me that there is another consideration in connection with the whole subject and that is the extent to which this government is prepared to abrogate the British preference, having regard to the trade of all countries with which Canada does business. We recollect very well that when the preference to Great Britain was increased from 25 per cent to 33 per cent the members of this House were all invited to arise and sing 'God save the Queen,' and we all got up and sang 'God save the Queen.' What particular air does the hon. gentlemen suggest we should sing on this occasion when we are cutting that preference down by about one-third? No appropriate music has yet been suggested

by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

There is another consideration. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in the campaign of 1896, adopted Sir Charles Tupper's policy of a mutual preference between Great Britain and Canada, if possible between Great Britain and all the dominions of the empire, and said that if he were returned to power he would go to Great Britain and would be able to accomplish everything in reference to such preference that Sir Charles Tupper could have accomplished. He went to Great Britain and told the people of that country that we did not require a preference in the markets of Great Britain, we had given Great Britain a preference and we would not desire a preference in the markets of Great Britain because he said he did not desire to see Great Britain cursed by that protection which he himself was then maintaining in Canada and has ever since maintained. He said he gave this preference to Great Britain in consideration of the splendid freedom which Great Britain has conferred on us. Has Great Britain taken any of this freedom away so that we feel constrained now to take this preference away in part? What is the policy of the government in this matter? The intermediate tariff was passed last year, but the government gave us no idea of the principle on which they would proceed in applying that intermediate tariff to the trade of any country in the world. Not one iota of information on this point was afforded during that debate. It is therefore idle for the Minister of Customs to suggest that anything which took place last year could be of any great service to us in this debate.

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has asked in the first place to what extent, by way of percentage, the British preference is cut down by this treaty which has been negotiated with the Republic of France; and in the next place, taking the actual trade conditions between Canada and France and between Canada and all countries to which this intermediate tariff must be applied by reason of this treaty with France, to what extent our trade with Great Britain will probably be affected in view of the smaller preference which the commodities of Great Britain will henceforth obtain in our markets so far as they are required to compete with these countries. That would appear to be a very reasonable piece of information to ask for and one which, having regard to the professed policy of the government in the past, the House is in a position to demand to-day. But it does not seem that the government are in a position to afford the information. However, the Minister of Customs has made the definite statement that so far as schedule 'C' is concerned, we are certainly entitled to this information, and if we are entitled to it, why is it not available when we are about to discuss the items of this treaty clause by clause? If it is not available, when will it be available? Because the admission having been made that it is essential, I presume the government will not feel like proceeding with the treaty until that information is forthcoming.

Mr. FIELDING. I am sorry I cannot follow the hon. gentleman in his conclusions. Last year this House, at the instance of the government, adopted a tariff policy which included a general tariff, an intermediate tariff and a preferential tariff. We had, in framing that tariff, to consider the prospects of trade with various countries. We had to consider what was a proper measure of taxation to impose on any goods imported into the country and what discrimination we should make between different countries. That was the time to have considered how these changes in the tariff might affect our relations with Great Britain and it was considered. Therefore the hon. gentleman is ony dreaming when he talks of some information being needed now on a matter that was fully discussed in this House a year ago. It was distinctly stated that by the intermediate tariff we reduced the British preference. It was fully considered then, at the right time. We did not need to go to Paris to inquire into the matter. The proper place to inquire was in this House a year ago, and this House, practically without division, established a tariff which it said we might properly apply as far as we could to the products of any foreign country. It was distinctly declared to be an instrument of negotiation. It was said that we wished to be prepared to apply it to such countries as we might deem proper to enter into negotiations with, having a desire to extend our trade. Therefore in giving to France, so far as we do give to France, the benefits of the intermediate tariff, we are giving the very tariff rates which this House last year, after full consideration, declared were fair and reasonable for such a purpose. So much for the intermediate tariff generally.

Now with regard to the few special cases to which the Minister of Customs referred. If schedule 'C' is examined carefully it will be found that the great majority of the things in it are articles not produced by Great Britain at all, and therefore no matter what rate you impose on these articles you do not interfere with the British preference. You have to have your tariff columns filled, you set forth that the duty on wines shall be so and so; but England does not produce wines, the chief item on which concessions are given to France—indeed the only important items are wines and silks. Wines and silks are the specialties of France. No matter what duties you impose on wines, you do not affect British trade in the smallest degree, because Britain does not produce wines. What difference does it make then to Great Britain if we grant a preference to France on wines? The question of the

effect of the duty on the production of wines in Canada was referred to last night and may have to be discussed later. That of course has nothing to do with the British preference. The same thing applies in the case of silks. The first item is a certain class of canned vegetables which are peculiar to France. We produce vegetables in Canada but there are certain specialties which are produced in France and which enter Canada to a small extent. There is a reduction on them but there is still a substantial duty. It will be found in every case where a reduction is made on any article, manufactured in Canada, that there is still a fair duty, affording to the industry affected a reasonable measure of protection in proportion to what is extended to other industries in Canada. I think that statement may be made generally.

The first item, for instance :

Vegetables, tomatoes excepted, including baked beans, in cans, or other air-tight packages.

These are specialties of France in which Great Britain does not compete at all.

Then we find the item :

Anchovies, sardines, sprats and other fish, packed in oil or otherwise.

What concern is it of England that we give a reduction to France on that item ? That is not going to affect British trade in the slightest degree ; it has no bearing whatever on the British preference.

Wines of the fresh grape of all kinds, sparkling, imported in barrels or in bottles.

That is of no importance to Britain ; England does not manufacture wines. Therefore, it is not going to affect the imports or products of Great Britain to the extent of one single penny. With respect to champagne the same thing is true. The duty on champagne is set forth here, but no matter what rate of duty we may levy on champagne that does not affect the products of England in the slightest degree. In the case of books we give them the same rate as Great Britain. In that case the preference ceases. There have always been items in the tariff as to which there has been no preference. In the case of French books, although the rate is the same, there will be no competition because very few if any books in the French language will be imported from Great Britain in all probability.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the duty on books admitted into France ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yesterday my hon. friend raised an important point on that. He thinks the treaty is unfair in that respect.

Mr. DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. I understood him to argue that this treaty is unfair in that while allowing books to come in at five per cent he has not seen that there is a corresponding reduction on books entering France. The reason why we could not ask any reduction on books entering France is that books are free in France.

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

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, my hon. friend was struggling hard yesterday to find some reason for condemning this treaty, which he knows to be a good one, and he drew upon his imagination to show that some great wrong was done because we actually gave a rate of five per cent on French books coming into Canada and he implied that we were going to pay a much higher duty on books going into France. It turned out that there is no duty at all. Now, there is the item of olive oil.

Mr. FOSTER. Take item 220.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the case of medical preparations, etc.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. We have in that case given France the same rate as we give to Great Britain.

Mr. FOSTER. You have given Great Britain fifty per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. No; last year there was no distinction between medicines containing alcohol and medicines which do not contain alcohol. Now we propose to make a reduction on those medicines which do not contain alcohol, allowing the rate to remain as before with respect to those which do contain alcohol.

Mr. FOSTER. You will have to provide for that by legislation.

Mr. FIELDING. This Bill deals with it. There are just two or three classes where the duties on British goods are the same as the duties on French goods. In the article of medical preparations and some other articles made in France and England there will be no preference. We give a reduced rate on olive oil. Is that going to injure a British industry ? Great Britain does not produce olive oil. Embroideries, laces, etc.—most of these articles—I think I might say all of them—are French specialties and there is practically no competition between Great Britain and France in the matter. France makes these articles of a special class, and I am informed by a gentleman in the trade that where an article with a corresponding name is made in Great Britain the article itself is so materially different that they are practically two different things and do not come into competition.

Mr. FOSTER. What is meant by 'embroideries, n.o.p. ; lace n.o.p.' in item 575 ?

Mr. FIELDING. In every case they are taken from our own tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. They are otherwise specified ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. One item about where there may be some debate is that of laces. There are laces manufactured in England, at Nottingham, but, I am advised that, although lace is manufactured at Nottingham and in France, there is a substantial difference between the two classes of goods. A gentleman largely engaged in the trade told me that from a practical point of view he did not consider that the French and Nottingham laces were the same articles and did not come into competition. But, there is the possibility of saying that this one article is made in England as well as in France. Take 'velvets of pure silk fabrics'; these are French specialties, as are 'ribbons of all kinds and materials,' and also manufacturers of silk or of which silk is a component part of chief value.' These articles, enumerated in schedule 'C,' are specialties of France and no matter what rate of duty may be imposed upon them they do not affect the British preference practically although nominally the rates may be the same. I have read all the items of schedule 'C' and I think I am correct in stating that as between French and British industry with respect to these articles there is little or no competition.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. One item the hon. gentleman has spoken of is silks and velvets. I find upon turning up the Trade and Navigation returns that we imported last year about $2,000,000 worth of these goods, or $1,929,385 from Great Britain, whilst from France we imported $678,000 worth. Surely, reducing the duty on these goods to within 2½ per cent of the British preferential tariff will have a very injurious effect on the importation of silks and velvets from Great Britain. We cannot expect to import anything like $2,000,000 worth from Great Britain in the future when we have the same duty on goods coming from France.

Mr. PATERSON. The great bulk of those goods did not come in under the preferential tariff. Of silk manufactures $1,057,000 came in from Great Britain but only $271,000 under the preference. Other countries have shipped these goods through Great Britain.

Mr. FIELDING. These silks that the hon. gentleman speaks of are very largely foreign silks. They come through Great Britain but not being British silks they are not entitled to the preference.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. In future that trade will come direct and will cut the British merchant out entirely.

Mr. FIELDING. No, my hon. friend did not hear the discussion yesterday between an hon. gentleman and myself. I point out that French goods could still be purchased in London or Liverpool and that if you proved the identity you could send them in under this treaty. French and other foreign silks may continue to be brought in by way of Great Britain.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Of ribbons we imported from Great Britain in 1906 $456,000 worth and from France $212.000 worth.

Mr. PATERSON. The same thing applies there.

Mr. FIELDING. There has been a very considerable British industry in ribbons. Coventry was the great centre of this industry, but it has not proved successful and it has ceased to be any longer a substantial industry. These goods come very largely from France.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there anything in this treaty that will prevent the government from making a similar one with any other nation that wanted to come in under this arrangement ? There is nothing in the treaty which would prevent the government from making new treaties ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is quite so ; we could make treaties with any other country subject to the condition that we will have to come to parliament and get concurrence in it.

Mr. BERGERON. Could we make an arrangement with Germany better than the one we have made with France ?

Mr. FIELDING. Not as respects the articles of this convention; we have to give France as good terms as anybody else in reference to these articles. If we should make a new treaty with Germany and give better terms with respect to any one of these articles we would be obliged to give those terms to France just as France would be obliged, should she give better terms to any other country, to give them to us.

Mr. PATERSON. In reference to ribbons, I find that $485,000 worth were imported from Great Britain during 9 months of 1907. That was a large item but only $9,144 worth came in under the preference. The others came from there but paid the general tariff. They were not British goods.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I would like to ask the minister if any of these countries could trade through England at the same rate of duty as goods may be admitted from France whether they are of French origin or not ?

Mr. FIELDING. They will get a better rate ; they will get the French rate.

Mr. BERGERON. It was said last year that nothing at all could come from Great Britain under the preferential tariff unless so much work has been put upon it by English workmen. Is my understanding correct as to that ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, that is in the regulations.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Customs said that comparatively few items in the tariff showed a reduction of as much as 5 per cent from the general tariff down to the intermediate, but I find on a reference to the tariff that these items are much more numerous than the Minister of Customs thinks. For instance, on blankets composed wholly or partly of wool, flannels, undershirts, draws, knitted goods; mats, door or carriage; Turkish or imitation rugs, the general tariff is 35 per cent and the intermediate tariff 30 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON. Are any of these articles in the French treaty?

Mr. HENDERSON. Some of them are. The statement was made by the Minister of Customs that it was not often there was a reduction from 35 to 30 per cent in the tariff, but I have enumerated some, and I could enumerate many others, to show that 5 per cent is a quite common difference between the general and the intermediate tariff. The Minister of Finance spoke of the protection given to the industries of this country, and I understood him to say he thought it had been fairly considered. I am not going to advocate any higher protection or increased duties, but if the Finance Minister was right in his tariff last year, then he would be supposed to endeavour to maintain the same level of protection to home industries under this treaty. On gloves and mitts of all kinds the preferential tariff is 22½ per cent, the intermediate tariff 30 per cent, and the general tariff 35 per cent. In future 30 per cent will be the duty on importations of gloves and mitts from France and from these thirteen other countries that may ship such goods into Canada under favoured nation treatment. I am not complaining so much about the reduction, but I do say that the government has not been fair to the glove manufacturer, because I submit that the moment they reduced the duty on the manufactured article they should have given a corresponding reduction on the raw material. I find in our tariff that on glove leather, tanned or dressed, coloured or uncoloured, when imported by glove manufacturers for use exclusively in their own factories in the manufacture of goods, the British preference is 5 per cent, the intermediate tariff 7½ per cent and the general tariff 10 per cent. The duty on the manufactured article is reduced under this French treaty, but there is no reduction on the raw material that the glove manufacturer must use. If the tariff of last year was fair, then I say that the present arrangement is very unfair indeed. On this raw material out of which gloves and mitts are made the British preference is as high as 50 per cent, but that was not much of a favour to Great Britain, because we all know that these glove leathers are largely imported from France and Germany, and therefore the preference given to Great Britain on glove leathers, and the low rate of duty on imports from Great Britain here in consequence, would not be of very great advantage to our glove manufacturers. The glove making industry in this country is one of considerable importance, and the glove manufacturer is handicapped under this treaty by having his protection reduced, while he is given no corresponding benefit by having a reduction made in the duty on his raw material. France is a large exporter of gloves, and the advantage of 5 per cent in the duty which this treaty gives her will naturally tend to increased importations from that country. I do not find fault with the reductions under the French treaty, so much, but I do find fault with the government, that they are giving no corresponding reduction to the Canadian manufacturer in his raw material. France produces the kid from which the glove is made, and it would be a great advantage to the Canadian glove manufacturer if the duty on this raw material of his were lowered.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the tanner?

Mr. HENDERSON. It would make no difference to the Canadian tanner, because these fine glove leathers are not made in Canada, and I doubt very much if they ever will be. Even in the United States these fine glove leathers are imported from Germany and France. I only wish there were some mode of remedying what appears to me to be an entire oversight on the part of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs, because I can hardly believe that they would intentionally have dealt so unjustly with an important industry of the town in which I live.

Mr. FIELDING. There was no oversight in the treaty. If my hon. friend's criticism is just, it could have been made with some force last year, but it certainly cannot apply to this treaty. We are not imposing any new rate on gloves by the French treaty. The rate is the rate that was adopted last year in the intermediate tariff.

Mr. HENDERSON. Last year we did not know that the minister was going to apply the new treaty to the manufactured article and not apply it to the raw material. We were led to suppose that there was going to be an honest application of the whole measure, but, unfortunately, that is not the case.

Mr. FIELDING. It was our business to secure concessions—what value they are remains to be seen—as respects the products of Canada entering France. It was not our business to thrust concessions on the French authorities with respect to goods coming to Canada. If we want to reduce the duty

on any article coming to Canada, we do not need to go to France to arrange it. This House could arrange it last year or this year.

Mr. HENDERSON. But the minister must surely see that when the French authorities asked for concessions on gloves and mitts, the answer should have been, we will give you that, but you must give us concessions on raw materials out of which they are made.

Mr. FIELDING. There would have been no use of our asking for concessions on glove leathers, because we do not make glove leathers and have none to sell.

Mr. HENDERSON. Our people make gloves and they have to import raw materials from France, and if there was a reduction on these it would be better for the manufacturer.

Mr. FIELDING. We can make that reduction if we want to do it, but we do not need to make it a part of a French treaty or to ask permission of the French authorities to do it.

Mr. HENDERSON. But when you bring down a measure to reduce the one, you should reduce the other at the same time. I think the minister had better be candid and say that it was an oversight.

Mr. PATERSON. I can relieve the hon. gentleman's mind by saying that we import no glove leathers from France, so that the question does not arise. Last year we imported from Great Britain $3,804 worth, from Belgium, $41 worth; from Germany, $8,245 worth, and from the United States, $327,000 worth. Therefore the treaty does not affect them, and they are in no worse a position now than they were before.

Mr. HENDERSON. I can tell the Minister of Customs that these glove leathers are not made in the United States. The United States imports them from France and Germany, especially from Germany. They may come to this country through the back door of Britain or the United States, but they are not kid-dressing countries and they import these goods from Europe.

Mr. PATERSON. That occurs in many cases. Many articles imported from the United States are not manufactured there, but are imported from Europe, but when they come here they must be entered as United States imports. I am not saying that the hon. gentleman is not correct in what he states about leather for gloves being tanned in France, but it pays no higher duty than it did before—that is my argument.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not following the trade returns in the statement I make; I am following information which I have apart altogether from blue-books. I have some practical knowledge of this matter, and I am guided by that. France manufactures enormous quantities of fine kid leather. The process is a very expensive one. I am told that it would take two years for the leather to pass through the process of tanning, and if it comes to Canada through the United States it comes originally from France or Germany.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth). I wish to speak again of the wine duties. I can assure the Finance Minister that this is a very live question in the grape-growing districts, where the people feel very keenly upon it. Every organization of fruit growers in Canada has passed resolutions of the strongest kind asking the government not to ratify that clause of the treaty which reduces the duties on French wines. I have presented petitions to this House from hundreds and perhaps thousands of fruit growers in the Niagara district, and more are coming every day. I wish to read a resolution from the Ontario Fruit Growers' Association, the leading organization of the kind in Canada, to whose views the Finance Minister paid so much attention last year in framing the tariff. This is the resolution they passed at the last meeting of the board of directors :

Resolved, that in view of the great importance and value of the grape growing industry of Canada, the directors of the Ontario Fruit Growers' Association cannot but regard the proposed reduction in the duties on light wines coming from France under the provisions of the proposed French treaty, as a most serious blow at the industry, as fully one-third of the grapes grown in Canada are annually manufactured into wine, and these wines come into direct competition with the light wines proposed to be brought into Canada at reduced rates of duty, and respectfully urge that the parliament of Canada do not ratify the portion of the proposed French treaty that provides for reduced duties upon light wines coming into Canada from France.

In the southern part of the province of Ontario, we have an organization composed of the leading grape growers and whose membership is composed of almost every fruit grower in the district. About six weeks ago they passed the following resolution :

Whereas the grape growing industry of Canada is one already of large proportion, the annual product amounting to 60,000,000 pounds of grapes at least, and whereas approximately one-third of these are manufactured into native wine, we the grape growers of southern Ontario, view with alarm the provision of the proposed treaty with France which provides for a reduction of the duty on the cheaper grades of French wines coming into this country, that come into direct competition with the product of our vineyards, and we respectfully urge upon the

government of Canada the importance of fostering this grape industry, rather than destroying or seriously crippling it, and hope that the parliament of Canada will not ratify that portion of the proposed French treaty which provides for a reduction of the duty on French wines, below the duty in effect under the old French treaty, which was greatly reduced from that under the general tariff.

I have here also a resolution from Niagara District Association which I shall not trouble the House with reading. It is on the same lines as the foregoing. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) also read a resolution the other day from another association to the same effect. These are practically all the associations in Canada of fruit growers and they all believe that this treaty will be very injurious to their interests. I would also point out that the spirits used to fortify these French wines do not pay any excise duty and therefore cost very little, whereas our Canadian producers, owing to the excise duty, have to pay ninety cents a gallon for the spirits they use in their wines. This difference alone is more than sufficient to counterbalance any duty remaining on the lighter grades of wine, as nearly all the wines in Canada classify under twenty degrees. I would ask the Minister of Finance whether there is any excise duty on the spirits used by the French manufacturers to fortify their wines.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend's statement is correct. There is no excise duty. Representations have been made to me on this line and they, as well as all representations coming from so influential a body are entitled to and will receive very careful consideration. But I am not prepared to say anything definite now as to what we will do with reference to excise.

Mr. FOSTER. How much alcohol is used by our growers in fortifying their wines ?

Mr. FIELDING. Some use a very considerable amount. They represent that the amount they are obliged to pay in the way of alcohol for fortifying purposes is very considerable. It is quite a tax upon them, at all events, and they seek relief.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. If they only use seven per cent or eight per cent, that would be equal to the whole amount of the duty.

Mr. FIELDING. We quite realize that the wine industry of Canada would feel very anxious on this subject, also that the gentlemen who represent these memorials ought to be the best authorities on the subject, and any opinions I would venture to offer would not be entitled to much consideration. Yet I am inclined to think that they magnify the difficulties of the situation. In one of the memorials they submitted they make the statement that the wines now imported from France do not compete practically with the wines of Canada, and they fear that a different class of wine would be imported under the new treaty. I think that statement was made was it not ?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I do not remember but is not that the case ? But under the old treaty were not the wines on which duty was taken off sparkling wines and not non-sparkling wines under twenty-six degrees ? Whilst under the new treaty the thirty per cent ad valorem is taken off every quality as well as ten cents per gallon off the specific.

Mr. FIELDING. The memorial contains the statement that the class of wines hitherto brought in from France has not substantially competed with the wines of Canada, and their fear is that, under the treaty a different class of wines may be imported. I think that the fear of the wine growers is not so much that the treaty would injure them, but that it may be possibly violated. Well, we must take the treaty as we find it. The wines it deals with are the wines of the fresh grape. I do not think that contemplates adulterated wines, and I think the fears of the wine growers may be unfounded. However that is well worth remembering. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) will remember that when a similar question was up some years ago in connection with the treaty of 1893, there was a widespread alarm among the wine growers that the making of any concessions in favour of light wines was going to deal a serious blow to our wine industry. Representations were then made as strong as the ones made now, but these impressions have been proved not to have been well founded. Our wine growers were unnecessarily alarmed. The old French treaty was negotiated in 1893 and confirmed in 1894. I have here the figures of the importations of light wines for a series of years. Take 1893, the year when the old treaty was negotiated, our imports were to the amount of $100,780. The next year they fell off to $82,754. In 1895, by which time the treaty had gone well into operation, the imports were $79,740. Let me give the figures from that date on, and my hon. friend will observe that there has been little or no increase in the consumption of the light wines of France :

1895	$ 79,940
1896	105,763
1897	81,334
1898	70,527
1899	90,837
1900	91,711
1901	95,616
1902	95,121
1903	98,524
1904	108,197
1905	102,889
1906	119,433
1907 (9 months)	83,765

And for the whole twelve months of 1907, $114,653. It will be observed that whereas, as far back as 1892, the importation of these light wines into Canada was a little over $100,000, last year it was only $114,000, notwithstanding the large increase of population and the large development of trade. In the same time the consumption of champagnes increased from 1892, when the value was $138,000, to $319,000 last year.

Mr. FOSTER. We have had more government steamers since.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, that had something to do with it no doubt. That shows very clearly that our people are not wine drinkers to any great extent.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Would not that show that the wines of our own Canadian growers have taken the place of the imports of the non-sparkling wines even under the old treaty, under which the duty was twenty-five cents a gallon? The increase in sparkling wines has been very great, but the non-sparkling wines have not increased because they are made in Canada, and that trade has been taken by the Canadian wine manufacturers. But had the importations of non-sparkling wines increased in the same ratio as the sparkling, there would have been a difference of over $200,000 against the wines manufactured by Canadians. But whereas twenty-five cents a gallon might enable our growers to meet the French competition, when you reduce the duty to fifteen cents, that might be the straw which breaks the camel's back. They thought that the twenty-five cents was going to break their back, but it turned out to be a sufficient protection. But I think it would be quite a different thing with a duty of fifteen per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend may be surprised to find that there is a larger protection to Canadian wine growing, even under this duty, than there is on most other Canadian industries. I have not the figures at hand, but I am advised that these lighter wines can be bought wholesale in Paris at from thirteen cents to twenty cents a gallon. If we take it at fifteen cents, this duty would mean a protection of one hundred per cent. Suppose we make every allowance that can be asked and count the price of the wine in Paris at thirty cents per gallon, that would mean a protection of fifty per cent. That is a pretty good protection.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. But how about the quality of the wine? At 15 cents, or even at 30 cents, it must certainly be adulterated.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) knows that adulteration of wines has been carried to such an extent in France that there has been almost armed rebellion among the grape growers. I understand that the French government enacted some legislation which prevents so much adulteration at the present time. But no doubt these adulterated wines are in store in large quantities, and our vine growers are afraid that the owners of those adulterated wines will regard Canada as a good dumping ground. Therefore, they ask, if this treaty must be ratified, that the government give us some positive assurance that the wine imported shall be the pure juice of the grape, not wine fortified, not wine sweetened with sugar. Of course, sugar sweetening is hardly required in France, though it is in this country. Our people might possibly compete under a duty of 15 cents per gallon if they are competing against the same article as their own and not an adulterated wine.

Mr. FIELDING. What has occurred in France, to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. E. D. Smith) has referred, should reassure him and the wine growers of Canada. The government of France found themselves much embarrassed through this question of wine adulteration. They had riots in the south of France in the early part of last summer, and this question of wine adulteration became one of the great questions of the day in that country. The government of France is anxious to do everything possible to prevent the adulteration of wine, and has passed some legislation to that end. I do not understand the nature of the measure, but certainly the object was to prevent adulteration. Under the treaty an analysis by the board of agriculture, a government institution, is provided for. Of course, the treaty must be carried out in good faith, but if it can be shown that wines that are adulterated are being brought in, my hon. friend the Minister of Customs can deal with them. But I certainly do not anticipate any trouble on that score, as the government of France are as anxious as my hon. friend (Mr. E. D. Smith) to prevent the adulteration of French wines, and will enforce their legislation, not to please us, but for the benefit of their own wine growers.

Mr. MARSHALL. Others are deeply affected by this treaty besides the wine growers. I notice that there is a reduction on canned poultry and also on canned vegetables. I do not know whether the hon. minister is aware that the canners are producing more goods than we can possibly sell in this country. I do not care so much about the reduction of the duty on poultry, but the reduction of the duty on vegetables seems to me a real hardship, and a mistake in the interests of the Canadian people. For instance, corn and tomatoes are reduced by 16 per cent. One thing that we do not like to see come into this market is French peas. These goods have a very pleasing appearance and taste, but they are colour-

ed and sweetened. Our laws do not allow us to colour our peas, and we do not wish to do it in any case. But the process of putting up draws the colour and no packer can give to packed goods the natural colour without using colouring material. The canning industry is comparatively new in Canada. Those engaged in it have laid out large sums to put their business in shape to put out the goods, and we feel that this reduction in duty will be a hardship. I find that the imports for the last nine months were about $50,000, the greater part, I suppose, being the French peas. With the reduction of duty this would increase to $60,000 or more—it may be three times as great. This will simply mean replacing some of our Canadian goods. Who benefits by the presence of these canning factories in Canada? Is it not the farmer? The farmer produces the peas, corn, tomatoes and other things that are put up, and if you put the canners at a disadvantage it must react upon the farmers. If we wish to get in condensed milk from France, if we have to pay 18 cents a dozen, surely that is not right. If we are shipping preserved meats, canned poultry, and so on, we must pay 15 cents a dozen, if I figure it out correctly. This new tariff seems to be entirely against the canning industry of Canada, and I hope the minister will try to remedy it. Especially, we desire to be reasonably protected against the French peas. Our pea is a sweet pea, a wrinkled pea to start with, but this is nothing more than a common pea coloured and sweetened.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to speak briefly in respect to the effect of this treaty on the grape growing industry which has been already referred to by my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith). Fully one-third of the product of that industry in Canada is converted into wines, so it is certainly a very important industry. We have 18,000 acres in Ontario which is devoted to the growing of grapes, and as one-third of that is devoted to the wine industry the question becomes very serious for the men interested in fruit growing. I would point out to the minister some figures in relation to the number of acres in certain counties devoted to the growing of grapes. I take these from the statistics of 1905 :

County.	Acres under grapes.
Lincoln	4,836
Wentworth	3,256
Essex	1,784
Welland	1,437
Halton	486
Kent	324
Lambton	246
Simcoe	207

From this it will be seen that not only is the eastern part of Ontario deeply interested in this industry, but the western part as well and the people of the western districts are constantly increasing their acreage and taking more interest in this industry. I sincerely hope the minister will investigate this matter more fully and if possible try to stop the importation of the adulterated wines coming from France, and the still larger quantities that are likely to come owing to the reduced tariff that has been extended to that country. It is bad enough for the agricultural industry to find that the concessions in the French market that were supposed to have been secured for Canadian agricultural products by this treaty are practically of little use to the farmers of the Dominion and that our general export market is narrowed down really to Great Britain, without having an important branch of agriculture, subjected to this unfair competition in our home market. It is time that the government endeavoured to open up the markets of Germany and France for agricultural products from Canada and for their admission into these countries under more favourable conditions than exist to-day.

Coming from the western part of Ontario, in which a large number of grape producing industries are situated, I wish to impress upon the minister the importance of that industry and to urge upon him the necessity of making, if possible, some further investigation into this matter and trying in some way to relieve the wine industry of the Dominion.

Mr. FIELDING. Leaving aside the wine question, as to which I have spoken, my hon. friend says we should make some efforts to open up the markets of France, Germany and other countries. Would my hon. friend tell me any concession we could reasonably ask from France that is not included in this treaty? I am not discussing what we have granted to France, but I take the remark which he made that we should open up the markets of France and Germany. What concession could be reasonably asked from France that is not included in this treaty?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I can merely say that if the minister when asking for concessions had requested, in return for the concessions which had already been granted to the French people, that Canadian agricultural products should be allowed to go into their markets on better terms than are contained in this treaty, then I would have to say that he was practically getting something for the farmers of our Dominion, but when he allows the advantages to go to large manufacturing industries, practically ignoring the farming industry—because he must well understand that this tariff is practically of no use to the farmers of this country—the treaty is not an advantage. The idea of two cents a pound on cattle going into that country, 2½ cents on

meat in tins, 2 cents on cheese, 2 cents on butter, 2 cents on fresh fish ! The minister knows well that we cannot expect to export these products into France with such a tariff wall against us. If the minister had asked and urged the French government to reduce the duty on these articles, then he would have been certainly giving a very great advantage to the farming districts of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not follow my hon. friend, that if I had asked that I would be giving a great advantage to the Canadian farmer. If I had received it I would have been accomplishing something, but I am afraid my mere asking would not have secured it. We are for the moment confining ourselves to the farmers' interests in respect to the admission of our products into France. Does my hon. friend expect that the French nation will grant to Canada terms which it refuses to grant to the rest of the civilized world ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If we are to grant to France privileges that will be a detriment to our country, we should have received some concession in return. I cannot understand the minister's position.

Mr. FIELDING. That is another side of the question, that is perhaps a matter of debate. My hon. friend thinks there is something we could have got from France. If he says that we do not want a treaty, then there might be room for difference of opinion, but I could understand my hon. friend's position. Suppose we had been content to rest on our old treaty, what would be the position? We would ignore France and would go to Germany and make a treaty with Germany. Then whatever we granted to Germany in return for concessions we would have been obliged to grant to France without concessions, that being the condition of the old treaty of 1893.

Mr. FOSTER. If it had been continued.

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly. We would have denounced the treaty of course, but my hon. friend did not suggest that. I am assuming now that we had just rested where we were. We found that France would not give special concessions differing from what she grants to other countries. She might think that we were not big enough, and that she would stand by the treaty. Then our hands would be tied by that treaty of 1893. If we had gone to Germany and negotiated a treaty, as my hon. friend would desire, and had given large concessions to Germany and had received large concessions in return, we would have been obliged to grant every one of these concessions to France without any return whatever. Therefore, if we were to do anything in extending our foreign trade, the first thing was to come to the best possible understanding with France. This seemed to be the best possible understanding. My hon. friend will see that if France has adopted that policy of having a moderately high tariff on agricultural products, I am not sure that we can throw many stones at her in that respect, as we have a stiff tariff on agricultural products in Canada. However, France having adopted that policy of high tariff, if we call it high, upon her agricultural products, what could we do? We could not expect France to grant us concessions that she refuses to every one else, but we said: while your tariff is high, we are not sure that we will not be able to send some agricultural products into your country. You import many million dollars worth of agricultural products and we think we may have a chance; but then we ask you to give us the best terms that you grant to any one else, and if at any time you are asked to make a treaty with any other country on these lines, we want to be assured of the best treatment accorded to any nation—and that we have received. I think that is of immense importance. Hon. gentlemen do not think so ; they look at the matter only from the point of view of to-day. They say you are not getting any concessions ; the duty on grain under the minimum tariff is the same as under the general tariff and therefore your minimum tariff is no good. To follow that out a little, let us suppose that our American neighbours, who have been seeking to make a treaty with France, had obtained a new treaty that France had granted them concessions on their grain and we should not have had any condition whatever with respect to it. What would our position be? Surely it is better to say, as we do say : If you will not give us concessions now, we ask that, if at any time you grant concessions to any other country, you will give us the same arrangement. That, I think, was as far as we could expect France to go. If we had gone to them and said: We will not make a treaty with you unless you give us a concession which you will not grant to any other country in the world, that would be an unreasonable position and we could not expect France to accept it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then the hon. gentleman admits that in so far as this treaty is concerned, he has not obtained any concessions beyond what any other nations have been able to obtain from France.

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly we do not profess that we have got a monopoly of the concessions. But, we have obtained concessions that we did not have before, which concessions a large part of the world had and which we did not have. But, we do not claim that France is going to give us a monopoly of her trade.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. But we have given her special concessions in return for that?

Mr. FIELDING. We have given concessions. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) last night said that these concessions meant the loss of millions of revenue. I think that his figures were exaggerated, but if it means the loss of millions of revenue it must mean the reduction of millions of taxation to the people of Canada, so that, while granting concessions to the government of France, we are at the same time granting a concession in the way of millions of dollars of reduced taxation to the people of Canada if my hon. friend's figures are correct.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. In so far as the treaty is concerned, I have no objection to entering into a treaty with France. I may say that anything that would bring our French provinces or any other provinces of Canada into close connection with France would be agreeable to us. But what I claim is that the minister, in being so liberal with concessions, gave away the rights of some of the industries of our country without getting any compensating advances for them.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Minister of Finance have any information in reference to the new treaty between France and the United States, which, I see by the papers, was concluded a fortnight or so ago ?

Mr. FIELDING. I saw some reference to it in the press, but I understand that it is a temporary treaty and only affects a few articles. One of the conditions in it to which the most importance was attached was that embodying an agreement to appoint commissioners to negotiate a larger treaty. But, I think, the treaty is regarded only as a temporary one.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it any more extended than the present treaty ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think not.

Mr. BRODEUR. The treaty with the United States concerns mainly Denrees Colonials and it has reference principally to sugar, molasses, &c.

Mr. MARSHALL. I would like to know if you are going to permit any French peas containing colouring matter to come in under the pure food laws of this country ? I understand that we are not permitted in this country to use colouring matter in anything. Are you going to allow these French peas to come in if they are coloured ?

Mr. FIELDING. I am not familiar perhaps as I should be with the pure food law. But, under our own Adulteration Act, with respect to the adulteration of foods, I should think that if it could be shown that any article imported into Canada was impure and unfit for food it should be suppressed. I must not answer too positively in regard to our pure food laws as I do not profess to be as familiar with them as perhaps I should be.

Mr. BRODEUR. As I had the administration of the Adulteration Act when I was in the Inland Revenue Department, I may be permitted to say that the Act does not make any difference between imported goods and Canadian goods. All goods which are offered for sale in the country may be examined and if they are found to be adulterated the person who offers them is liable to a fine.

Mr. FOSTER. That is if exposed for sale ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Exposed for sale.

Mr. FOSTER. You allow them to come in but if they are exposed and offered for sale they are subject to inspection.

Mr. BRODEUR. If they are offered for sale. If one of the inspectors goes into a store and finds on the shelves goods which are offered for sale he procures samples of these goods and if, on analysis, they are found to be adulterated the merchant is liable to a penalty. In the case which my hon. friend mentions, if these goods are adulterated, under the Adulteration Act, the man who offers them for sale will be liable to a penalty.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. The minister says he is subjected to a fine, but the question is : Is he fined ? There have been scarcely any fined while the shelves of nearly every grocery store in Canada have upon them adulterated goods.

Mr. BRODEUR. When I was Minister of Inland Revenue we fined a good many people. They were forced to pay the cost of the analysis and sometimes it amounted to $15 or $20. They were also obliged to make good some other expenditure. In some cases actions were taken against these people to compel them to pay the cost of the analysis and this other expenditure to which I have referred.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. It does not amount to anything. If a manufacturer, sending out a large quantity of stuff, has one or two cases seized and the retail grocer is fined, the manufacturer pays a little fine of $5 or $15 but it does not amount to anything. He goes on his way and does the same thing next day, or next week, or next year. As a matter of fact the prevention of the adulteration of goods has amounted to nothing at all in years past. The fine is too small and there is only one case analysed out of 500 that are on the shelves. If a case is discovered of a certain manufacturer's goods being adulterated and the retailer is fined with respect to that one case no practical result is attained. To stop this thing the department ought to go on and hunt for the same goods upon other shelves and

make the fines severe enough to stop it. At the present time the enforcement of the Adulteration Act is a perfect farce.

Mr. BRODEUR. Take the wholesale importer or merchant; suppose an inspector goes into his store and finds goods which are adulterated, it is a very serious thing for him. It is not so much the quantity of goods or the amount of money which he is called upon to pay that makes it serious for him, but it is because his reputation suffers. If the newspapers would be kind enough to publish the names of those who are mentioned in our blue books as having been guilty of adulteration or having being in possession of adulterated goods, I am sure it will be a very serious check on the practice of manufacturing and offering for sale adulterated goods.

Mr. FOSTER. But they do not do it.

Mr. BRODEUR. But even as it is, our blue books are spread over the country and in some cases commercial travellers representing a house whose goods were analysed are very glad to show to their customers that some of their competitors were selling goods which were found to be adulterated. The amount of money which is paid is not the most serious thing sometimes, but it is the injury that it causes to the trade of the person whose goods have been found faulty.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I quite agree that if these cases were published it would be a more severe punishment than the fine, but they are not and the bulletins lie pigeonholed in the department.

Mr. FIELDING. Usually it is not done and one must make allowance for the newspapers which do not want to have too many quarrels with their customers. I noticed recently in the Ottawa papers an account showing that a number of drug stores had been found to be selling articles which were adulterated. The hardship is that the man who has the goods in his possession is not the man who has been guilty of the adulteration.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I fancy the manufacturer would stand behind him.

Mr. FIELDING. I suppose if the merchant is made to understand the risk he is running he will fall back on the manufacturer, and I think some good is being accomplished.

Mr. BARR. The administration of the Adulteration Act has cost the country a great deal of money, but it seems to me that unfortunately very little has been accomplished. It is not so much in the drug store that adulterated articles are to be found, for we know there are canned goods coming in from other countries a great many of which have been shown to be impure. The Pure Food Act has not accomplished the object it was intended to accomplish. These impure foods are sent through the country, and the manufacturers of them know that if they are fined occasionally and it is hushed up, it will not affect them very much, because they make so much money by introducing the impurities that the fine is not felt by them, and so long as it is not known to the public it does not affect their business. Above all, the people should have pure articles to eat and drink. It seems to me that we should not allow the importation of impure wines from France or anywhere else. There is great danger from them, because, manufactured as they are from drugs, they are said to increase the appetite for alcohol more than pure wines do. Then again, these wines are so cheap that in place of buying cigarettes, boys on the streets buy a bottle of wine and go back to their resorts and drink it. Our efforts should be directed to securing pure food and drink for the people of Canada, and if the Act is contravened by anybody they should be exposed. In that way alone will a stop be put to adulteration.

Mr. MARSHALL. It is just a question whether colouring matter can be considered adulteration. I do not know that the colouring used in canned fruits or vegetables would be called adulteration.

Mr. SPROULE. There is colouring in butter, too.

Mr. MARSHALL. Now, I have no actual authority to say this, but I have been told that the colouring used in these French peas is copperas. We have experimented on peas ourselves, and we have tried copperas, and we find it is the only thing that will cause them to retain their colour. Our peas are just as green as the French peas when they go into the can, but all vegetables are cooked after the can is sealed, and that process draws the colour. I do not know whether or not there is sufficient copperas in the French peas to be injurious, but I do know that we do not use it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Can that be detected by analysis?

Mr. MARSHALL. I am not able to say, but I think it could. The large packers in the United States are not using copperas, because their pure food laws prevent them, and the colour of American peas in the tin is similar to the colour of the Canadian peas, because they are put up by the same process without colouring. If it be that the French peas are coloured, it is not fair to the Canadian canners to allow them to come in, because they look so much nicer than ours.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I may say that I have a letter here from one of the largest pork packers in Hamilton, in which he states that in 1903 the French government arranged treaties with several countries giving them a preference on hams and bacon and salt meats. At that time the Hamilton

firm was doing a considerable business with France, but it immediately ceased when these treaties came into effect. Now, in view of the present Canadian treaty with France, the Hamilton firm is opening up communications with their old agents, and they hope in the very near future to do a very large business again with France. In regard to the agricultural implement manufacturers, we know that the International Harvester Company is the largest in the world, and they have a very large branch of that concern in Hamilton, employing about 1,800 men. At present the International Harvester Company is shipping from the United States to France about $2,000,000 worth of agricultural machinery per annum. Since this treaty has been under discussion I have communicated with the heads of that concern in Chicago, and three or four of the head officials of the company have been here on several occasions looking into the whole matter, and I am satisfied from the information which I have received that they will be compelled to come to Canada and manufacture agricultural machinery for export to France. The difference in the duty on a self-binder going from Canada to France as compared with the same implement going from the United States will be between $7 and $9 in favour of Canada when this treaty is ratified, and there is an advantage of $5 in favour of Canada on a mowing machine. I am satisfied that we are going to increase enormously our business with France in agricultural implements.

Mr. FOSTER. That would not hold if the United States gets a treaty.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The treaty has been passed between the United States and France, and it is of comparatively little value to any one.

Mr. FOSTER. But it is preliminary to another treaty.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Our treaty is very much fuller than the American treaty.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Is not the wholesale price in Canada a great deal higher than in the United States, and in consequence they can ship from the United States cheaper than they can from Canada to-day ?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The manufacturers claim that they can manufacture just as cheaply in Hamilton if they can manufacture in large quantities as they can any place in the world, and I have no doubt that the ultimate result will be that this agricultural implement company will manufacture in Canada for export to France. Now, with regard to laces and silks, I have had several interviews with dry goods merchants in Hamilton in order to get information on this point. They say that this tariff will be of especial benefit to themselves and to the consumers of laces, silks and velvets in Canada, as these goods come almost exclusively from France. Therefore they feel very much pleased, indeed, that there is a reduction of duty. They think it is going to enlarge their business very materially, owing to the reduced prices at which they will be able to sell these goods. So on the whole, as far as Hamilton is concerned, we are exceedingly well pleased with the treaty.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. May I draw my hon. friend's attention to the fact that if these harvester people in Hamilton can manufacture as cheaply in Canada as anywhere else in the world, they are certainly not selling their goods to the wholesale trade in Canada as cheaply as they are in the United States.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I said that they they could manufacture as cheaply in Canada as they could anywhere else in like quantities. If they manufactured in larger quantities, they could of course manufacture more cheaply still.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the Minister of Finance if it is correct, as stated by the hon. member for Hamilton, that there will be a benefit of $9 on implements of the reaper class going to France ; and if so, will that not be equally applicable to machines exported to the Argentine Republic on account of it being in this combination of most favoured nations ?

Mr. FIELDING. That will of course depend on the tariff of the Argentine Republic. Canada has the same terms there as any other country.

Mr. PATERSON. While we are on the question of the effect of this treaty on the farming community, perhaps it would be as well to put on record what a farmer has sent to me namely, an extract from an editorial in the Breeders' 'Gazette,' a weekly journal for American stock farmers, established in 1881, and now in its fifty-third volume. This article shows how our American friends view this treaty, and it reads as follows :

France, it will be recalled, branded the entire meat supply of North America as unwholesome and barred it out of its markets. A short time ago Canada offered an intermediate tariff on French goods which the country of the beaver cannot produce, and the French fear of Canadian meats and live animals vanished like snow off a hedge in May. It is, however, still deathly afraid of all such goods emanating from south of the St. Lawrence, the great lakes and the forty-ninth parallel. You will observe it makes a vast difference from which side of the wholly imaginary boundary line the meat comes, alive or dead. France is wise to the fact that its people need more meat of a civilized order. It is stated that in 1906 no less than 56,000 horses were slaughtered for food in Paris alone, furnishing some 12,000 tons of meat. No self-respecting nation wants it-

citizens or subjects to eat such low-grade food as horses and dogs, if it can be helped. Its influence must in the very nature of things be brutalizing.

Yet here there are nearly 100,000,000 of people in France and Germany awaiting food and we can supply but little of it, while Canada, into which country one may step at a stride from the United States, enjoys the privileges of one-half that market. Obviously, Canada does not believe its farmers may go hang. Under the ironclad provisions of our present tariff law our national officials can do nothing to provide satisfactory outlet for many products of our farms. Their hands are tied completely and the seigniors of the Senate announce that there must be no reciprocity legislation at this session of Congress. The probability is that while these political bosses are forcing us all to stand pat, Canada will beat us to the German market just as it has to the French, and then what we have to trade in the way of lowered duties will not do us much good.

Mr. FOSTER. What is all that ?

Mr. PATERSON. It is the view of an American journal of great influence among farmers.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that not a slightly satirical article ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I was just going to ask the hon. minister what his own opinion is of that article.

Mr. PATERSON. The article shows that Canada has secured a market in France for meats.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the minister think that we can afford to send horses to France to be slaughtered for food and pay $30 duty on them ?

Mr. PATERSON. Hon. gentlemen opposite are so oblivious to plain English that they do not understand the nature of this article. This paper recognizes the fact that there are certain meat products used in France which it would be better for the people to have replaced by hog products.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why is hog any better than horse ?

Mr. PATERSON. The hilarity and laughter with which this is received by hon. gentlemen opposite will come very well when this question is discussed before the agricultural community. It will show how little value hon. gentlemen opposite attach to the great farming industry of this country and to the benefits that have been secured for it. I am very glad of these interruptions, and of the trifling manner in which these hon. gentlemen are taking this matter. The people will see that, with all their talk about the farmers and their interests, when something practical is being done, it is only received as a matter of jest.

Mr. FOSTER. Won't the minister kindly give us a word on pineapples as a farm product ?

Mr. PATERSON.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the pineapples were in the treaty negotiated by my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. Quite wrong as usual.

Mr. PATERSON. Castile soap was there.

Mr. FOSTER. That is quite different from pineapples.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman for a whole year was unable to say whether that meant soap or not. He differed with Sir Charles Tupper on the matter, but word came from Sir Charles Tupper that he had better put the treaty through. The hon. gentleman remembers also getting eels into the French treaty. I do not want to make fun of his treaty; it was a little treaty, but it was something. They said that Sir Charles Tupper had just the same power and that he had also a British ambassador with him. Suppose, for the sake of argument, we grant that, here was Sir Charles Tupper, the leader of the Conservative government, with the British ambassador, armed with plenipotentiary powers, negotiating a treaty. One British plenipotentiary is as strong in diplomacy as another. Therefore Sir Charles Tupper had the help of as valuable a man as my hon. friends, and the result was he got a treaty allowing us to export some eight or ten articles to France, among which were eels and some other things of that kind, but we were obliged to send these on a ship direct to France. We could not even have eels slip in under that treaty unless by direct shipment. On the other hand, French goods coming to Canada might come via Germany or Italy or the United States or any other quarter of the world. All that was required was that the goods should be of French origin. That was a treaty negotiated by Sir Charles Tupper, aided by a British diplomat, and as one British diplomat is equal to another, to whom should we give the full credit of this last treaty which embraces hundreds of articles, many of them very important to the industries of this country and which opens up to the producers and the manufacturers of these articles a market of $300,000,000. Many of these articles are the products of our farms and our factories. Why not give credit then to these two Canadian ministers, who had not greater assistance than had Sir Charles Tupper, but who accomplished so much more? Hon. gentlemen opposite show their utter incapacity when they scoff at this treaty which our American friends admit means a very serious blow to them. It is impossible apparently for these hon. gentlemen to learn anything with reference to trade matters. Yet, notwithstanding their jeers and laughter and their utter carelessness and disregard for our farming interests, they will find out that the people who will be benefited by this treaty will have to be reckoned with, and

that a treaty which opens up a vast market for the pork industry of this country, to mention only one item, is one the value of which our people will soon appreciate. Of course, under constitutional rules, a treaty such as this must be submitted to parliament as a whole, and if there be a certain number of gentlemen who cannot understand its benefits, it is their privilege to laugh, but that will not improve their position in the eyes of the farmers and manufacturers of this country.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has given us a good laugh.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if it is not true that, after these goods are admitted to France, they have still a considerable duty to pay before they can enter such cities as Paris? I understand that these cities impose an octroi which will affect these products, and that these goods will still have to pay another duty after entering that country.

Mr. FIELDING. There are such duties, but we have guarded against any unfair imposition of them. Turn to article 12 of the treaty and the hon. gentleman will find that we have dealt with that very point.

Products of Canadian origin of any kind imported into France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions, and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China, shall not be subject to any other or higher duties of excise, internal consumption or octroi than those which are or may be charged upon like products of French origin.

The articles of Canadian origin must be treated in the same manner as articles of French origin. French goods, from the rural parts of France, entering their cities, are subject to such duty. This provides that no duty can be imposed on our goods that are not imposed on goods of French origin. More than that we could not ask.

Mr. HENDERSON. What are these duties?

Mr. FIELDING. They are duties imposed by the respective cities of France. They are usually on wines, provisions and spirits and include meats.

Mr. BERGERON. I thought the octroi was abolished on wine.

Mr. BRODEUR. They have not the same custom as we with regard to excise. In the districts where they manufacture spirits and brandy no excise duty is charged, but when these are brought into Paris or other cities they are subjected to the octroi before being allowed to enter.

Mr. FOSTER. That goes to the city revenue?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is divided between the city revenue and the general fund.

Mr. BERGERON. Was not the octroi abolished for Paris?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, it still exists.

Mr. SPROULE. How much is the duty against Canadian hams, sides and bacons?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend from Grey asks what is the duty on meats. French mutton, under the French minimum tariff, is 6·75 francs per 220 pounds, under the general tariff, 9·65 francs. Pork, 4·82 francs under the French minimum tariff and 7·72 francs under the general tariff. Beef and other meats, 5·79 francs and 9·65 francs. Pork butchers produce, 5·79 and 9·65 francs. In these cases the reduction on the duty in the two tariffs is very considerable.

Mr. HENDERSON. What would be the ad valorem?

Mr. FIELDING. I would have to get the value of the article and I have not got that.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. What would be the extra duty on bacon on going into Paris?

Mr. FIELDING. Whatever they impose on the rural products of France we would have to pay. We could ask no more than that.

Mr. HENDERSON. The point raised by my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) is very important. It may make the duty almost useless.

Mr. FIELDING. Then it would make it useless to everybody else.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is no answer. If we are giving something to get something, and are getting nothing, what is the use of giving? The minister should, before 8 o'clock, be able to give us some idea of where we stand. That point does not seem to have been taken into consideration.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, to such a degree that we specially provided we should not be subjected to any other tax than is imposed on a French citizen.

Mr. HENDERSON. True, but the citizen of France may have a very high duty imposed on him.

Mr. FIELDING. No doubt.

Mr. HENDERSON. And that might nullify altogether what we are expecting to get.

Mr. FIELDING. It might be said of a citizen of Canada that he had to pay a high municipal tax. It is a matter of internal regulation.

Mr. HENDERSON. That seems to me a far-fetched idea. I do not see what bearing it has upon the question.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Referring to the article read by the Minister of Customs

showing the large amount of horseflesh consumed as food in Paris, that may have an important bearing on the case. I know there is a heavy duty on food products going into Paris. Well, if our horses go into France under this treaty at $30 a head and our cattle at $20 a head, and if we have to face a large duty—the exact amount of which is not known to us—in order to get those animals into Paris for sale, that may seriously affect the trade. It would be well for us to understand the exact conditions. If a horse is imported into France paying duty under this treaty, does he go into Paris free of any local duty or not? I understand that horses used as draught animals in Paris, after they can no longer earn their keep in that way, are slaughtered for food. Is the possibility of that considered and the horse taxed as a food product before he can be taken to Paris for sale? And how about the other cities? I am aware of this food tax on food products entering Paris, but I believe that in Lyons and other large cities in France there is a similar local tax.

Mr. PATERSON. But it will apply to all our competitors, will it not?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It might. But we want to know what tax we have to face on these articles, and, until we know that, we cannot tell what our position will be.

Mr. PATERSON. We know that millions of dollars worth of horses and other animals are imported into France. And, even though this octroi, whatever it may amount to, has to be paid, it will have to be paid by our competitors also. Therefore, we are in as good a position as they. Of course, I am not arguing against ascertaining the facts, but only showing that the octroi manifestly does not operate to prevent imports into France, and that we should not be worse off under it than our competitors.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) does not quite understand the point I raised. We send a horse into France with the idea that he is to be used as a draught animal. Suppose it is desired to send that horse into Paris, is there a duty to be paid? If the horse is driven into Paris with a load, is he to be taxed as a food product? And must that tax be paid every time the horse is driven into the city? Or when a horse is once in Paris, must he stay there? And if he is driven in as a beast of burden without tax and is afterwards slaughtered and used for food, must the tax be paid? We have to pay $30 to get the horse into France. It may cost us $50 to get him into Paris.

Mr. FIELDING. But the octroi would not apply to a horse from Canada only—every horse exported to France would be in the same position. I understand that the octroi duties differ in different parts of France, and I fancy it would be difficult to learn exactly what they are, as it would be for the French Foreign Minister, if he desired it, to say exactly what was the municipal tax in Canada. He would be apt to conclude that as the products of his country are not singled out to their disadvantage it would not matter what this local tax might be. I think there is no octroi on horses, although I am not sure.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. That is the very point I wish to know. I know there is an octroi on food going into Paris, but I do not know if it would apply to a horse taken in as a beast of burden. Perhaps the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) could tell us.

Mr. BRODEUR. The octroi is mostly on such things as vegetables brought into Paris for sale. It is a tax much as we impose a tax on articles brought into the market for sale.

Mr. BARR. Like a toll-gate.

Mr. BRODEUR. In Montreal, for example, every one taking vegetables to be sold on the market has to pay a tax for the right of offering his goods for sale. In Paris they collect the octroi on such food products. I have no reason to believe that there is an octroi on horses.

Mr. BERGERON. I am sure that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) does not wish to leave the House under the impression that in Paris they import horses and dogs for food purposes.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not say that.

Mr. BERGERON. But what the hon. gentleman did say might be held to imply that. Though horses or dogs may be used for food, it is without the knowledge of the sanitary authorities. There is no open or lawful importation into Paris of horses and dogs for food.

Mr. PATERSON. I have not intimated such a thing.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I appreciate the remarks of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), but I do not think they cover the point. When people with produce go to sell on the Montreal market—and the same is true of other places I take it—they pay for the privilege of selling on the market. But if they drive to a greengrocer's and sell their stuff to him, they do not pay a tax. In any case, this market tax of which he speaks is a trifling matter, whereas the octroi, I understand, is an ad valorem tax and runs as high as 20 per cent. I remember distinctly having heard it referred to as affording a reason why the hotels and restaurants in Paris had to charge so much for meals furnished to their customers.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THE HAMILTON RADIAL ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 25) respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke.

Mr. GRAHAM. I might say to the committee, in accordance with my promise to give the opposition notice when this would likely come up again, that I think Monday, the day proposed, would be suitable. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. HENDERSON. The member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) is anxious to discuss this Bill but he cannot be here before six o'clock. I wish that his convenience could be consulted and that he would have an opportunity to discuss the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. I understand that the member who has charge of the Bill, Mr. Clarke, had a conversation with Mr. Lancaster, and I imagine that the discussion on Monday will last until he arrives at six o'clock.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Lancaster is interested only in the last clause about Hamilton, he wishes to be here to discuss that.

Mr. HENDERSON. As long as it is understood that he will have an opportunity to discuss it, there will be no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. No advantage will be taken of him. The debate will probably continue until six o'clock.

Motion agreed to and progress reported.

BRITISH YUKON RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 21), respecting the British Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Stewart.

On section 1:

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I feel like raising the objection which I have before raised on several occasions, that when Bills are amended in committee they should be sent to the House in the amended form. I think the Minister of Finance was rather inclined to agree with me on that.

Mr. FIELDING. In many cases when there are numerous amendments a reprint is made. If the amendments in this case are small, perhaps the rule would not apply.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How are we to know when Bills are amended?

Mr. FIELDING. That is a very fair question.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 47), respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—Mr. Stewart.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to have some information from the Minister of Finance. The original Bill in this case gave the company power to construct a work such as is usually constructed by a government and there is a provision in an Act passed session before last for the taking over of this canal by the government if they see fit. It provides in substance that the government may take over the work at any time on a week's notice of their intention so to do and that the government shall then pay to the company the value of the work actually done by the company in making plans and the value of any tangible property of which possession may be so taken. I do not know the policy of the government in reference to this matter. If it is proper work to be done at all it ought to be undertaken by the government and although it does not as yet present itself in as undesirable a light as the Quebec bridge project, yet it appears to me to be to a certain extent on the same line. The section which I have referred to is like the action of the heathen Chinee: it is almost too good to be honest. If we are only to pay what is stated there, I do not know why the company should exist at all. There is no provision even that they shall get interest on their money. We can take it over at any time on paying them for what they have actually done without interest or anything else. I do not think that is a sensible kind of business to go into. I do not think the government in the first place should have authorized the construction of this canal by a company. If it is a desirable work they should have undertaken it themselves and, without elaborating the argument at all, I wish at this early stage to register my opinion of the transaction that it is not an advisable one. I may change my mind on hearing from the Minister of Finance the reasons which have influenced the government in this matter. I was not in the committee when the Bill was reported.

Mr. FIELDING. I was not at the committee either and I am not in a position to announce the policy of the government in this matter.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister probably knows why the government has departed from its ordinary custom of retaining the waterways of the country in its own possession as a monopoly that should be preserved for the people, and handing the control of this waterway to a private company. It is not in accordance with the general policy of this or any other government. Why should we give these gentlemen control of that which should for ever be retain-

ed as a public highway for the people of Canada ? I quite recognize that there is a provision that seems to give it back to the government on easy terms but I have no faith in the working out of that in the interest of the people in the end. The minister probably could inform us why this departure from the ordinary custom has been adopted in this case.

Mr. FIELDING. I might also plead that I am not very positive on this point. I think my hon. friend might be able to get his information on his own side of the House. My recollection is that this charter was granted some years ago and probably before this government came into power. I know that we have been extending it from time to time but I think it had its origin some years ago and what entered into the minds of the hon. gentlemen who originated it, I would not like to undertake to say, Speaking from memory, I think the original charter was given to this company before this government came into power.

Mr. SPROULE. As one who opposed this Bill many years ago I can with perfect consistency oppose it at the present time. I held the view then as I do now that it is neither the part of wisdom nor good policy to give over any navigable streams to any private corporation. It must be, if ever built, one of the highways of commerce, and it is one of the important highways of commerce that we naturally expect the government will build at some time. It may be that the undertaking is of such a gigantic character that they would not likely commence it soon, but whether it is commenced early or late I can see no justifiable reason why we should give it over to a private corporation. I have opposed it several times and I do so still. This charter has been held by a private corporation for a long time. I share the fears expressed by my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) that some way or other this private corporation will succeed in making up an expensive bill if work is ever taken over. Somehow or other these bills are always much larger than we expect them to be and although it is rather innocent looking and favourable for the government taking it over, in the sense of the wording of it which seems to stipulate that the country would not be required to pay more than what the work is actually worth, I think it is a matter which should receive general consideration. I remember the discussion that took place upon that clause when it was introduced as to the question of whether the company would be entitled to be paid what they had expended, or what the work was actually worth. I think it would be a safer principle to pay what it was actually worth than to pay the actual expenses, because people can make up expense bills in a wonderful way, especially engineers and promoters and men of that class. This has had a history of that character for quite a long time and therefore we are suspicious that whenever the government do take it over there will be a large bill for the country to pay. I have been opposed to the principle of giving into the hands of a private corporation so that they may make a monopoly of it, a work of this character, notwithstanding the fact that the government may have the right to control the tolls to a certain extent. I am opposed to the principle of giving into the hands of a private corporation that which must be one of the great waterways of commerce in our country. I think it is wrong, that it is very bad policy and I do not see any reason why we should continue. I think it would be better to buy them out and drop the company.

Mr. LENNOX. In reply to what the hon. Minister of Finance said as to the time when this company was first incorporated, I am aware that it was incorporated in 1894, but although that kind of thing seems to weigh with the minister it does not weigh with me in the slightest degree.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not now.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not care and never did care who inaugurates a thing if on further reflection and with greater experience, I come to the conclusion that it is not in the public interest.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend should not have asked me to explain why some one else did it years ago. That is all.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the government's policy ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is a fair question.

Mr. LENNOX. I have only asked the minister to say what their present policy is?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend went farther.

Mr. LENNOX. They came into power before the second session of 1896. That was the first unfortunate session we have had in modern times.

Mr. FIELDING. That does not seem to be the popular opinion.

Mr. LENNOX. The charter of this company was extended and has been extended ever since and without seemingly any careful consideration of the policy of it by the government. I shall not refer to the Minister of Railways because he has not come into contact with this matter much as yet. At all events I would like to know from the hon. gentleman who is promoting this Bill (Mr. Stewart) what position it stands in at the present time—what amount of money has been expended, and how far the scheme has advanced ?

Mr. SPROULE. And what will it cost to buy it ?

Mr. LENNOX. I think the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Stewart) has charge of the Bill.

Mr. STEWART. I am not aware as to the amount of money that has been spent but this company has been in existence since 1894. From that time up to the present time I know that a considerable amount of money has been spent, but how much I do not know. In 1896 when the Bill came before the House the matter was discussed along this line, and at the instance of the then Minister of Railways and Canals, a clause was inserted in order to protect the government should the work be taken over.

Mr. U. WILSON. I understand that the government have been spending during the last few years, a considerable amount of money on surveys and other work on this canal. If the case is that they have spent half a million dollars what is the sense of having a private company spending money ? If they have claims against the country we ought to settle the claims. There is no sense in renewing the charter of this company and allowing them to go on and expend money which will be wasted because the government have taken the matter practically into their own hands and if it is ever built and made a success of, it must be done by the country. We want no more Quebec bridges or public works of that character to be put into the hands of private companies which can only raise a small proportion of the money required, and who have in consequence to come to the government for aid. I think it is not good policy to renew the charter of these men if the government are going to take hold of it because I do not think it is possible for this company, without the aid of the government, to build this great work. Besides it is a work which will be used by the Canadian public and must be controlled by the government. I think that the government should first settle with this company, get rid of them and if they are going to do anything with the work let them do it themselves. I do not think the time is opportune to spend money on it at the present time.

Mr. LENNOX. Perhaps the minister will inform us if it is a fact, as stated in the press, that $500,000 has been expended on the government surveys of the proposed line of this canal. The promoter of the Bill says there has been a large amount of money also spent by the company on surveys, and we should know what that amount is and whether this expenditure is still going on.

Mr. SPROULE. And whether the company will get the benefit of that expenditure.

Mr. LENNOX. Now that they are getting a renewal of their charter we would like to know if the company is going on with the work next year or when.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Had my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) been at the meetings of the Railway Committee he would have been able to get all the information with regard to this Bill that he is so anxious to get now. All these details were given in the committee by the promoter of the Bill, and that is what the committee is for. While I do not say that my hon. friend has not the right to ask for the information now, it does seem he is a little captious in seeking detailed information which could be much better obtained in the committee.

Mr. LENNOX. With the greatest respect to my hon. friend (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) I must say that he assumes a good deal to himself when he undertakes to tell a member of this House what information he should seek and when he should seek it. I have not missed three sittings of committees since the beginning of the session, but as I am a member of two or three committees, when these committees sit at the same time I cannot be present at each. No member could distribute himself in that way unless he is a bird—and there are some birds in this House that we don't appreciate. However, I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) can say that there was one word of explanation given in the committee on the matters I refer to. I have a right and the House has a right to get this information, and if the hon. member for Pictou does not want to know he need not listen. I want to know from the promoter of the Bill what are the prospects of the company going on with this work and whether any arrangement has been made to repay the $500,000 which the government is said to have expended on preliminary surveys.

Mr. McCOOL. I quite agree with those hon. gentlemen who have said that the Georgian bay canal should be a government work entirely. But this company got a charter some years ago and in good faith they went on and spent a considerable amount of money. I do not know that there has been any expenditure by them on surveys since the government undertook the surveys three or four years ago. But nevertheless, I do not think it would be fair, that this parliament having given them a charter they should now be shut off and not be given a chance to do the work if the government should decide that they will not undertake to do it themselves. I think the Georgian bay canal project is too large a question to be allowed to drop for any such consideration as the present financial condition of the country, or anything of that kind. It is claimed by the company that a gentleman from London

(Mr. Paods, M.P.), who was over here last summer is able and willing to undertake the construction of the canal. Again, I want it to be perfectly understood that I am not advocating the giving of this work over to any company, or the giving of the control of a river like the Ottawa to any private corporation. This work is a work that should be done by the government, but if the government does not undertake it, it would be most unfair to snuff out these people at this stage and after their years of work in connection with the project, not to give them a chance. They claim that even if this charter is not renewed they have done sufficient work on surveys, &c., to have kept their old charter alive to the present time. But outside of that altogether I do not see what harm can be done by renewing this charter. I have no interest in the company nor do I wish to see any private company get control of the Ottawa river, but if the government does not do the work I would rather see this company or some other do it than not have the canal built.

Mr. SPROULE. If the Georgian bay canal is ever built it must either be undertaken as a public work by Canada or the country must subsidize a private company by guaranteeing its bonds, and after our experience of the Quebec bridge we can see what the fate of the country would be in such an event as that. Above all, it would be the height of folly to allow any private corporation to control the navigable waters of a river like the Ottawa. If the government have spent, as we have been told, nearly half a million dollars in surveys, is the private corporation to get the benefit of that expenditure for nothing? The work is too immense for any private corporation that we know of to undertake, unless it receives substantial aid from the government and it would be much better for the government to do the work itself. Every time this question has been discussed in the House we are told there is some mythical rich capitalist behind it. The first estimate of the cost was about $9,000,000; then it jumped to $14,000,000; then to $30,000,000, and now it is $100,000,000, and still this unspecified millionaire capitalist is behind the work and is going to build it. But he does not get very far with his operations although he wants to hold on to the franchise, and no doubt the day will come when we will be obliged to buy the concern out and pay a good round figure for it. It seems to me that this should be avoided now. I say that no private corporation should control such a great national work as this ship canal will be if it is ever constructed.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. It is rumoured that the present company is not spending any money and that they just want to keep their charter alive so that they will have a claim against the government. If the company is spending money at the present time it is folly for them to do so, and I want to know from the promoter of the Bill whether this is the case or not.

Mr. STEWART. The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. McCool) has stated that he did not think any money had been expended by the company since the government undertook the surveys, and I think that is correct.

Mr. LENNOX. How long ago is that?

Mr. McCOOL. They spent large sums of money just previous to the government making the surveys. They made a survey of the summit level about 1900 or 1902.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Has no money been spent since then?

Mr. McCOOL. They have been spending money.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What have they been doing?

Mr. McCOOL. They have had one of the most expert engineers of this country here a whole summer going over all the surveys, making plans and specifications and estimating the cost, which he put at $80,000,000 for a twenty foot waterway. The government decided to make a survey on their own account for a twenty-one feet of navigation or twenty-two feet depth in the locks. When the government started that work the company naturally ceased spending money on surveys. I do not suppose the government would have allowed them to continue if they had wanted to do so while they were looking into the matter themselves at such heavy cost to the country. The company are in the same position that they were in two years ago, when their charter was renewed, and if there was a good reason for renewing their charter at that time, there is just as strong a reason to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. Oh, no.

Mr. McCOOL. At any time within the last two years this company has claimed to be in a position to go on with this work if the government would give them permission to do so. That is the position they have occupied right along. They state to-day that they are ready to go on with the work.

Mr. SPROULE. Did they not want the government to guarantee a large amount of bonds?

Mr. McCOOL. I think they did ask for a guarantee of bonds, but that request was withdrawn. That, however, is beside the matter. I think it would be most unreasonable to refuse a renewal of this charter to these people. It cannot do any harm to this country or to anybody. If the government takes over the work, the country will be responsible to the company for its expenditure up to the present time, having

granted it a charter in the first place. The charter having been granted, I think common honesty and good faith demand that a renewal of that charter should be given until it is definitely known whether the government is going on with the work or not.

Mr. LENNOX. This seems to me a very peculiar proposition in view of the state of the facts. When this company said they were ready to go on with the work, the government stepped in and undertook surveys, which have cost the country $500,000 or more. The government is still in the field, and as far as we know are going on with the work themselves. Under these circumstances, to renew this charter would be simply to encourage the company to undertake more expense. We would give them a kind of possession of this public highway which should be vested solely in the country. I understand from the hon. gentleman who has just spoken that notwithstanding the fact that the government has been making surveys, and is I presume continuing to spend money from year to year, this company is going on, keeping an office open in Ottawa, employing expensive skilled experts to devise plans and specifications, and making prepartions for the construction of this work. The cost of all this is to be paid for by somebody, and there is no doubt that it will have to be paid by the country in the end. We understand from the hon. gentleman who has just spoken that the plans proposed by the government are not identical with, though somewhat similar to the plans proposed by the company. So that in the end we shall probably have the government settling upon a scheme radically different from that proposed by the company, and on which the company is at present expending considerable sums of money, and the country will have to pay for both expenditures. I do not think anything could be much more indefensible than such a policy. It would be very easy for the government, without renewing this charter at all, to compensate these gentlemen for the money they have expended up to the present time, if they should ultimately get any benefit from the surveys they have made. This company, through misfortune or otherwise, have not at all carried out the contract which they entered into with the country on any of the occasions when the charter has been renewed. They would have no ground for complaint if they were paid nothing, so far as I can see. At all events, I think the government should take some definite action in reference to this matter, instead of renewing the charter from time to time and putting off the evil day, when we shall have to pay a very surprisingly large sum of money to this company. Not one gentleman has given us a hint of the amount of money that the company has expended up to the present time. They speak of it as a large sum, but there does not appear to be anybody who has stated to the government what it amounts to and the government do not appear to have thought it worth while to find out. So we are going it in the dark, and although it is not to be compared with the Quebec bridge for blundering stupidity, it is on similar lines, and is going to get there if we encourage it and keep it going long enough. I am quite in favour of building this canal as soon as the country is in a position to go on with the work; but I am not in favour of farming it out to any company which, will get all the money or all the guarantees from the government and take all or a large part of the profits.

Mr. TAYLOR. For the information of the government I want to give the opinion of one of the largest exporters of grain from the Northwest. This is a letter which I received the other day:

Kingston, Ontario, February 10, 1908.

Geo. Taylor, M.P.,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—We note that you want information regarding the Welland canal v. Georgian bay. This is a pretty full question, and perhaps requires a good deal of correspondence to make it perfectly intelligible to you. However, I am going to make a pretty broad assertion in the first place; the proposed Georgian bay canal, if built according to specifications, when completed would be unable to compete with the present old fourteen-foot Welland.

Grain loaded in Fort William, going by Welland canal, on ordinary lake steamers, could be delivered in Montreal in five to six days after loading.

The Georgian bay canal with the number of locks and delays and cross currents, would take fully this time, if not more.

The season of the year when Manitoba grain goes out is late in the fall. Not much of the grain gets to Fort William before the 10th or fifteenth of October. In other words, we find it difficult to cover our requirements until that time in the year. On the height of land which the Georgian bay canal would have to go through, we would think that navigation would close early, much earlier than here, because we can get grain through to Montreal, and have done so, on the first day of December. We would think that the Georgian bay canal would close at least two, if not three, weeks earlier, and therefore, be of very little use for fall business, which is the bulk of the business.

The cost of deepening the Welland canal, estimated by the present engineer in charge, which is the only estimate we have ever seen, was put at about sixteen million dollars; this would mean virtually a new canal, with reduced locks and depth of 21 feet, capable of taking in the largest steamers that now travel the upper lakes.

Regarding the saving made by this enlarged and deepened Welland canal, it requires little or no figuring to prove that the present rate of freight from Fort William to Montreal would be virtually cut in two.

The large steamer travelling the upper lakes, carrying 350,000 bushels, is able, per bushel, to carry at very much less figure than the steamer coming through the Welland canal carrying 70,000 bushels. The cost of operating that large steamer is very little greater, except fuel, than the small steamer. Take nine days to make a trip to Buffalo and back, from Duluth to Fort William, and allowing the steamer 1½ cents per bushel to Buffalo, which is the ordinary rate of freight to that port, and that same steamer would carry her full load of 350,000 bushels to Kingston and return to the west, in eleven days. In other words, it would take her only two days more to deliver her cargo to Kingston and return to Fort William, than to deliver her cargo at Buffalo and return.

Now if you allow the steamer ½ cent per bushel more to Kingston than to Buffalo, she earns on the trip to Kingston better earnings than on any part of her trip on the upper lakes and you have the grain in Kingston at 2 cents per bushel.

With the ordinary river barge, grain has been carried to Montreal at 1⅜ cents; last year owing to no opposition whatever, just one company, the Montreal Transportation Company, they advanced their price to 1⅞ cents; their barges are mostly very small barges, and very much out of date. Large barges suitable for the river trade, carrying 48,000 to 64,000 bushels, could be built very cheaply and could deliver this grain in Montreal at not more than 1⅜ cents per bushel, and this would deliver it aboard the ocean steamer free of any other charge. Therefore this grain could be taken from the port of Fort William and place it on the ocean vessel at Montreal for 3⅜ cents per bushel, and the carriers would have a fair profit.

Last year we paid 7½ cents per bushel, today they are asking 7 cents per bushel, so you see what I said in the first of this letter, that if the Welland canal were deepened, we would cut the rate in two, and save 3½ cents per bushel on every bushel of grain from the west to Montreal.

Not only would we carry our western grain through, but we would carry American grain, because grain is like water, it is going to flow by the easiest channel, the cheapest route takes it.

Buffalo, strange to say, is shipping as much Manitoba wheat as Montreal. Why? Because the big steamers do this very cheap. The charges from Buffalo to New York are very high, 5 cents per bushel, in fact 5·90 cents to f.o.b. steamer, New York from Buffalo. When the Erie canal is deepened to the twelve or fourteen feet as they are now talking of doing, they will take this grain from Buffalo and put it in New York at probably 3 cents per bushel, perhaps 2½ cents. Trade that we are barely holding now, we will lose altogether, we will all be sending our grain through American channels a few years hence, unless the government gets wise quickly and deepens the Welland canal which is the only feasible way of taking care of our western trade; only twenty-eight miles of canal to make which is giving us the finest deep waterway on the face of the globe, and making our northwest land worth from two to three dollars per acre more.

We have given you a good deal, and could give a good deal more, but this is a busy day here, and I trust that I have made myself plain. The government knows of this, gave it to them last year; at the time they seemed convinced, but they never put a dollar in the estimates yet to make a survey to see what this proposed enlarging and deepening of the Welland canal would cost; in this they have been very slack; why should they go ahead with the Georgian bay canal and spend millions and not make an estimate of the cost of the other route? Any business man figures out every proposition before he finally determines which one he will undertake to do, and the same argument should apply to the government. I am loath to have the opposition take hold of this thing, it should come as a government measure, however, somebody has to act, and act quickly.

Yours truly,
JAMES RICHARDSON.

This firm are the largest exporters of grain from the west. They have been in the business a lifetime, and the proposition they make is the only feasible one and the only one with which the government should grapple. This Bill which is before us is for the extension of time of a charter which the company in question got fourteen years ago. They never put a dollar into the scheme, and every year they come for a renewal of their charter. It is not in the interests of the country that this charter should be renewed from year to year according to the letter I have just quoted, and the proposition suggested in this letter is a feasible one. If we are going into a large expenditure of money, we ought to make perfect the St. Lawrence and the Welland canal route, on which we have spent so much money, by spending a little more on them.

Mr. HAGGART. The question is not before us whether the St. Lawrence or the Georgian bay canal route is the best. I have heard with pleasure the letter which my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has just read, but I entirely differ in opinion from the writer. He is misinformed and does not know the facts. The question has been debated in this House again and again. We in this section have stood up for the Georgian bay canal and have proved conclusively that a canal built on the principle we advocate would be for the general advantage of Canada. I am not living on the line of the Ottawa river, and therefore am just as much interested in the St. Lawrence route, but surely those who live along the Welland and the St. Lawrence canals should not be so prejudiced against the construction of this other work. However, the work is not under consideration here at present. Neither is the question under consideration as to whether it should be built by the government or not. But the parties are before us who have a charter and who have performed the conditions of the charter which we gave them some years ago. They have prepared and filed their plans. These plans have been in the possession of the government for the last year.

They cannot do more. The parties who are interested in the building of this canal are the most successful and the richest contractors in the world. They have faith in the undertaking and intend to construct the canal. If they do not, let the government construct it. I perhaps am in sympathy with those who advocate its construction as a government work, but it is useless to tell us that all canals are properly government work and should be built by the government. All the canals in England are the enterprises of private corporations, and so are nearly all the canals on the continent. That should be no objection. What we want is the canal. These parties have kept the enterprise alive to the present. They have expended a large amount of money on it. They have had their engineers at work, they have filed their plans with the government and are willing to enter into a contract. If the government do not wish to have it built according to the plans, that is their option. The plans are not at the option of the contractor, but have to receive the approval and sanction of the government, and I suppose that the government, in its own interests, even if it entered into a contract with this company, would like to know from its own officers what the cost of the undertaking is likely to be. It is but a simple matter of justice to these parties that we should pass this Bill. They have expended a large sum of money on this undertaking and are prepared to enter into a contract, and they say to the government: If you do not enter into a contract with us, do what you agreed to do. Take over the work already done, and that work will be essential if you build the canal yourselves, and pay us only the actual expenditure for the material and work done upon it. They ask for no fancy rates, they ask for no profits at all, but they ask the carrying out of the clause which the Minister of Justice put into their charter two years ago, which binds the government to give them the actual cash expenditure they made on work which is essential for the building of the canal. It is within five minutes of the expiry of the hour allowed for private Bills, and I shall not detain the House any longer. The building of the Georgian bay canal is an undertaking in which this section of the country is vitally interested, and they do not want to see any obstacles thrown in the way of its progress.

Mr. LENNOX. I am sorry the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) did not give us himself this information which now comes from the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart), namely, that it is the government who are blocking the way, that it is they who are responsible for the delay in proceeding with this work, and that the government are in possession of the key to the situation and refuse to unlock the gate.

Mr. GRAHAM. How about the hon. member for Leeds?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am voicing somebody else's opinion.

Mr. LENNOX. I take it for granted that what the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) says is true, and that he has knowledge of what he is speaking about. He tells us that this company is one of the greatest financial corporations in the world, that it is ready to go on with this work, but that the government are so vacillating and uncertain that they cannot even tell us to-night what they are going to do. I believe this is a bad policy that the government is pursuing; I am confident that the future will prove it so. But I recognize the fact that the government are committed to it over head and ears and cannot turn back now. I shall not block the way.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not want my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) to vote under any erroneous impression. I am going to have him vote with the full knowledge that no company has proposed to build this canal without aid from the government, and when the statement is made that a company is ready to enter into a contract for the construction, I am confident that there can be no foundation for that statement. No company will build this work without government aid, and no company has ever pretended that it could.

Mr. LENNOX. That merely shows the necessity for the discussion we have had, for we have now some light on the subject that we had not before. As I said, I do not wish to block the way.

Mr. BERGERON. I may say at once that I am not opposed to the Georgian bay canal; on the contrary, it is an old friend of ours. I am one who have always believed that the Georgian bay canal, when it is built, will be built by the government of Canada and not by a company. I do not wish to say anything against this company. I knew the first promoters in 1894 and 1896 and they were very anxious to have this work built and very much in earnest. But we do not need to go outside the Bill itself for proof that this work cannot be built by a prviate company—and it would not be good policy for the government to have a canal built by a private company. This charter was granted in 1894, renewed in 1896, again in 1900, again in 1902, again in 1904, again in 1906—they come before us every two years. And if we grant this extension, they will be back in two years again. I do not blame them. I understand well that they cannot build this work. The government has spent nearly a million dollars for surveys of this canal route, and when they make up their minds—as I hope they will—to build the canal, how will they stand with this company? We have had other cases of this kind where private companies stood in the way. The government

will have to deal with the company. The company will say: We have a charter to build the canal, and we have incurred certain expenses——

Mr. CONMEE. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) does he think we get rid of the claim simply by refusing this charter? Would not they advance the claim regardless of that?

Mr. BERGERON. No.

Mr. CONMEE. I think so.

Mr. BERGERON. That is where we differ. This company is dead, and if it is to live, it must be because this parliament revives it. I would not be unwilling to allow them legitimate expenses, but I do not want them to take us by the throat.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the Bill he will see that it provides, as the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) has said, that they will have only their expenditure.

Mr. BERGERON. But my hon. friend knows what that means—we have had it here often. We know the kind of claim that will be put in, and we know that the company will have plenty of friends on both sides who for sympathy, or otherwise, will help them to get all that they claim from the government. The government is a good milch cow and everybody knows where to find it. The government has had this matter before it long enough to be able to decide upon a policy, and it has undertaken expenditure which will give it the necessary information. Then what is the use of renewing this charter, leaving this company in the hope that they will be called upon to do something or that they may get something from the government? It is purely and simply a bait—I do not believe it is good policy for this parliament to revive the charter. When the company has a claim, let them make their claim; I would be one of the first to help them to get all they are entitled to. But for us, representing the whole people of Canada—not only those in this part of the country, but all the people—to say that we will revive the company is only to put the company in a better position to demand more from the government than they are legitimately entitled to. I do not believe in this policy, and I, for one, will vote against it.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I have no objection to the government paying people what they have legitimately spent upon a work of this kind. But I do want the government to stop their spending, for it seems to me hopeless to expect these people to build this canal. If that canal is built, it will have to be done by the government. Meantime we ought to stop the spending of money for which a claim will be ultimately made against the country and for which the country will have nothing to show.

THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

The time for private Bills having expired, the House resumed in Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 57) respecting a certain convention between His Majesty and the President of the French republic.

Mr. BERGERON. As I understand, if there was a treaty of commerce between France and the United States of America, such as this treaty, goods could come through New York and be delivered in Canada, according to this clause.

Mr. FIELDING. No. The hon. member says if there were a treaty between the United States and France; that would not be the test, but if there was a treaty between the United States and Canada; if we were to extend the benefit of our intermediate tariff to the United States, then the United States would come within the terms of that clause and goods could be brought in as the hon. gentleman states.

Mr. BERGERON. That is not my interpretation of the clause. It reads:

To enjoy the benefits of the aforementioned tariff advantages, Canadian products shall be conveyed without transhipment from a Canadian port or from a port of a country enjoying the French minimum tariff to a port in France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China.

Mr. FIELDING. I was reading from the first part, the hon. member is reading from the second.

Mr. BERGERON. I am not criticising it. I am only pointing out this fact in answer to the criticism of the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Claude Macdonell).

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend refers to the second part, to goods going out of Canada. If the United States should receive the French minimum tariff, that would be correct.

Mr. SPROULE. We have already, I understand, a line of steamers subsidized between Canada and France. Is it intended to have two lines of steamers and that we must have a direct line?

Mr. FIELDING. I think the proposal is to enlarge the range of the present line. We have at present a line operated by the Allans from Canada to Havre by way of London. The details of the new arrangement may perhaps be given by my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur).

Mr. SPROULE. Enlarge it how?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a contract to-day providing for a subsidy of $100,000, which is at the rate of $5,555 per trip. This

sum of $100,000 represents 18 trips. It is proposed that we should increase that amount to provide for more numerous trips but not to increase the amount per trip.

Mr. SPROULE. What are you paying the line now?

Mr. BRODEUR. $100,000, sometimes a little more. We pay $5,555 per trip and the existing statute gives authority to give $133,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is $133,000 the total amount of the subsidy ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not sure of the amount, but it is about that.

Mr. DANIEL. That is it. $133,333.

Mr. BRODEUR. The contract would expire with the opening of navigation this year and the new subsidy is to replace the old one.

Mr. BERGERON. How many arrangements have been made for subsidizing lines of steamers to France? An arrangement was made some years ago to subsidize some French company.

Mr. BRODEUR. The Ligne Bossière.

Mr. BERGERON. That was the first one. After that collapsed was there any other?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no arrangement with the government of France with regard to this.

Mr. BERGERON. No I mean some subsidy paid by the Canadian government for this same service.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is to-day a contract by which we pay $5,555 to the Allans. There is no other contract. This contract, which was entered into in 1905, will expire in the beginning of the season of navigation of 1908, and the resolution of which I have give notice is to replace the contract now in existence.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that this subsidy is to be $133,000 on condition that they make so many trips.

Mr. BRODEUR. The resolution which is tabled declares that we will pay the sum of $100,000 for 18 round trips, that amount to be increased proportionately so that each additional trip would increase the subsidy by $5,555 each.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that this must be a direct service. Does the French government assist in subsidizing this line ?

Mr. BRODEUR. This subsidy would be given according to the policy adopted some years ago, I think in 1894. For many years the subsidy then voted was not taken up and consequently no money was spent under that statute. Some years ago the Allan people negotiated with the then government to take over that subsidy. A contract was entered into with them in 1905, and, as I have said, it would expire in a short time and the resolution which is to be submitted is for the purpose of renewing and expanding that contract.

Mr. SPROULE. To-day the Allans can call at an English port going each way.

Mr. BRODEUR. Under the new arrangement the first port of call and the last port of call must be French ports.

Mr. SPROULE. But in the meantime they could call at an English port.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is nothing to prevent them going to some other place. I do not know whether the company which will take over the contract will desire to go to London.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the minister state the difference in cost of the new and old contracts?

Mr. BRODEUR. Previous to the existing one?

Mr. ARMSRONG. What will be the difference between the new contract that we are entering into and the one which has expired?

Mr. BRODEUR. The only difference is stated in the resolution, which my hon. friend will see on the Order Paper. I will read it :

Resolved, that it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to enter into a contract for a term not exceeding ten years with any individual or company, for the performance of a steamship service between a port or ports in Canada and a French port or ports, on such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council deems expedient, and to grant therefor a subsidy based upon a minimum service of eighteen round voyages a year, and a subsidy therefor not exceeding one hundred thousand dollars, and so in proportion for a more frequent service.

If the requirements of the trade should demand a weekly service instead of the service which is now in existence, consisting of fourteen trips during the summer and four during the winter, under this resolution the Governor in Council is authorized to enter into a contract for the purpose of paying the same amount per trip, namely $5,555 but for a more frequent service.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. But the minister has to make some estimate of what the increase is likely to be?

Mr. BRODEUR. What shall be the increased service to begin with has not yet been determined? It must not be forgotten that it is provided by this treaty that goods, to get the benefit of the treaty, will have to be imported direct. There have been in the past large quantities of goods imported

through different ports. As these goods now will have to be imported direct it will probably increase to a large extent the number of voyages required.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the estimated amount of the increase?

Mr. BRODEUR. Perhaps we will have a weekly service; I do not say immediately, but later on it will probably require a weekly service.

Mr. BERGERON. Will these vessels carry the mails from Canada to France?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. And they will be paid for it?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. BERGERON. That will be part of the contract?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. When my hon. friend was negotiating with the French authorities was there any question whether they also should subsidize a line of steamers between Canada and France? We all know that it has been the policy of France for many years to subsidize steamers to carry their trade all over the world. Was there any question as to whether they should pay their share of the subsidy in view of the fact that a treaty had been negotiated between the two countries?

Mr. BRODEUR. They have a different way of subsidizing their boats.

Mr. BERGERON. They pay money for the construction of ships?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. They do it in their own way, but it is a question whether they would not be willing to pay a share of the subsidy. Was that proposed? There would be no harm in asking them to do so.

Mr. FIELDING. It was thought best that that should not be a matter of treaty, but that each party to the treaty should be left entirely free. We are not pledged to grant a subsidy under the terms of the treaty and they are not, but we hope that the development of trade will be such on both sides that they will find it expedient to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. If we give them a market for $5 worth of their goods for every $1 they give us a market for, you would naturally expect that they would be more interested in stimulating this trade than we are. Therefore, it would be natural to expect that they would contribute their share towards keeping up a direct line of steamships. Then there is another thing; if you make the line of steamships direct the subsidy will not be as valuable to the company operating the line as if it were an indirect line and they were allowed to call at other ports. We are paying the whole of the subvention for the purpose of having the advantage of placing $1 worth of our goods in their market for every $5 worth that they place in ours.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the terms of the new contract be practically similar to those of others in so far as the choice of ports is concerned? If my memory is correct, I think that under the old contract the lines of steamers getting subsidies had it left to them as to the choice of a port on this side of the Atlantic. Will the new contract contain that as one of its terms or will there be any alteration as to that?

Mr. BRODEUR. The existing contract provides that the ports of call shall be Quebec and Montreal during the summer and St. John and Halifax, or St. John alone—I am not quite sure—during winter. The question of the port of call has not been determined yet. It will be a question for negotiation with the company interested.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. This matter of a bonus to a French line of steamers appears to me to be a very proper question to discuss for a moment. If the advantages of this treaty are to be mutual, and I believe they are, there should have been a proposition from our friends who negotiated the treaty that the French government should bear part of the cost of this line. We are doing about $1,500,000 worth of trade with France. You are going to bonus a line to the extent of $150,000 per annum, which is ten per cent on the goods that you are going to export from Canada. That is a very fair profit in itself and if this treaty is properly negotiated and is evenly balanced surely the transportation question should also be put upon the same basis. This line of steamers should have been assisted by the French government to the same extent that it is being assisted by this government.

Mr. FIELDING. The steamship subsidy and the treaty are two entirely different things. Of course, one has some relation to the other as these steamers will carry the trade, but it was thought best that each government should be left free to do as it chose. We are not bound to subsidize this line. The French government are perfectly free to subsidize the line if they wish. Their method of subsidizing their vessels is such that it is rather difficult to establish a joint line. They will only subsidize vessels sailing under their own flag and it was thought better that each party should be left free to act independently in that way.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It is not likely that there will be enough traffic to pay for the subsidizing of two lines and as the Minister of Finance states that these goods are to

be carried directly to Canadian ports it becomes necessary to subsidize a line. We will require these ships if the goods are to be brought into Canada at all because we have no direct line at the present time between Canada and French ports.

Mr. FIELDING. We have a line at present which is subsidized running between Canada and Havre.

Mr. BERGERON. The Allan line flies the French flag, so that there would not be the difficulty that the minister suggests in carrying on negotiations.

Mr. FIELDING. The Allan and other lines fly a good many flags but the nationality of the vessel is what I referred to.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the meaning of the expressions in clause 10.

Mr. FIELDING. It means that we cannot impose any restrictions against France that we do not impose against all other countries; we cannot discriminate against France. We shall not prohibit the importation of any article from France unless in the public interest we prohibit it from other countries.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. With reference to the expression 'goods of French origin', are the materials that are to be used in these goods to be entirely of French origin or may a certain percentage of material be incorporated in them which is not of French origin, and if so what percentage?

Mr. FIELDING. We use the words of the old French Treaty declaring that all the goods must be of 'French origin,' and we have no such rule as is applied in the case of the British preference. I do not anticipate any difficulty. Of course if it is shown that an article is not substantially French we would have to use a reasonable interpretation of that clause.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think there is much danger of any trouble in that respect.

Mr. FIELDING. There never has been.

On clause 11,

Mr. BERGERON. What is the explanation of this clause.

Mr. FIELDING. We are guaranteeing to France favoured nation treatment in everything except as regards the tariff, where we reserve our right to discriminate. The proviso that the privilege shall not apply to border states arises out of the treaties between France and some of the adjacent countries by which a strip of territory fifteen kilometres or about ten miles on each side of the boundary is regarded as a sort of neutral zone and where they do not enforce the customs regulations. The other proviso relates to a treaty which France has with Monaco by which she regards Monaco for commercial purposes as part of France.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. For a good many years the United States have modified the usual form of favoured nation treatment clause by providing that the concession shall not be given unless it is accompanied by the same compensation which is received from the foreign country.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the American interpretation of the favoured nation treatment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Not only that but they make it an express provision in their treaties. I do not say that we should adopt that practice but it is a matter for consideration when we are negotiating these treaties as to whether after all that is not the most logical and advantageous course in the long run.

Mr. FIELDING. The United States have been very strenuous in insisting upon that point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to bring to the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance the following reference to commercial treaties in Schuyler's work on 'American Diplomacy,' at page 421:

> In such treaties it has been usual to insert what is called the 'most favoured nation clause,' the effect of which is to give to each party the same treatment and the same privileges which have been or may be granted to the most favoured nation without further specification or agreement. The form in which this clause has been inserted in most of our treaties is as follows, from our treaty with Italy:
>
> The United States of America and the Kingdom of Italy mutually engage not to grant any particular favour to other nations, in respect to commerce and navigation, which shall not immediately become common to the other party, who shall enjoy the same freely, if the concession was freely made, or on allowing the same compensation, if the concession was conditional.

In their recent treaty with Japan they have modified that a little, and put it in this way in Article xiv:

> The high contracting parties agree that, in all that concerns commerce and navigation, any privilege, favour or immunity which either high contracting party has actually granted, or may hereafter grant, to the government, ships, citizens or subjects of any other state, shall be extended to the government, ships, citizens or subjects of the other high contracting party, gratuitously, if the concession in favour of that other state shall have been gratuitous, and on the same or equivalent conditions if the concession shall have been conditional; it being their intention that the trade and navigation of each country shall be placed, in all respects, by the other upon the footing of the most favoured nation.

In both of these cases the minister will observe that the favoured nation treatment is to be on the same terms.

Mr. FIELDING. Favour for favour.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Favour for favour, for example, if we made a treaty to-morrow with Germany, extending to Germany certain tariff concessions and receiving from Germany certain tariff concessions, then France would enjoy the same concessions from us provided she gave us the same concessions that we received from Germany. That point seems to me to deserve consideration so far as future treaties are concerned, because you can keep yourself straight in that way, otherwise you run the risk of being the loser in the future.

Mr. FIELDING. That point has been well considered in other cases, and the position of the British diplomatic service has been that the older principle is the safer and the better. I think all the British treaties without exception adopt the view that if a concession be granted to another country, whether it is granted for compensation or not, it must be granted to Great Britain. The principle works both ways, and there are many ways in which it works to the advantage of Great Britain and would work to our advantage. I am aware that the Americans take the other view and adhere strenuously to it; but the practice of the British diplomatic service has been entirely against it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I entirely appreciate what the Minister of Finance has said. I know that the British rule has been the other way, but it occurred to me that there might be a special reason for that. Great Britain being a free trade country, is not in a position to give any great tariff concessions except in respect of wines and a few other articles on which she imposes customs duties. The principle which has been alluded to may work very well for Great Britain, while the American principle may work better for the United States; and as our tariff system more nearly resembles that of the United States than that of Great Britain, being based on the protective principle, it is worth while for us to consider whether the American form of treaty stipulation might not be the better for Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. While that may be well worthy of consideration in the future, we are and must necessarily be bound by all the existing most-favoured nation treaties of Great Britain, which apply to Canada. So long as those treaties remain, we shall have to adopt the British view.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not contending for a moment that in a form of treaty stipulation of this character there could be much doubt about the construction. While the United States makes it perfectly plain the other way, I am not criticising the British construction. I would be prepared to accept that.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the Minister of Finance know what are the commercial arrangements between England and France?

Mr. FIELDING. England gets the benefit of the French minimum tariff.

Mr. BERGERON. When there is anything applicable to France in this treaty it always adds 'Algeria, the French colonies and possessions and the territories of the protectorate of Indo-China.' In the arrangement between England and France, does England mention all the British colonies in the same way?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend will see that the difference is due to the fact that England's colonial system differs materially from that of France. For instance Great Britain does not undertake to make tariff arrangements for Canada, but France does make the tariff arrangements for most of the French colonies and possessions.

Mr. BERGERON. I like our system the best. I ask simply for information.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the hon. Minister of Finance explain just what is meant by octroi?

Mr. FIELDING. I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to answer that question.

Mr. BRODEUR. The octroi is a sort of excise duty collected on goods which are taken into a city or town for local consumption. It has to be approved of by the central government.

Mr. BERGERON. I think it is a municipal law to begin with, and it has to be sanctioned by the government.

Mr. BRODEUR. If my hon. friend will consult Maurice Bloch's 'Dictionnaire de l'Administration Française,' he will find a complete explanation of octroi.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Can the minister give us an idea of how many cities that system is applied to in France?

Mr. BRODEUR. All cities and towns—about 1,500, I understand.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Has the minister any idea of what percentage of duty is imposed on goods entering these cities?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not that information. I have got it on wines, and it is about 2 cents a gallon.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Can you give us any idea of the food products?

Mr. BRODEUR. No; we have not got that.

On article 16,

If importers of French wines furnish certificates of analysis thereof, issued by the scientific establishments under the control of the Minister of Agriculture of France and designated by him, such certificates shall be taken into consideration for determining the alcoholic strength of such wines by the Canadian customs authorities, without, however, restricting their rights of appraisement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the meaning of the words 'take into consideration'?

Mr. FIELDING. The French ministers would have been pleased if we would have agreed to accept these certificates as authentic, but we said that, although they should be entitled to much consideration, we did not wish to give up the right of our customs authorities to call them in question if anything should give cause to suppose that these certificates would be erroneous. We would treat them with every respect, but not regard them as final.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. This is simply with regard to alcoholic strength, but what about adulteration?

Mr. FIELDING. There is no reference to adulteration, because the question was with regard to alcoholic strength.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. What would the minister expect to do if he found that the wines were adulterated by the use of chemicals?

Mr. FIELDING. If that question were raised the customs authorities would have to call in experts.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How carefully will they be examined?

Mr. FIELDING. I am bound to suppose that the customs will do their duty efficiently.

On article 20.

This convention, after being approved by the French Chambers and by the parliament of Canada, shall be ratified and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Paris as soon as practicable.

It shall come into force immediately after the completion of that formality and shall remain in force for a period of ten years, unless, however, one of the contracting parties shall within such period signify to the other party its intention to terminate this convention, in which case this convention shall cease to have effect twelve months after the reception by the other party of the notification as above.

In case neither of the contracting parties shall have signified before the expiry of such term the intention of terminating this convention, it shall remain binding until expiry of twelve months from the day on which either of the two parties shall have denounced it.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the meaning of this?

Mr. FIELDING. I explained that on the introduction of the Bill. Although ten years is mentioned, the treaty may be terminated on twelve months' notice by either party. We had desired to make the treaty for ten years, but our French friends did not care to bind themselves to that term. They left the ten years in as a reference, but so worded the article that the treaty can be terminated on twelve months' notice.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What it practically amounts to is this. During the first ten years after the treaty comes into force it shall be liable to be denounced on twelve months' notice, and after these ten years it shall continue to be liable to be so denounced.

Mr. FIELDING. Exactly.

Mr. BERGERON. It may run more than ten years?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes; but it may last only one. We left the ten years in, though legally it is meaningless. It implies, however, a sort of moral obligation.

Mr. DANIEL. Reverting to the subject of adulterated wines, is there any Canadian law at present making it illegal to import adulterated wines? Otherwise the customs would have no authority to analyse such wines.

Mr. BRODEUR. They will be in the same position as any other food products. If any article which is adulterated is offered for sale, the person offering it is liable to the penalty provided by the Adulteration Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as adulterated articles are concerned, the position will be the same after the treaty as it is at present. The only significance of the situation is this, that if the treaty is to increase the import of articles which are specially subject to adulteration, it is necessary to look into our laws and see what remedies we have. My hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Marshall) referred to the importation of pease which are said to be coloured by some injurious substance. Other hon. gentlemen familiar with the wine trade talk of adulteration as being prevalent in certain classes of wines. If the treaty is likely to encourage the importation of articles specially liable to adulteration, the government should look carefully into our laws and see that there is some remedy.

Mr. FIELDING. I feel more anxious on that point, because it is of importance. The French government are exceedingly anxious to guard against adulteration, and I should hope that, as we are acting in unison, that danger will be avoided.

Mr. BRODEUR. This clause with regard to analysis was added by the French authorities with the view of preventing adulteration and of preventing articles being offered for sale which are adulterated.

Mr. BARR. Seeing the position the minister is in, would it not be wise for him to propose any necessary amendments to the law in this respect? He does not appear to be at all clear on the subject.

Mr. FIELDING. If the Adulteration Act is found defective, certainly it should be looked closely into.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall I read the schedules?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose we could leave them to the end of the Act, and if any hon. gentleman wishes to call attention to any particular item——

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly.

On article IV:

Every reduction of customs duty granted by Canada to any foreign country whatever on any of the products enumerated in schedule 'B' shall apply to the fullest extent to similar products originating in France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions, and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask whether, under the law of France, it is necessary to have a provision of this kind, or does the government of France possess the necessary powers by decree to accomplish in respect to Canadian products entering France that which is accomplished by this section regarding French products entering Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. Their proceeding is similar to ours. They have submitted to the chambers a law which has been passed—I am not sure if it has been completed. So, the proceeding in the two countries is substantially the same.

Mr. DANIEL. I suppose this is a clause which will fix as part of the treaty all those articles mentioned in schedule 'B'——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Both 'B' and 'C'.

Mr. DANIEL. When I spoke of this treaty on the second reading, I mentioned particularly the importation of absinthe. If it is possible, I would like to see absinthe cut out of this treaty entirely. There is no need of Canada importing any such article. There is no benefit in it, and its importation will be accompanied by a great deal of evil, especially if it is used to any great extent. It has been considered in France, and especially in Paris, as a great injury to the youth of the country. As I said when speaking on the matter before, we have a sufficient number of means of getting artificial headaches and shattered nerves without importing another one from France, and I, for one, would like to see this liquor, absinthe, cut out of the treaty. If it is possible to do it, I will make a motion, but, if it is not possible, I will leave it to the minister to take action.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Daniel) is under a misapprehension as to the effect of the treaty as affecting this article. He is under the impression, I take it, that we are making a concession in the duty on absinthe. There is no change in the duty on absinthe under this treaty. We are putting this article in a list of articles concerning which it is provided that the rates of duty granted to other countries by Canada, under the intermediate tariff must be conceded to France. For the present, the rate is exactly as it was. And, if we see fit, either for the reason given by my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel)—whose views as a professional man we are bound to consider—or for any other, to legislate so that absinthe should be prohibited from entering Canada, we have a right to do so.

Mr. DANIEL. I am not objecting to the rate of duty. So far as I am concerned, I should be better satisfied to see the rate higher than it is. What I object to is the absinthe itself, and, if my opinion has any influence, I would exert it in favour of having the article cut out of the treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. But cutting it out would not——

Mr. DANIEL. If that cannot be done, I would rather see the duty raised than lowered.

Mr. BERGERON. But this treaty puts us under no obligation to import absinthe or to admit it at any particular rate of duty. What my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) wants—and he may be right—is to prevent the importation, but that can be done by a different procedure.

Mr. BRODEUR. By a change in the tariff.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes. But it has nothing to do with the treaty before us.

Mr. DANIEL. If the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) would intimate to us now, that when he comes to make his budget speech he will put absinthe on the prohibited list, I should be entirely satisfied.

Mr. FIELDING. I could not undertake to do that, and, in any case, it will make no difference so far as this treaty is concerned. And we can prohibit the importation of absinthe without affecting this treaty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If we prohibit it from all countries.

Mr. FIELDING. Exactly. This treaty does not in any way interfere with the freedom of this House in this matter. If we wish to prohibit it altogether, well and good; the only thing to which we bind ourselves under this treaty is that if it is prohibited from France we will prohibit it from other countries also.

Mr. DANIEL. I take it that if absinthe were placed on the prohibited list we should be doing what France is doing with regard to our proprietary medicines. She totally prohibits them. I suppose, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) suggests, she prohibits them from every country. In that case, cutting absinthe out of the treaty would prohibit it from France, but I suppose it would require other authorization to prohibit it from other countries as well. I leave the 'how' of doing this to the Minister of Finance. But I should be glad to hear from him some statement that he would do it

Mr. FIELDING. Cutting it out of the treaty would not prohibit its importation from France. If we wish to prohibit it, it must be by amendment of the general law of Canada.

Mr. BERGERON. What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Daniel) is asking the Minister of Finance is, when he prepares his budget, to propose the prohibition of absinthe. I think that is a suggestion worthy of consideration.

Mr. FIELDING. That is worth consideration.

Mr. BERGERON. Of course it has nothing to do with the treaty.

Mr. BRODEUR. In regard to absinthe I think the least danger would come from France because last year a Bill was introduced before the Chamber of Deputies asking the abolition of absinthe, and there has been a campaign against it in the press so that it is likely that in a very short time the manufacture and use of absinthe will be entirely prohibited in France.

Mr. BERGERON. I think it is prohibited in the French and German armies.

On section 4—Extension of advantages to Tunis.

Mr. BERGERON. Of course the French government would notify this government of any such desire.

Mr. FIELDING. This would have to be by agreement. Tunis has a somewhat different form of government; although it is a protectorate of France, the French government do not desire to make a bargain binding it, but they wanted to have provision for its admission to the advantages of the treaty should it desire to enter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Which provision in the treaty refers to this?

Mr. FIELDING. 18. It is to be by an exchange of notes between the two parties.

On section 5:

The advantages granted to France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions, and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China by the said convention, with respect to the commerce of the said countries with Canada, shall extend to any and every other foreign power which by reason of the operation of the said convention is, under the provision of a treaty or convention with His Majesty, entitled, in whole or in part, to the same or to the like advantages with respect to its commerce with Canada, to the extent to which in the manner aforesaid such other foreign power is entitled thereto; and such advantages shall continue to so extend to such other foreign power so long as the said convention remains in force, or until the right of such other foreign power to such advantages under its treaty or convention with His Majesty is sooner determined.

Mr. BERGERON. What is that, in a few words?

Mr. FIELDING. That is to provide for the extending of the advantages of the treaty to countries enjoying most-favoured nation treaties.

Mr. BERGERON. With France?

Mr. FIELDING. Treaties with Great Britain which apply to Canada. Any foreign country which has a favoured-nation treaty with Great Britain applicable to Canada becomes entitled to the advantages of this treaty. Although that is covered by the treaty power, it has been thought that we should properly give effect to it by specific enactment of this parliament. That was done under the treaty of 1893. Although that treaty with France would also apply to the favoured-nation countries, it was thought proper that Canada should legislate giving effect to that. We provide by legislation of Canada that the benefits of this treaty should be extended to all countries having favoured-nation treaties with Great Britain. Canada being a part of the empire we are bound to give these benefits to all favoured-nation countries because we give them to France. I gave a list of these nations earlier in the debate.

On section 6:

The advantages so granted to France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions, and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China by the said convention, shall extend to the United Kingdom and the several British colonies and possessions with respect to their commerce with Canada, so long as France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions, and the said territories continue to be entitled to such advantages; provided, however, that nothing herein contained shall be held to diminish any advantage which the United Kingdom and British colonies and possessions now enjoy under the British preferential tariff.

Mr. BERGERON. That is the same thing on our side.

Mr. FIELDING. In the case of countries enjoying the British preferential tariff, this is hardly necessary because the British preferential tariff, except in a few instances, is more favourable than the rates

now given. But take Australia or Newfoundland which do not enjoy the benefit of the preferential tariff, we give them by this legislation the benefit of the lower rates which we accord to France, it being a principle that no part of the British empire should be taxed at a higher rate than a foreign country.

Mr. LAKE. In order to obtain certain advantages from France we have to give considerable advantages to a great number of other countries, that is the position?

Mr. BERGERON. And vice versa.

Mr. FIELDING. That is one way of putting it. As the matter stood before, we were under obligations to give to France without compensation everything we might give to another country for compensation, and therefore we thought it better, as the first step in our foreign negotiations, to come to a good understanding with France. We could, of course, with the consent of the British government, denounce these old treaties, but I think that would be unfortunate. In the first place it would be embarrassing to the British government, it would be an international affair. It must be remembered that we get some advantage in return because each nation has to bargain with us that in no case will it give advantages to other nations greater than it gives to us. On the whole we get compensation.

Mr. BERGERON. On the whole does it not diminish our tariff?

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, yes, it extends the benefit of the diminished rates under this treaty to a large number of countries; it is a material reduction in respect of a large number of articles.

Mr. BERGERON. It makes the Canadian tariff lighter than before.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, we took the rates set forth in the intermediate tariff of a year ago, and that did to some extent diminish the protection as between the intermediate and the general tariff. But below that were the rates of the British preferential tariff; so that generally the protection to Canadian products was not decreased, except it be on lines which are not produced in England.

Mr. BERGERON. It gives a benefit to countries enjoying the advantages of the French tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. But the British preferential tariff is below that and the preferential tariff is usually considered the measure of protection. Generally the manufacturer measures the protection by the British rate. In this case it will be found that the British rates will be below the rates given, and if the British rate is below the rate given, it will be no reduction in the protection on Canadian products. But undoubtedly there is a reduction in the protection on goods that are not made in Great Britain.

On section 9:

The operation of all laws inconsistent with the giving to the provisions of the said convention and of this Act their full effect shall from time to time be suspended to the extent of such inconsistency.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the meaning of that?

Mr. FIELDING. Supposing these reductions some country entitled to, should by some act of their own cease to be entitled to these rates, we only want to suspend the legislation so long as the present conditions exist. If these conditions should change, then we do not wish to suspend the legislation any longer. That was the object, and I think it serves the purpose.

Mr. BERGERON. If the minister will read that clause in French, perhaps we would understand it better.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a system for which there is precedent and which has been found satisfactory.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You say here shall 'from time to time' be suspended. The expression 'from time to time' is never used in a matter of that kind, so far as I am aware.

Mr. BERGERON. It seems to me that 'for the time being' would be better.

Mr. FIELDING. There are varying conditions owing to the fact that we may be dealing with various countries. I think the draughtsman put it in for that reason. However, I do not think it is very important.

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose it means that if a treaty between Great Britain and some other country should be denounced the words 'from time to time' would apply.

Mr. FIELDING. It meets varying conditions.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose these negotiations were carried on in French?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. This must have been a translation.

Mr. BRODEUR. This clause 9 was not in the treaty and was not discussed in the negotiations. It was something that was put in the law of 1893 or 1894, when parliament approved of the treaty of 1893, and it was thought advisable to put the same provision in our existing law, but it was never made the subject of negotiation between France and Canada. It is only a matter of following the language of our own statutes.

Mr. FIELDING. This is not in the treaty ; it is in the Act. I would suggest that we accept the words as they are drafted, and before the third reading I will have them submitted to the Department of Justice to find if, in their opinion, it is desirable to change them.

Mr. BERGERON. It is understood that any hon. member who wants to discuss any of these items may do so later on ?

Mr. FIELDING. On the third reading I have no objection. I think the discussion which has taken place has been very thorough, but if on the third reading any hon. gentleman wants to discuss the matter further I have no objection.

Mr. BERGERON. I have in my mind that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), who was very anxious to discuss the Bill, but who, I am afraid, has been called away by sickness.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. member for Jacques Cartier wishes to speak on it, I have no objection.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will my hon. friend look at the top of page 21? Why do you say '6 quarts and 12 pints'?

Mr. FIELDING. That is the form of measurement in our tariff. Six quarts do not generally make a gallon. It is not 6 quarts, but it is 6 quart-bottles.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My suggestion was as to the grammar of the phrase. I do not understand why you should say '6 quarts and 12 pints.'

Mr. FIELDING. I have the treaty here in the original print, and it is 'quart' ; the letter 's' has been imported in the Canadian reprint. It will then be '6 quart bottles or 12 pint bottles.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You had better change it then.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, I think that 's' had better come out.

Bill reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 24, 1908.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 103) respecting the Eastern Trust Company—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 104) to amend the Companies' Act—Mr. Guthrie.

CO-OPERATION.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved that :

Item No. 7, Public Bills and Orders, for the second reading of Bill (No. 5) an Act respecting co-operation, be transferred to government orders.

Motion agreed to.

OLD AGE PENSIONS.

On the order for the introduction of a Bill to authorize the issue of government annuities for old age :

Mr. FIELDING. I ask that this order be dropped as the matter is covered by a resolution which is on the Order Paper.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Dropped.

PLACING OF BOOMS IN INTERNATIONAL STREAMS.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 105) to regulate the placing and maintaining of booms in international streams.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the hon. gentleman briefly explain the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill provides that no boom or shear boom, shall be attached to the Canadian shore of any international stream or placed in the bed of any such stream upon the Canadian side of the middle thread of the main channel without a license therefor having been first obtained from the Minister of Public Works. It is also provided that such license may be granted by the minister upon such terms and for such length of time as he may deem advisable. It further provides that any person who attaches or maintains any such boom upon the Canadian side of the channel shall be liable to a penalty for every day that it is so maintained of not less than $100 and not exceeding $1,000. I may say that the immediate cause of the introduction of this Bill is a state of affairs which has arisen upon that part of the St. John river which forms the boundary between the state of Maine and the province of New Brunswick. Some two or three years ago a company was incorporated by the legislature of the state of Maine and they proceeded to the erection of a mill at Van Buren upon the American side of the St. John river opposite St. Leonard's. In connection with the mill they established sorting works, booms and piers, so that they practically closed the whole of the American side of the St. John river. Then, in order to facilitate their operations, they acquired some shore rights upon the Canadian side of the river and they have swung out

shear booms from the Canadian side, the result of which is to divert into their sorting works on the American side all the logs going down the St. John river destined for mill owners below these works. The result of the construction of these works has been to cause very great delay and loss and damage to the mill owners of Woodstock, Fredericton, St. John, and other points on the St. John river. Under the present law the navigation of the river cannot be obstructed unless with the approval of the Minister of Public Works, but it may well be argued that the placing of these shear booms in the river does not obstruct the navigation and therefore the courts of our country would have no control over them. It has been thought advisable that the government through the Minister of Public Works should have some control over that portion of the international waters which are within Canada, and all that this Bill proposes to do is to place a certain control and a certain regulation of these booms in the Federal authorities. Under this Bill, if it should become law, the minister can make provision as to the description of sorting works and may take all necessary precaution to prevent delay and loss or injury to the mill owners down the river. It seems to be, in the case of an international stream, the only mode which can be suggested by which the large lumbering interests of a great river like the St. John can be protected. It has been thought best to make the Bill general in its application, although I may say frankly to the House that I am not aware of any case in which the difficulty has arisen except on the St. John river. The Bill has been presented in response to petitions which have been very largely signed by those conducting milling and lumbering operations on the St. John river, and I think I may say that the opinion of the people interested in these operations which are situate below these works on the river, is unanimous in favour of legislation of this kind. It is urgently called for, and if the measure becomes law it will prove very advantageous to the public interests there.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I presume the minister has considered the question of provincial jurisdiction in the bed of the river and shore rights.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, very carefully. This is a navigable river, and I think there can be no question as to the jurisdiction of this parliament to deal with it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 106) to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I intended to speak in French, but I am asked to speak in English. This Bill is a very simple one. Its first object is to amend section 270 of the Railway Act, which says that trains shall be run, as far as possible, on schedule time to be fixed by public notice. I propose to amend this section by striking out the words 'as far as possible,' and to provide that the railway company shall be subject to a minimum fine of $5 for each minute of delay to one of its trains. There is no penalty in the present Railway Act for the delay of trains, and it is perfectly useless to have a provision with respect to that matter without a penalty being attached. The railways of this country seem to treat the public with a great deal of levity; you sometimes know at what hour a train will arrive at a station, but you never know at what hour you will get to your destination, and there are quite a number of unnecessary delays without any reason whatever. My proposition is that the company shall be fined for delays unless they can prove force majeure.

The second object of the Bill is to amend section 343 of the Railway Act so as to compel steamship companies navigating in inland waters and receiving subsidies to give free transportation to members of the House of Commons and of the Senate. I see no reason why we should discriminate between railways and steamships in this matter. The steamship companies receive subsidies from this parliament and they come here seeking legislation just as the railways do; and while parliament discriminates between railways and steamships in this matter, the steamship companies in turn discriminate between members and give transportation to certain members who possibly favour their legislation, while they refuse it to others. If we are going to have the principle of free transportation by railway companies and steamship companies, it should apply to every member of the House and to every senator or to none at all.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FEDERAL INTERFERENCE IN PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Under rule 37 Mr. Foster wishes to discuss, as a matter of public importance, the following:

The interference of government employees in federal electoral contests by frequenting and addressing public meetings in the interest of a particular party. And, the promise of federal aid and subventions by members of parliament and by the government.

Shall the hon. gentleman have leave to move the adjournment of the House?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Mr. Foster moves, seconded by Mr. R. L. Borden, that the House do now adjourn.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). The House will remember that some days ago I put a question to the Minister of Railways based upon a telegram sent me, stating that employees of the Intercolonial in Moncton were interfering in the provincial elections which are being carried on in the province of New Brunswick. The names of two gentlemen, Leblanc, were mentioned, and it was circumstantially stated in the telegram that these gentlemen had been addressing meetings and taking an active part in the election in the county of Westmoreland. The Minister of Railways appeared a little doubtful that any of his tried and trusty employees would be engaged in anything so different from railway work, and he took the benefit of a day or two to make inquiry. Afterwards, in answering my questioning, he informed the House that he was not able to find that these gentlemen had been actively engaged in political work, but that he was still diligently prosecuting inquiry. He prosecuted the inquiry for another day or two, and a few days ago he informed the House, on a question of my own, that one of the Leblancs had been at his home over Sunday and had gone back to his work in Quebec, and that the other Leblanc had gone away somewhere, and he did not know where he was. I think he intimated that he had leave of absence. Then the minister said that he had notified the superintendent that the department did not wish its men to be engaged in active political work, although it accorded to them the fullest liberty of voting and exercising their franchise. I have received to-day circumstantial evidence in the way of the following affidavits, which will show that the information I had was correct in every particular:

Canada—Province of New Brunswick.

I, Antoine Bourque, of Cocagne, in the parish of Dundas, in the county of Kent and province of New Brunswick, farmer, do solemnly declare

That on the evening of the twentieth day of February, A.D. 1908, I attended a political meeting held in the interest of the local government candidates, at Cocagne, in the said county of Kent, which meeting was attended by a large number of the electors of the said county of Kent. That the said meeting was advertised as a political meeting by, and in the interest of the local government party, and Henri LeBlanc, of Moncton, in the county of Westmoreland, was one of the principal speakers at the said meeting, and spoke there at length. That the said Henri LeBlanc advocated in his said address at the meeting the election of the government candidates, and condemned the local opposition party, and asked the electors to vote against the opposition candidates. That the said Henri LeBlanc is an employee of the federal government and is employed in the general offices of the Intercolonial Railway at Moncton, Westmoreland county, and I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

his
ANTOINE X BOURQUE,
mark.

Declared before me at Shediac, in the county of Westmoreland, this 21st day of February, A.D. 1908. W. A. Russell, a commissioner to take affidavits to be read in the Supreme Court, and I certify that the foregoing declaration was first by me read over to the said declarent who affixed his mark thereto in my presence, and who seemed perfectly to understand the same.

W. A. RUSSELL,
Commissioner.

Canada—Province of New Brunswick.

I, Jeremiah S. Legere, of Robicheau, in the parish of Shediac, in the county of Westmoreland, and province of New Brunswick, farmer, do solemnly declare

That on the fourteenth day of February, A.D. 1908, in the evening, I attended a political meeting held in the school house at Robicheau, in the parish of Shediac, in the said county of Westmoreland, in the interest of the local government party. That the meeting was announced as one in favour of the said government party, and held as such, and the speaker at the said meeting was Henri LeBlanc, of Moncton, in the said county, who is an employee of the federal government, and who is employed in the general offices of the Intercolonial Railway at Moncton. That he advocated the election of the government candidates for this county. That the said meeting was attended by a large number of the electors of the county of Westmoreland. That the said Henri LeBlanc also spoke at a political public meeting at Dupey's Corners, in the said county, on the evening of the thirteenth instant for the government candidates, and I am informed he has since that time spoken at other public political meetings. That I know Alphonse T. LeBlanc in the employ of the federal government, in the service of the Intercolonial Railway, and he spoke and took part in a public political meeting held at Barachois, in the parish of Shediac, in the said county, on the evening of the twentieth instant, in favour of the local government party. And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

JEREMIAH S. LEGERE,

Declared before me at Shediac, in the county of Westmoreland, this twenty-first day of February, A.D. 1908.

W. A. RUSSELL,
A commissioner to take affidavits to be read in the Supreme Court.

These two affidavits can be supplemented by others if it be necessary ; but I think they quite establish the charge which was made, that these employees of the Intercolonial Railway have been, if they are not now, actively engaged in partisan work, openly and publicly speaking and assisting at meetings, not only standing up for their friends, which is a laudable thing in a man, but maligning and saying very harsh things of their political opponents, which is not right in an employee of the government, who is an employee of the whole country, and is paid by the money of the people of both political parties. We find that Henri Leblanc addressed political meetings at Dupey's Corners on the 13th of February, at Robicheau on the 14th of February, and at Cocagne on the 20th of February and the affidavit goes on to say that he has addressed other meetings. It would appear that Henri Leblanc is regularly engaged in the campaign. Alphonse Leblanc spoke on the 20th of February at Barachois, in the county of Westmoreland. This information was brought to the attention of the Minister of Railways, I think first about the 13th of February, and it was preceded by a debate in this House raised by my hon. friend the member for York (Mr. Crocket), who made similar allegations ; and I think it is rather peculiar that, having had their attention called to it at that date, and having at their disposal wires and all the resources of quick communication, these two gentlemen could have been speaking on the 13th, the 14th and the 20th of the month, and none of the argus-eyed officials of the Railway Department should have been able to have discovered this indecent exhibition of partisan work on the part of employees of the government, and have informed the minister of it. One does not care to jump at a conclusion ; but it would seem as if a leave of absence had been asked by Mr. Henri Leblanc, and that he had been sent out for the regular work of the canvass. It makes no difference to my mind whether he was on leave of absence or not. That a man employed by the government and paid by the people of this country to do the country's service, should, whether on leave of absence or not, be taking part in elections, standing up for his friends and accusing his opponents, praising a portion of his paymasters and depreciating another portion, is not decent or proper. What does the government propose to do ? Has it no sense of the incongruity of its conduct ? Is it simply jollying the people ? This government sails under very fine colours. It hoists its flag at the top of the mast and on that flag is inscribed in burning letters the policy that paid employees of the government should not engage in partisan work, either in Dominion or local elections. That is a fine thing for the religious newspapers and the independent newspapers to take notice of ; and the partisans of the government are quick to take notice and praise the Laurier government for this wonderful step in advance, for taking this high moral ground. But what does it mean when we find this government, standing right under that flag, allowing their employees, from day to day and whenever elections are on, to take exactly the opposite course, right in the teeth and by the side of the ministers and thus giving the lie to this solemn declaration of policy ? We find an employee of this government in Woodstock, N.B., attending a political rally, which is the most intimate kind of political work, and there with all the backing he has from being a Dominion government official and with what little patronage and influence that may give him, exercising both on the faithful to keep a certain government in and to prevent another certain party from being elected ; and the best the Postmaster General can say is that he was informed this man had not addressed a public meeting. Why, there is not the least doubt that Smith did attend a Liberal rally and did address that rally. I do not know what the minister has been doing about it since, but he owes it to his government and to himself and to fair and honest dealing, to discipline this man ; and he may rest assured that that Smith is not the Smith who sails under Conservative colours and is a candidate for election.

That is the offence of a lower official. But what shall we say of the offence of higher officials? We find the Minister of Public Works going down to the city of St. John, and by the deft use of imaginative forecasts and predictions as to what may take place in the future, dangling before the eyes of the electors the deep borings and dredging and other works around the city of St. John for the purpose of building a grand terminal for the Grand Trunk Pacific and other railways, and then stating that if the people interested want to strengthen his hands as a federal minister and have these predictions verified, they must put in the six men in the county and city of St. John whose elections he is advocating. What does that mean? Why, in the beginning, before 1904 we had a chosen vessel from Ontario, the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth)—who was greatly desired by the Prime Minister in order to add dignity and strength to his cabinet and make up for losses the government were sustaining in that province—we find that that chosen apostle did not consider it beneath himself to go through Durham with an imaginary clock on one shoulder and one of the mouths of the Trent canal on the other and promise those great benefits to the country out of a well-filled treasury if the electors would only do what he wished.

I tell the right hon. gentleman, whether he knows it or not, that when the words were scarcely yet cold from his mouth, heartily endorsing the resolution we passed

unanimously against the employment or participation of federal officials in elections, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), who is just now leaving the chamber, took one of these same officials, travelled with him throughout the country, put him up on every platform, and when interviewed about it said he thought that public officials had just as much rights as any other class. To-day, Sir, nineteen-twentieths of the officials in the Northwest provinces are simply party managers and participants, and whatever they do, no matter in what sphere, their first and principal disposition is to do what will help the party instead of what will benefit the public. Where is this man Leech to-day? There never was a more gratuitous insult given the good feeling and the good sense of this country than was given when this government appointed that man, who had defrauded thousands upon thousands of Liberal-Conservative voters of their votes in Manitoba, to administer the seed grain fund. After this man had performed that dirty work to the satisfaction of the ministers who employ such men as Wagner, Nixon and others, he was made administrator of this fund of $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 which we voted in order to help the people in a great national crisis and on the promise of the government that the vote would be thoroughly, well and properly administered. What did Leech do in Manitoba? He hunted out every Conservative and drew his pen through every one he could disfranchise. Why? Because he was looking for advancement and because he thought—and it is not a thought that does credit to this government—that the surest road to advancement was to do something illegal, something wrong, something contemptibly mean for his masters. Yet that is the man they appoint to administer this fund. What may we expect him to do? When he comes to file the applications he will do exactly as he did in the case of the lists. He will say: This one is a Conservative, ah ! I will mark him off. This one is a Liberal, ah ! I will be good to him. So that the malign influence of this man is again at work in the Northwest and is given this great benefaction of the people as a fund to work upon. I say it is an insult to the opposition and to the good sense of the people, which, I hope, will be taken well to heart. We have brought this thing up time and again and we would like to hear from the First Minister what he is going to do about it. Is he going to continue to act the pharisee? Is he going to broaden the phylacterics and still make great pretensions? Or will he, for once in his life, be honest and take that declaration of his and tear it into ribbons and say that he made it in a moment of weakness?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Will he be honest enough to say that he never intended to carry it out? He is trampling it under his feet every day. Why then cling to this hypocritical pretense? Why keep it alive? It is not such a lesson as should be given the people by men in authority. The determination to carry out its every pledge should be a distinguished trait of a government that aims to be one of the foremost in the world. Does the Minister of Railways and Canals mean to say that if he had been really desirous of setting right this matter he could not have found out the facts between the 12th inst. and the present time? If he had been in earnest, he would have had his men after these employees and would have whisked them back into their proper places. Why does he not do it in this case? The impelling spirit is not there. Mr. Speaker, I have done my duty in bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). It is a pleasure to the House, and must be a pleasure to the country, that public opinion has got to such a state that a mere suspicion about two minor employees on the Intercolonial will attract so much attention. Time was when, if the whole shops had turned out on a political campaign, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) would not have seen it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was in the day when 'shingles' were ordered by wire.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. As a matter of fact. one of the complaints I have had since I took over the Department of Railways and Canals from those who are in the employ of the Intercolonial is to the effect that they are not allowed nearly the latitude in political matters that they were allowed in the old days. Now, my hon. friend was unfair in the latter part of his remarks when he intimated that I had made no attempt to settle this matter from the 13th instant to the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that.

Mr. GRAHAM. It amounted to that. He said I did not make any practical attempt. Now, that is not fair, and I think he knows it is not fair. When he brought this matter to the attention of the House, I told him frankly that I had not heard of it. But I wired at once to find out if there was any truth in it. I am not going to charge men with doing something merely on suspicion that they have done it. I am not going to tell men they must quit doing something unless I know they have done it. I am not going to tell men who are as good citizens as I or my hon. friend that they must abide by a cast iron rule until I know that there is need to call that rule to their attention. I am not so full of suspicion as my hon. friend about people in general. I wired to the general manager and received word from him that Alphonse

was then at his work in the province of Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. And where was Gaston ?

Mr. GRAHAM. He was following. Now, surely when I found that one of the men whom my hon. friend suspected, was actually at his work, my hon. friend would not expect me to tell that man. 'Now that I have found you at your work you must stay there.' The other gentleman, I found, was absent from his duty. I wired to find where he was and to inform him that, so far as the employees of the Intercolonial were concerned, the department wanted them to have the fullest liberty to exercise their citizenship and their right to vote as they pleased, but we did not want them to take part in either Dominion or provincial affairs. Since that time, I received a telegram that Alphonse had been in Moncton over Sunday. I wired asking that he be given the same information. Surely, my hon. friend cannot ask me to do more than that. Surely, in doing this, I am treating the House and the government and myself fairly. I have stated plainly that I am not in favour of employees of the government taking part in Dominion or provincial affairs. And I believe that the facts do not bear out the statement that, since I have wired, these employees have taken any part in those affairs. I do not see how I could do more. I state again that that is my opinion and that is what I wish carried out. On the other hand, my hon. friend gave us a telegram the other day the substance of which was that some one had heard one of the Leblancs say that he was going to open a committee room. I do not know that he has opened that committee room—in fact, I do not think he has. The hon. gentleman presents two affidavits. Well, it is not fair to condemn a man even on affidavits. Of course, I am not saying a word in disparagement of the men who made those affidavits ; but I think we had better wait,—perhaps affidavits may be made on the other side. Looking at the matter fairly, without attempting to make political capital, I think my hon. friend will see that, so far as the Department of Railways and Canals is concerned, it has done its duty in the matter.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I join in the expressions of pleasure of my hon. colleague (Mr. Graham) because of the fact that my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has so greatly modified his views as to what is proper in connection with political campaigns. I can well remember the time when he did not, at any rate, hold, though he may have sometimes expressed—if he will pardon me for saying it—the same views that he holds now. I do not wonder that, sometimes, gentlemen in the employ of the government who may have a warm feeling for either this government or the provincial government, may be tempted to take some little part in politics when they see so many Conservatives in the employ of the government in the various provinces—and I think now particularly of my own province —who have been allowed by this government, with impunity, for ten years, to take an active part in politics on the Conservative side. I agree that it is not desirable they should do so. Sometimes, it is exceedingly annoying and irritating to Liberals to find this going on, but at all events, they have allowed it to go on without taking very active steps to prevent it.

Now, so far as concerns the statements that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has made with regard to myself, I may say that it is also a pleasure to me that he has made these statements in my presence when I could have an opportunity of making some reply. In that respect, he has not followed the example of two gentlemen from the province which he formerly had the honour to represent, who made an attack on me in my absence, declaring that I had interfered in a provincial election—and then, forthwith, themselves hurried off to take part in that election on the other side. As to anything I have said in New Brunswick, I should not be afraid or ashamed for all the members of this House to see every word that I have uttered. I have held out no promise to the people of New Brunswick as an inducement to them to vote in favour of the provincial government. It was not necessary that I should do so. It was enough for me to point to the record of the Liberal party so far as Canada and the maritime provinces are concerned. I may say that the political course of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) who formerly represented my native county in New Brunswick and now represents North Toronto, gave me a very good text, and has always given me a very good text, on which to speak to the electors of that province. For many years, down until my hon. friend ceased to be a member of the government from New Brunswick and until the Conservative government went out of power, my hon. friend allowed a course to be pursued by that government that was greatly disapproved of by the people of New Brunswick and the maritime provinces generally. He never seemed to be imbued with what we down below are pleased to call the Canadian idea of developing Canada, of carrying Canadian trade through Canadian ports, but my hon. friend and his government permitted, year after year, the Atlantic mail steamers, to seek their terminus, subsidized though they were by Canadian money, at a foreign port and thus helped to build up a foreign city at the expense of the people of Canada. I was able to contrast the policy of the present

government with the policy of their predecessors, and what I did was to show to the people that the policy of the present government was to do everything which was reasonably possible to build up Canadian ports and, in carrying out that policy, I was able to tell the people that I thought the city of St. John, the great commercial metropolis of New Brunswick which I have the honour to represent in this parliament, would be immensely benefited and that the result would be to greatly increase its prosperity and greatly add to its population. Well now, there is nothing wrong in that, it seems to me. It seems to me that it is entirely proper and right for a public man, when he goes before the people, if the party to which he belongs has anything to be proud of, to call the attention of the people to its record and to ask them, by their votes, to show their approval of that record.

But, what was particularly complained of was that I pointed out to the people that borings were to be made in Courtenay bay. My hon. friend rather gave this House to understand that I intimated that the work would be done by the department over which I have the honour to preside. So far from that being the case I distinctly stated to the people of St. John that my department would not and could not undertake this expenditure. I told them further that if they had faith in the city of St. John being one of the termini of the Grand Trunk Pacific they should be prepared to undertake that expense themselves, and it happened fortunately that the premier of the province of New Brunswick was in the city of St. John at the same time and he expressed his willingness to co-operate with the city of St. John for the purpose of carrying on this exploratory work of ascertaining where proper terminal facilities for the Grand Trunk Pacific could be provided at that city. Surely it is not holding out a delusive hope to the people when attention is called to the fact that the Grand Trunk Pacific is now entirely under construction from the Atlantic to the Pacific, that it is going to open up a vast area of fertile country and that before many years there will be traffic carried over that road which will seek its Atlantic outlet in summer at Montreal and Quebec and possibly at other St. Lawrence ports, and that that vast traffic will seek a port in the winter season at St. John, Halifax and other maritime province ports. Surely I was not doing wrong in pointing out these facts to the people, and I felt it was my duty to do so. I am proud of the record which this government has made in that respect and in all other respects. To show that I did not express these views simply because there is an election on in New Brunswick, I may say, and I am proud to say it, that not long ago I paid a visit to the shores of the Georgian bay and I found the same Canadian feeling which can be witnessed down in the province of New Brunswick; I found there a desire to build up the ports through which the trade of our great Canadian west can be diverted from American ports and brought over by Canadian ships and railways to the ports of the Atlantic. That is a good policy, that is a taking policy, it is a Canadian policy and it is the policy which should be impressed upon the minds of our people so that every Canadian from the Atlantic to the Pacific, may realize that he is a citizen of a great and growing country and that as the years go by and the trade of the west develops so will all parts of Canada, particularly the eastern section, share in the advantages of that great development. That is all I have done. I have called attention to this splendid Canadian policy. I have called attention to the splendid results which are likely to flow from it and I have recognized that the contest which is going on in New Brunswick is a contest which, through the action largely of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and hon. gentleman who are associated with him in this House as followers and supporters, has become a party contest. For many years provincial politics were conducted upon non-party lines, but my hon. friend, who was then leader of the Conservative party in New Brunswick, called the party together and insisted that it would be in the public interest and in the interest of the Conservative party that provincial politics should be run on party lines. Although we had then supporting us many prominent Conservatives, men like Col. Chipman, of St. Stephen, and George J. Clarke, two of the most prominent Conservatives of the province and members of the provincial legislature.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Fowler as well.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not speak of Mr. Fowler at the present time. I prefer to confine my remarks to the gentlemen I have named because they were very prominent members of the party and were always fair and consistent supporters of the provincial government. At the call of the hon. member for North Toronto, urged as they were to take ground in the interest of the Conservative party, they separated themselves from the provincial government —they reluctantly—I use the word advisedly—separated themselves from the provincial government, withdrew their allegiance from that government in which they had every confidence and which they believed was administering the affairs of the province in the most prudent, the most economical and, at the same time, the most progressive manner. Therefore, this contest is, to a large extent, a federal contest. So, I say to members of the opposition and to members of the Conservative party:

Was it improper that I should go down to my own native province as I did, was it improper that I should ask my Liberal friends to rally to the support of the party which represented the provincial government? I thought it was proper that I should do so and in doing so I have made no promises. I never said to the people that if they did not support the provincial government certain things would not be done or that certain things would be done. I have done what I was entitled to, I have pointed out what the policy of this government has done for the people of the maritime provinces and upon that policy I have asked for the support and confidence of the people.

Mr. G. W. GANONG (Charlotte). Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) is a gentleman of coincidences. We have known him as that for a great many years, and it certainly is an odd coincidence that he and the premier of New Brunswick .should have been at that particular place at the same time. It is certainly very odd that he should have talked so much about federal works. The hon. gentleman has forgotten his little talk about the dredging needed in the Miramichi. Perhaps he has also forgotten about double tracking the Intercolonial Railway from Moncton to Halifax. There are quite a number of things which it is very convenient for this hon. gentleman to forget. I do not profess to follow him in his meanderings, but there are one or two things to which I would like to refer. We know how easy it is for the Minister of Public Works to make promises in New Brunswick in connection with provincial election. We know what promises have been made.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What are the promises may I ask?

Mr. GANONG. Dredging on the Miramichi. The hon. gentleman may not have given his sign manual to it, but he knows that he spoke of the desirability of doing that work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend allow me?

Mr. GANONG. You might as well take your medicine; it is good for you.

Mr. PUGSLEY. So far as the dredging for the Miramichi is concerned, when I became minister I found that my predecessor, as long as two years ago, had determined to have that work done.

Mr. GANONG. That was done to get a few votes. But in the county of Charlotte, in which I am more particularly interested, I wish to know whether the First Minister has delegated through the Minister of Public works to Senator Gillmor the right to promise public works. I was there on Friday last and they have summed up $100,000 worth of public works already promised in that constituency.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose you would say that we brought on the great storm that destroyed the works.

Mr. GANONG. Senator Gillmor was so well known that when he was in this House, as some hon. members will remember, he was always known as 'Dan.' He is really a resident of Montreal, but he is senator for the county of Charlotte. If this hon. gentleman has no authority the people of Charlotte county want to know it, and would like to know it from the First Minister. If the First Minister thinks he can pose as the pattern of all that is good under heaven and not take responsibility for these things the electors of this country want to know. There are many instances that can be brought home to the First Minister but I will leave that to a later time.

I wish to refer particularly to the matter in connection with which I visited the county. I was solicited some time since, by the Ministerial Association of the River St. Croix, among other prominent gentlemen in that vicinity, to know if there would be a disposition to sign an agreement by which an election should be conducted according to the electoral laws of the province of New Brunswick, which were of course enacted principally by my hon. friends opposite, the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) and the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). A meeting was held a week ago Friday, that is on the evening of February 14. A large number of Liberals and many Conservatives were present and for a meeting of two parties with diverse political opinions, I do not think there was even a more harmonious meeting. An agreement was reached and I wish to read the resolutions passed for the information of the House. The resolution are as follows :

Whereas the Ministerial Association of the St. Croix valley has submitted to the two parties interested in the present political campaign that the coming election be conducted without resort to improper or illegal methods for procuring votes, be it therefore resolved:

First—We agree that in no instance shall money, liquor or any other consideration, directly or indirectly, be used by any of the candidates or any agent of the candidates, or any person representing the candidates or on their behalf for the purpose of procuring or preventing the attendance of an elector at the poll, or of influencing his vote; or for any purpose in connection with the election, beyond the payment of bills for necessary printing and hall rent and other legitimate expenses under the Controverted Elections Act.

Further resolved—That each committee will deposit in the St. Stephen's Bank a fund of one thousand dollars to be used for the prosecution of any and all offenders against this resolution or the election law; such fund to

be under the control for this purpose of a committee of five to consist of two members to be appointed by the opposition committee, two members to be appointed by the government committee, and the president of the Ministerial Association of the St. Croix valley, subject to the check of a majority of the committee.

Further resolved—That all promises, if any, of reward, office or remuneration as a bribe to the electorate in this campaign, heretofore made, shall be cancelled and that no further promises or assurances of a similar kind be hereafter made.

Further resolved—That these resolutions be subscribed to by the representatives of the county of Charlotte in the Senate and in the House of Commons of Canada, and by each and all of the candidates now in nomination, and by twenty prominent representatives of each party, to be selected by the committee representing the opposite party.

Further resolved—That each party to this agreement will not send any but authorized agents of the candidates to the different polling stations for work on election day.

Further resolved—That each member of this committee and each one subscribing to these resolutions shall do all in his power to carry the terms of these resolutions into effect; shall report any violations of these resolutions to the members, or one of them, of the committee for the enforcement of the same, and shall do everything in his power for the prosecution and conviction of any offender.

Further resolved—That the signatures of the members for Charlotte county in the Senate and in the House of Commons and all the candidates in this election be obtained to these resolutions within seven days from the present date, and that the deposit of $2,000 be made and the signatures of the members of the twenty from each party be obtained within seven days from the present date; otherwise these resolutions shall be inoperative.

Dated at St. Stephen, New Brunswick, the fourteenth day of February, 1908.

That seven days elapsed last Friday night and I note by to-day's 'Gazette' that our Liberal friends, at least those representing the New Brunswick government, had all signed this, but Senator Gillmor had not. Several excuses were made, one being that the deposit was too large. They are very short of funds down there just now, and I presume will be until the minister visits that province again. They wished to have it reduced to $500; the opposition agreed to that but then there are excuses for evading that. What did my hon. friend say?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was merely a remark to my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster).

Mr. FOSTER. Just an aside.

Mr. GANONG. My friend has all he wants in connection with his money friends in Montreal. Let him be as bold in the House as he is outside. Then his friend the ex-minister will have something to say about the $25,000 his friends sent from Montreal to beat him. There is lots of it, you can get all you want. I know something in the county of Charlotte that you will get——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be very glad——

Mr. GANONG. The purchase price you made in order to get a candidate at the last election.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be very glad if you will make a motion at any time on the subject.

Mr. GANONG. You can have all you want of it. This whole matter depended on the signing of this agreement by Senator Gillmor, the representative of the government in that county, the representative of the First Minister, as far as that is concerned, and the First Minister cannot shirk the fact, he must either repudiate here the promises made by Senator Gillmor, or stand under the opprobrium of having made this arrangement or permitted it to be made in order to influence the electorate in that county. The difficulty has been perhaps that Mr. Gillmor would have too much trouble between now and election time in cancelling all the promises he has made. He has been down there now three weeks working and he could not in one week cancel all the promises he has made in that time. One of the terms of this agreement was that he should take back all the promises made, and I imagine he would not have time, to get over all the county and do that in the interval before the election.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that one of the reasons that he would not sign the agreement?

Mr GANONG. Probably it is. At any rate the evidence is that the hon. gentleman has refused to sign that paper. The evidence is also without any question that the hon. gentleman has claimed to be acting under the authority of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr Graham) adopted a somewhat injured and pathetic tone with regard to the introduction of this matter to the House by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). It seems to me that the minister hardly appreciated the situation. He spoke of his answers as being especially fair. I think his answers, if he will permit me, were perhaps a little indirect on all occasions when this matter has been brought to the attention of the House, and there was even a tone of flippancy in them, on one occasion at least. That at any rate is the impression I received, and I trust that in making that statement I shall not be considered as being at all offensive. The hon. gentleman's manner, the spirit of levity with which he seemed to regard the whole question, indicated that he was not aware that

a resolution had been adopted by this House, moved as an amendment to a motion to go into Supply, and accepted by the Prime Minister. That resolution declares :

That whilst it is desirable that every official in the employ of the government of Canada should enjoy perfect freedom of political opinion and the untrammelled exercise of his franchise in accordance therewith, no official should be engaged or permitted to engage in partisan work of any description in the election of a representative in the provincial or Dominion legislature.

A telegram was read in this House by a member of this House, upon his responsibility as such, stating that a man of credibility had informed him that two civil servants on more than one occasion had engaged in partisan work in the elections now pending in New Brunswick, and the Minister of Railways promised inquiry. He eventually, not of his own motion, but when the matter was mentioned again, declared that one of these men had returned to his work and that the other had been in Moncton. If the resolution of this House means anything one would suppose that the minister would have been prepared to state to the House, yes or no, as to whether these men had been engaged in partisan work, and that he would further have been prepared to state whether or not the government intended that the unanimous resolution of this House should be treated as a dead letter.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend has forgotten, or else I have forgotten what occurred. The first telegram said that one of the Leblancs made the statement that he was going to open up a committee room. That was the charge made against him, so far as I remember.

Mr. FOSTER. And that he was also engaged in political work.

Mr. GRAHAM. I wired to ascertain and gave the answer I got, that he was home over Sunday and had returned to his work in the province of Quebec ; he being a traveller, I could not do more than that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I appreciate all that, but that does not meet the question at issue. The question was not whether that gentleman was at home on Sunday or at church on Sunday ; the question of moment to this House was whether that gentleman did what he was charged with having done, and that was the question the minister should have answered. Although the government of this country has been apprised of this alleged interference of these employees, it has up to the present time given no satisfactory information, and it has been left to a private individual under oath to show that these men have been interfering in the provincial elections as charged. The question now remains: Does the government propose that its officials shall treat the unanimous resolution of this House with contempt, and is it to be enough when these employees are charged with violating that resolution, that the House should be informed that one of them is at home over Sunday and that the other is expected shortly to return to his work in the province of Quebec.

Mr. GRAHAM. I never made that statement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What statement did the hon. gentleman make ?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is pretending to quote my statement and he should do so as correctly as possible.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am trying to.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What did the hon. gentleman say ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not say that one of them was at home on Sunday and the other was going to return to work ; I did not make any statement about the other man.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What did the hon. gentleman say about the other man ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, if the hon. gentleman is making my statement he should make it correctly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If my hon. friend does not make his own statement I will have to make it for him.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have made it once already.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend does not see fit to correct me and therefore I shall have to leave the matter as it is.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am willing to have it left as it is.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman is willing to have it left as it was, why did he interrupt ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not as it was, but as it is.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I see ; he does not see fit to correct the statement and he is willing to leave it exactly as I made it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is of serious moment that officials should disregard the unanimous resolution of this House in respect to an important subject. These men can be engaged for a week or ten days in an election campaign before any member of this House has become aware of it, and the Minister of Railways or some other minister can take four or five days or a week to procure information more or less satisfactory with regard to what these employees are doing, and then the only satisfaction the House and the country may receive is

that one or other of these men has returned to his duty, without the slightest information as to whether he has engaged in political work and without the slightest information as to the course the government intends to pursue in respect to men who have deliberately engaged in partisan work contrary to the unanimous resolution of this House accepted by the government of the day. Upon that the Minister of Railways has given the House absolutely no information.

Now, with regard to the Minister of Public Works; he has been as smooth in this House with regard to the matter as no doubt he has been in the province of New Brunswick. He tells us he has made no promises. But the Minister of Public Works knows perfecly well that he can make what are in effect promises without using very explicit language; he can raise expectations in the minds of any community by doing just exactly what he did in Miramichi. He says that these issues are federal issues in the province of New Brunswick. Who made them federal issues. The Minister of Public Works sought to make them federal issues and he sought to make them federal issues by going into the province of New Brunswick and allying himself with the provincial government and seeking to influence the people with the consideration or the expectation that if the provincial government were sustained these federal works would be carried out and his hands would be strengthened. When I say he used the words 'his hands would be strengthened' I think I quote his exact expression. The Minister of Public Works need not suppose that anybody in this House or this country will be deceived by the explanation he has made to-day. It is too transparent altogether. He goes to Miramichi, he wants his hands strengthened, he points to needed dredging in the Miramichi river; he goes to the city of St. John and to the city of Moncton and elsewhere, he alludes to the necessity of double tracking the Intercolonial from St. John to Halifax, and he desires that his hands should be strengthened in all these matters. And his hands can only be effectually strengthened, as he declares, by the return of the provincial government and he points out the great advantages the city of St. John will receive if his hands are also strengthened by the return of five or six members from that city to support the provincial government. And then he desires the House and the country to understand that he is not making use of federal patronage and federal aid for the purpose of influencing the elections in that province. I can tell the Minister of Public Works, with all respect, that no argument of that kind will be accepted by the House or by the country. Furthermore, we have not yet had a distinct statement from either the Minister of Public Works or the Prime Minister, as to whether the Minister of Public Works has been authorized by the cabinet to go into the province of New Brunswick at this particular juncture, to explain the necessity of these public works and to promise in effect that they will be carried out—provided of course that his hands are strengthened by the return of a sufficient number of Liberals to keep the provincial government in power.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know my hon. friend does not wish to misquote me.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can assure my hon. friend that I have made no such statement as that these important works will be carried out. All I have attempted to say was in reference to certain matters in my own department. And in regard to Charlotte, I might say that not long ago, within the last two or three weeks, there was a violent storm which did enormous damage there, and I sent my engineers, as I thought it my duty to do, for the purpose of seeing what the damage was and with a view of taking the necessary steps to repair as speedily as possible the great injury which had been done, and which if not repaired would be disastrous to the fishermen and the people of that locality.

Mr. GANONG. Would my hon. friend allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly.

Mr. GANONG. I wish to remind the Minister of Public Works that the principal promise was made before the storm.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not so.

Mr. LENNOX. That is what brought on the storm.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That seems to have been a coincidence that went astray. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is capable of putting this in the most engaging and plausible manner. Let him not for one moment seek to minimize my appreciation of his ability in that regard. I thoroughly realize it; but even in the engaging way in which he has presented it to the House just now, what does it amount to? It amounts to this, that federal works will still go on in the province of New Brunswick, but that it is exceedingly desirable that the hands of the minister shall be strengthened and upheld, like those of Moses of old, by the return to power of the present provincial administration. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works knows exactly what that means; he knows exactly what he intended, and the Prime Minister knows exactly what he intended; and it is important that the people of this country should know and understand whether these promises—I call them pro-

mises, notwithstanding the statement of the Minister of Public Works—in respect of federal aid and federal interference in provincial elections, have been made with the assent of the Prime Minister, and also whether or not the promises made by a senator of this country in the county of Charlotte have been made with the assent of the cabinet, the Prime Minister or the Minister of Public Works. I understand from my hon. friend from Charlotte that it has been distinctly stated by Senator Gillmor that the promises he has been making in that county, involving a large expenditure of public money, have been made with the assent and sanction of the Minister of Public Works. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, in the course of his remarks, although he dealt with a great many subjects which were not very relevant to the matter under discussion, forgot to mention the statement made by the hon. member for Charlotte.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He spoke after I did.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Although the minister interrupted my hon. friend from Charlotte on other points, he did not interrupt him on that point or give the House any information upon it. Under these circumstances, I think the matter has been well brought to the attention of the House, and we will listen with some interest to a statement from the Prime Minister as to what the policy of the government is in respect to this matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I certainly have no complaint to make of this matter having been brought to the attention of the House, though I am sorry that many things have been imported into the discussion which are absolutely foreign to it. With regard to the blame which my hon. friend from North Toronto has sought to cast on the government in the matter, I have no objection to meet him fairly and squarely. The subject is not a new one by any means ; on the contrary, ever since I have been in parliament, whenever there has been a provincial election, I have always heard complaints made that the government in office, whether it has been Conservative or Liberal, has been taking part in the election and allowing its employees to do so. Let us first deal with the original question, that is the part which is to be taken by employees of this government in the provincial election in New Brunswick. My hon. friend from North Toronto, I am sorry to say, used strong language in speaking on this question ; and when he used such expressions as 'moments of weakness,' he perhaps forgot his own record. I think we might discuss a question of this kind without attempting to throw mud at either one party or the other. I agree with him, and I believe all the members of this House agree with him, that employees of this government or of any other government should not be allowed to take an offensive part in the elections so far as Dominion elections are concerned. As has been truly stated by the hon. leader of the opposition and by the hon. member for North Toronto, the employees of this government receive the money of all the people of Canada, and therefore, as has been affirmed by a resolution of this House, they should not be allowed to take an offensive part in Dominion elections. I know, from my own experience, that when they do so there is always created in the community a scandal, and worse than a scandal, a feeling of resentment against those officials. The feeling is that they are not in their proper place, that they should be attending to their official duties, and that the utmost that they should be allowed to do—and in this we are all agreed—is to cast their votes. The present is not a Dominion election, however, but a provincial election. So far as I am concerned, and so far as the Minister of Railways is concerned, our opinion is that the same principle should prevail in provincial elections as in Dominion elections. I am surprised that the hon. leader of the opposition should attempt to cast any reflection upon the Minister of Railways in this matter, because he stated, not only on one occasion, but on two occasions—and, I am sorry to say, I believe in the hearing of the hon. leader of the opposition—that he had given strict orders that all the employees of the railway were to take no part whatever in the election. What more can be done than this? The hon. member for North Toronto a few days ago brought to the attention of the House the statement that certain officials had taken part in the New Brunswick provincial election. The first step my hon. friend the Minister of Railways took was to seek information as to whether or not the statement in regard to these two employees was true. He stated that he had sent instructions to the manager of the railway, Mr. Pottinger, that these employees and all other employees on the Intercolonial Railway were to be told that they were not to take any part whatever in the provincial election. If, in the face of this injunction, these employees or any others interfere in the election against the orders given, they must do so at their peril. This makes the point as clear as it is possible to make it ; but hon. gentlemen opposite go very far in their contention as to the responsibility of the government in this matter. I have been told by my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) and also by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition that in my capacity as First Minister I am responsible for the actions of Senator Gillmor.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not say that. I said that we would like to know whether or not the promises he was making were made with the authority or sanction of the government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I suppose my hon. friend will say that I was responsible for them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If made with your sanction, certainly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend from Charlotte did not mince matters. He put it very distinctly, that I shared the opprobrium of Senator Gillmor's actions.

Mr. GANONG. If authorized by you, certainly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, I have only to say that Mr. Gillmor is an old friend of mine; I know him to be an honourable man; I have nothing to say against him. If he has been the author of good actions, I do not claim the credit; and if he has been guilty of bad actions, I do not accept the blame. As a senator he is perfectly independent of the government, and if he has made any promises in the county of Charlotte, I cannot accept the blame nor claim the credit.

Mr. GANONG. Not unless you have given him the authority to make them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have simply to say that so far as I am concerned, I have not for six or eight months spoken to Senator Gillmor nor communicated with him, directly or indirectly, in writing or verbally. I give this pledge to my hon. friend and hope he will accept it as I give it to him, I have no connection with Senator Gillmor and did not even know he was engaged in the elections. But that is as far as I would like to go in this matter. With regard to the conduct of members of parliament or members of this government, I believe that the rule which should apply to officials does not apply to them. I think that they are free to take part in elections either Dominion or provincial. That has been the rule since confederation, and no doubt will be to the end of time. Shall we be told that a member of parliament is not as free as any other citizen of Canada to take part in an election, whether Dominion, provincial, or municipal or any kind? Is he to be debarred, because he is a member of parliament, from expressing his views and exercising his rights the same as any other citizen? As far as the making of promises is concerned, I have the word of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), which I accept, that he made no promise whatever, but spoke as a citizen, as a child of New Brunswick. If so, he did not trespass beyond the rules of the House or beyond the reasonable influence which he could exercise as a member of this House and a native of that province.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let me give my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) before he replies the date he read that telegram. The date was February 17th, instead of the 13th, so that there was not very much time lost.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) rather intimates that I was unfair to him. I did not intend to be unfair and I do not think that when he reads my statement in 'Hansard,' he will find I was. However that makes it necessary to traverse the ground a little. On the 17th February I read the following:

Alphonse E. Leblanc, travelling passenger agent Intercolonial Railway, is out canvassing here for local government candidates.

I may set the minister right in that respect. He had the idea that all that was complained of in the telegram was that Leblanc was going to open a committee room at Dupey's Corner, but the telegram is explicit. It says further that:

He is out canvassing here for local government candidates, and has announced that he intends to open a committee room at Dupey's Corner and hold it open day and night until after election. Henry Leblanc is an employee of the Intercolonial Railway in audit department and general offices in Moncton, is also going out through Shediac and Dorchester parishes, from school house to school house, decrying and denouncing the opposition candidate.

That was on the 17th and I asked the minister if he had any information. The minister replied as follows:

I have made some inquiries and have not been able to ascertain if the two gentlemen named have taken part in the election. I cannot give the definite answer my hon. friend would like in that respect, but will not let the matter drop and will make further inquiries.

So far so good. Nothing happened after that until the 21st, four days after the telegram was read. On that date I asked the minister if he had any further information. I would like the First Minister to listen to the answer, because I do not think that the Minister of Railways went as far as my right hon. friend thinks he did. Here is what the Minister of Railways said:

I may say that I have some news, if not information. I wired, as I promised, to the general manager of the railway, and I was informed by him that one of the Leblancs, the travelling agent, who lives in New Brunswick, had been in that province over Sunday and had returned to his work in Quebec.

That is exactly what the leader of the opposition stated as his recollection.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He made another statement.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, the Minister of Railways proceeded as follows:

I received another telegram from the general manager, saying that the other gentleman, Leblanc by name, was absent from duty, but he did not know where he was or if he was working in an election. I wired to the general manager to inform the Intercolonial Railway employees, including Mr. Leblanc,

that while they were all at perfect liberty to use their franchise as citizens with the utmost freedom in whatever way they wished, we did not want the employees of that railway to take active part in election contests, either Dominion or provincial. I have not heard from him since.

That was the suaviter in modo of the hon. gentleman. My right hon. friend said the minister did all he could, inasmuch as he immediately sent a telegram instructing the manager of the Intercolonial Railway to inform Leblanc and all the other employees that they were not to take part, in any shape whatever, in provincial elections.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, there is a difference in the phraseology and a most decided difference indeed. I think that these gentle words that the Minister of Railways did not want the government employees to take part in any election contest were calculated to encourage the party implicated to go on. Of course the minister does not want any employee to take active part in elections but he does not forbid it. There is no telegram calling Leblanc back to his work or instructing him to take positively no part in provincial elections. That would have been justified and I think would have been effective. But take the answer as given coupling with it the minister's statement today that an affidavit does not settle the question as there may be counter affidavits, I cannot help coming to the conclusion that nothing definite will be done until a chance is given for counter affidavits.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will see that, he has not given us any information that any of these men have done any active political work since the last telegram was sent. As regards the affidavits, I was pointing out that the affidavit habit is not a good one.

Mr. FOSTER. What I was going on to say is that the minister holds out encouragement for a counter affidavit and that the Leblancs will likely, when that comes to their ears, say we have some days of grace yet and we will do all we can in the electoral contest. Does the minister doubt it ? The telegram of the 17th went into the newspapers of the 18th at New Brunswick, where both these men had the opportunity of reading it ? And on the 20th we find them both addressing public meetings. Does the minister not know where ? Any man with his wits about him could very easily tell where. It would have been easy for the hon. gentleman to find out where Henry Leblanc was if he wanted to. What I complain of is that the minister did not use his mandatory power and say to Mr. Pottinger that if these men were engaged in electioneering anywhere, he should call them off at once and they should comply at the peril of losing office. That would have done the business, but this sort of thing will not. When these gentlemen read in the newspapers that the minister hints at counter affidavits, I am afraid they will be willing to attend another little rally and keep the faithful in tune.

Mr. EMMERSON. You must have a pretty bad case when you make use of that argument.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the telegram was effective.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, I wish to say a word as to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). He is comparatively a stranger to most of the members of this House. However, the members of the House are old enough to sit up and take notice, and I think they are doing it. They will find that in certain things the Minister of Public Works is an adept. How delightfully shrewd it was of him to lay a foundation for the work of all these Liberals in the provincial election by saying that for ten years past several Conservatives, who are still being paid by the government, have engaged in partisan election work. But he took very good care not to mention the names of any such Conservative employee. Had he done so, evidence might be called in to rebut his assertion. Had he thought it possible to offset the charge that is made from this side by showing that Liberal-Conservatives had been working in an election, he would have been glad indeed to give the facts that would have maintained his statement.

Mr. SINCLAIR. With the permission of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) I would ask if he is not aware that hundreds of Conservatives were dismissed after 1896 for taking part in the election?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) is far behind the times. Is he not aware that a fortnight ago I made the same statement that he himself now makes, and the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) faced me down in this House, declaring that there had been no such number as a hundred or two hundred officials dismissed? I said that there had been hundreds of such dismissals and that I could prove it by returns brought down by this government. My hon. friend from Nova Scotia (Mr. Sinclair) had better ply his Prime Minister with these questions.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Why is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) asking for names of those taking part in elections if the records give hundreds of names of those dismissed for that very action?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think I understand the point.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I understood my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) to criticise the Minister

of Public Works for making the statement that Conservatives had taken part in elections, but had not the courage to give names. Now, the hon. gentleman admits that he knows of hundreds dismissed. Then, why does he ask for names?

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) has not been very attentive to his duty. The Minister of Public Works, if he had an argument at all, had this argument—that Conservatives had been at work in elections and that nobody had interfered with them. Does the Minister of Public Works really think that such a statement as he makes, even if he had given all the facts, could justify this Liberal government in allowing its partisans to go through the constituencies working in the elections? Surely he does not so far forget the old days of logical training in the University of New Brunswick, from which he has profited so well, as to stand upon an argument of that kind. But it was the strangest of coincidencies that the Minister of Public Works—with a large amount of business in this House to be attended to—with pestering calls for returns, keeping him busily engaged in hunting up people who were not so busily engaged, but that they could help him to get out these returns, with his estimates on in the House, with public Bills awaiting his attention, with the Grand Trunk Pacific hotel hung in midair because he is not here to push through his legislation—I say it is a wonderful coincidence that, with all these duties demanding his attention here, he found himself in the province of New Brunswick, that he casually met Premier Robinson of that province, and passed the time of day with him, and that it happened that they stood on the same platform together and that he spoke for Premier Robinson.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not remember saying that.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sure the hon. gentleman carefully laid out his plans. He does not act on impulse. Many days before he went down, they knew he was coming—they were all longing for his coming. They were assembled when he did come, and they all hailed him as one who had come back from the land of promise, bearing the grapes of Eschol on which they were hungering to feed, and the bringing of which, they hoped, assured them of four fat years in the promised land of office. Was it a coincidence? Or was it a well-laid plan calculated day by day for St. John, Chatham, Campbellton and all the others? Surely no one will be taken in by such sophistry as that of the hon. gentleman. He picks a quarrel with the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket), the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) and the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) because, forsooth, these cowardly members of parliament attacked him in his absence. Well, of all men, I should think my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) would not vaunt himself as so terrible that any man on this side would fear to criticise him in his presence. For he himself did not show the mettle of knightly courage and great daring when he was called to account again and again by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) for the brave sayings he had uttered on the platform when he was eight hundred miles away from the opponent whom he attacked. Why, he was not only eight hundured miles away, but he was in the Northwest at the time—three thousand miles away. My hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works—was he Minister of Public Works then or was he Minister of Railways and Canals in prospect?—when he had three thousand miles of distance between himself and the man whom he attacked, was very brave in his utterances, but when the distance was reduced to a rod and a half or something less, he sat under a castigation and under a presentation of facts such as have seldom been the lot of any minister and said never a word.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) allow me to ask him a question as an old parliamentarian? If I have made, outside of this House, any statements reflecting upon a member of parliament, the truth of which statement is denied, is it not the proper course for that hon. gentleman to produce in this House the paper reporting my utterances and to move for a committee to investigate my conduct? I will say that if that is done I am prepared to substantiate everything I have said in any place.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend felt that he would like to have a lawsuit, when he was three thousand miles distant from the hon. gentleman whom he attacked. He declared then: If the person whom I attack will bring a lawsuit, he will find whether I am stating the truth or not. But it does seem to me that if I were to attack the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on the public platform for a certain course, if I were to run him down the banks and talk of his 'unlimited corruption' and everything of that kind—being brave enough and strong enough to do this before the people of this country—when I met the right hon. gentleman in this House and was challenged to make good my words in his presence, I would make good my words or I would die in the attempt. My hon. friend has been cavorting round in a sphere of politics not quite so wide as this, where the light is not so intense, where methods of attack are tolerated that do not carry in a parliamentary assembly like this. Let me tell my hon. friend of many years—and my friend of to-day, I hope—that he never made a

more serious mistake tactically or otherwise, than when he sat dumb in his seat before the challenge to make good before the people of this country a charge against the leader of the opposition in this parliament which was absolutely baseless. And yet, like the hon. member for East Assiniboia, he has an idea that when he gets up everybody cowers and runs away, gets under a barn, leaving nothing but the feet sticking out. He must not run away with that idea. If the minister runs away from his public duties to take an unwarranted part in a provincial election, he cannot complain if the business of the country is not brought to a standstill to wait until it pleases him to come back. It was an opportune time for making these statements and they were made, and it was the fault of my hon. friend, and he has no reason to find fault with any one else, if he was not here to meet those statements. He says he was in New Brunswick. What for? We heard his own statement, he was down there canvassing Dominion issues. Does he deny it? He stated that here this afternoon. He cannot deny it, because we have here the newspaper reports. I thought this was a provincial election in New Brunswick. Are they running a provincial election in New Brunswick on federal issues ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Have you forgotten the Moncton convention ?

Mr. FOSTER. No, I have not. I owe my friend a debt of gratitude for reminding me of it, I shall refer to it later. The electors of New Brunswick are fighting out the Highways Act and some very extravagant expenditures by the provincial government, some of them made when my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) was a member of that government; and yet he stands here to-day and admits over and over again that he was there discussing federal issues, the dredging of the Miramichi, the Liberal and Conservative trade policies for the Dominion of Canada—he has not mentioned a single question that was not a federal issue.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Has not mentioned in this House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, I beg pardon.

Mr. FOSTER. Why was he bringing in federal issues ? Simply as he knows and as every one who heard him knows, in order that he might make these federal issues tell towards the election of a provincial government in New Brunswick. My hon. friend has lost a bit of his memory; perhaps several parts of his memory have suffered some slight damage. But my hon. friend brought to the attention of the people of St. John not one local issue, beyond the fact, as he calls it, that when I was a member of the Conservative government we permitted the Allan mail steamers to call at a foreign port and that he reprobated that policy, that they should not be allowed to make Portland one of their ports of call. Has he forgotten that before the Conservative government went out of power in 1896, it had arranged and had announced as its policy that on the lapsing of the existing subsidy the next subsidy to the mail steamers from the maritime ports should exclude the city of Portland as a port of call on this side of the water ? My hon. friend has also forgotten that when this government came into power, these gentlemen whom he pledged himself in 1896 in the county of Kings to fight and to foil with all the power at his command in the interest of the great Liberal-Conservative party and its honoured chieftain for whom he could find no words of applause and commendation too strong—this was after he stepped off to the independent step which was but one step to the convenient after-step of stepping to whichever side won in that election without any loss of prestige, he forgot that pledge and became a warm adherent of my right hon. friend who leads that government—and then that same government of my right hon. friend kept the Allan line steamers calling, for two years after their subsidy and contract had run out, at the port of Portland in the state of Maine.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is wrong now.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I am not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was only one season.

Mr. FOSTER. I had the curiosity to look it up and I had it ready for my hon. friend; I have not the exact dates here, but I can give them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. One season.

Mr. FOSTER. But the general statement is right, and I think he will find it is two years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend asked the voters in the city of St. John interested in a local election to approve of what policy ? The policy of the present Liberal government in the Dominion. That is what he asked them ; he said so in the House this afternoon, you will read it in the 'Hansard' to-morrow. What a lovely way that is of keeping issues distinct and not using federal influences in a local election. The hon. gentleman stands before 6,000 electors voting on the Highways Act and on provincial finances and politics and says to them : Behold, the policy of the Liberal party to-day; contrast it with the Liberal-Conservative policy of a few years ago, and voters, local election voters, when you go to the poll vote for the local men because of their federal policy; that policy is superior

to the policy of the Conservative party of a few years ago, vote for them in order to strengthen my arms. Oh, that phrase! It has come down from the First Minister to my hon. friend. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) speaking in Ottawa, putting his hand on the shoulder of George W. Ross, said to the people of Ontario: here is my right hand, do not allow my right hand to be shattered. And, in a lesser way, the Minister of Public Works who was at that time not a very strong supporter of my right hon. friend, now says with all the zeal of a newly proselyted convert: Remember I must have my hand strengthened. The old Sunday school teachings came back to him, his mind went back a thousand years into the desert, to the wanderings of the chosen people; and he saw Aaron and Hur and all the imagery of that time, and appealed by all that sacred memory to the people of St. John; Strengthen my hand, uphold my arm. Where are my arms? In Ottawa—borings, dredgings, offices, post-offices—strengthen my arm and I will haul them down here for you; but beware if you defeat Robinson and his supporters, my arm will be so weak that I cannot pull even a third-class post office here for you. What was the object, the aim of my hon. friend? There was only one, there could only be one.

I have not been able just now to read again the speech made by my hon. friend and reported in the St. John 'Sun.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would really do you good to read it through.

Mr. FOSTER. It might do me good. It certainly would refresh my memory in some respects. But, I find here certain things which he has stated. He refers to Mr. Blair, his predecessor. But, does he refer to Mr. Blair in the line of provincial politics? Oh, no. He says:

> The government, while Mr. Blair was a member of it, took the first great steps towards realizing the expectations of the people that St. John would become one of the great winter ports of Canada by cancelling the contract under which the subsidized mail steamers made, in the winter season, the city of Portland, in the State of Maine, their Atlantic terminus.

Will my hon. friend be fair enough to state that the Liberal Conservative government, before this was done, absolutely wrote their conditions to the Allan people advising them that when their present subsidies ran out no further subsidies would be granted for any of their vessels which ran to Portland, that his own friends were the ones that extended the time, and that Mr. Blair, if he did anything at all, simply cancelled the wrong action of his own friends and carried out the policy of the Liberal Conservative party which preceded him?

> He obtained a large government grant——

From the local government? It might have been apropos if he had alleged that the local government, through Mr. Blair, had given a grant to the city of St. John. But no:

> He obtained a large government grant for the improvement of the northern part of the harbour in connection with the Intercolonial Railway.

Why did my hon. friend bring that in? Blair was the representative of the Liberal party in New Brunswick; he got large grants for the city of St. John; I am his successor, strengthen my arms and I will bring you down just as good a grant as Blair brought down!

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend allow me to interrupt him before passing away from this interesting subject of the mail subsidy? To show the treatment which the city of St. John received when he was in power, will he allow me to recall the fact of a delegation coming to Ottawa in 1895, seeing the hon. gentleman and also the Hon. Mr. Ives, who was then Minister of Trade and Commerce, and being informed that the government was about entering upon an agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Allan line of steamers to make Portland, Maine, for the next ten years, their Atlantic terminus?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir; no such thing as that was ever contemplated by the Liberal Conservative government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can say to my hon. friend that Mr. Ives distinctly so informed the delegation from the city of St. John.

Mr. FOSTER. That is an absolute mistake. How does my hon. friend recognize that attitude as being consonant with what I have stated as the actual policy of the Liberal Conservative party?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The intense agitation which was raised in St. John resulted in the formation of the Independent party whose candidate I became in the following year.

Mr. FOSTER. And in being whose candidate you had such an immense influence that you lost your deposit in St. John.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is true, but I defeated your two candidates.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister wants to show that he had the enormous influence that switched off the Conservative government from that suicidal policy and put it on the right track, but the proof of the pudding is in the eating of it, and when the hon. gentleman ate his pudding as an independent candidate he lost his deposit.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. You had a hard job saving yours in the same election.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Duncan Ross) so often sets dynamite off. Then, having exploited that argument in reference to Mr. Blair he turns to another predecessor:

Mr. Emmerson followed by securing something which was never thought of as being possible when the Conservative party was in power, the dredging of the berth sides on the west side of the harbour. I am now but widening the trail and am moving on to the full performance of the duty which as your representative I feel that I owe you in this respect.

Is it not complete ? Arguing local politics down there, he discusses the Highways Act, introduces the argument that one of his predecessors (Mr. Blair) brought a great boon to the city, that another predecessor, who, by the way, was his immediate predecessor whom he most effectually ousted, brought down berth widening powers in the harbour of St. John and then he followed up with that smooth and most exquisite phrase 'I am but widening out the trail.' This is just the opening of a large vista. Mr. Blair has removed a little of the underbrush, Mr. Emmerson has been allowed to remove a little more, and if you will just strengthen my hands I will make you a pathway which will be like a great road! These are not local issues. Strengthen my hands for the local elections in the province of New Brunswick! Then he goes still further. He declares that the Grand Trunk Pacific will in all probability take over the Central road. Now, will you just look at that for a moment as an argument in local politics ? Here is a government which gives half a kingdom to the Grand Trunk Pacific and to the Grand Trunk together. They can get whatever they like. When they come for help from the lakes to the Pacific help is forced upon them from Moncton to the Pacific. When they come to talk about a railway station in the city of Ottawa a hotel is forced upon them and they are placed in the central part of the city. Anything that these people want they can get —presumably. Watch the peculiar way that it is approached—I am now a member of that same government: I am in the internal ring and I know how things are going on; Mr. Hays tells me that they will take over the Central Railway; it may be a matter of some delay but they are going to take it over. Is that a local issue, or is it a federal issue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Undoubtedly it is a local issue because one of the greatest issues that Mr. Hazen was raising was that the Central Railway would not be part of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. FOSTER. The great issue that Mr. Hazen was raising would be thereafter precluded. The hon. gentleman granted subsidies, issued bonds and spent money without the authority of this country, he subsidized that road until in that road, which is to-day worth almost nothing, as it stands, he has placed very nearly $1,000,000 of the people's money. Now he comes down as a federal minister and says: I have the promise of the Grand Trunk Railway ; Mr. Hays says that he is going to take it off of our hands; just strengthen my arm and the federal government will relieve the province of the burden that is crushing it. So I might go on all the way through. I have done sufficient to show up the hon. gentleman.

Now, I want, just one moment, in passing, with my right hon. friend the leader of the government. He had something to say about this not being a new issue. It is not a new issue. We are perfectly agreed upon that. He rather had a slap at me as to moments of weakness and my pharisaical pretensions and the like of that. That is all badinage and good humour, and I find no fault with the right hon. gentleman upon that account. But now, he says that my opinions and those of the hon. Minister of Public Works are exactly the same, that my opinions are the minister's opinions. In a debate on July 17th, 1905, what did the right hon. gentleman say? He said:

It may be said perhaps that we have no jurisdiction over provincial matters and that the resolution goes too far in including provincial elections as well as Dominion elections. But after reflection I have come to the conclusion that we would accept the motion as it reads. Political parties are not so differentiated between Dominion and provincial politics as to make it advisable that they should be treated in a different manner. We accept the services of all those who are engaged in the civil service of this country on the understanding that they shall give their undivided attention to their business. Of course, they are citizens, they have the right of franchise, they have the right to their opinion; they have the right, as I have said before, of citizens to express their opinions. But for my part I am strongly of the opinion I held when in opposition, that an official who takes an offensive part in election campaigns makes himself and his party a scandal, places himself at once at variance with a large portion of the community who contribute towards the payment of his salary, and minimizes to that extent his usefulness. Therefore he detracts from the service which he is expected to give.

And in another place, he thinks an officer should not act as a government agent or scrutineer, and he says :

I do not think any officer of the government should do anything else but record his vote and exercise the legitimate functions of his citizenship.

Now, these are sentiments we all believe in and I want to ask the Prime Minister : Has he given effect to these sentiments ? Will the right hon. gentleman tell me of

one single instance in which a man who has proven over and over again to have interfered in elections, has been punished ? The right hon. gentleman knows the case of Wagner; a man who was twice in jail because of his defrauding the very immigrants whom he was placed in charge of; a man who after that was promoted by one of the ministers, and who after that again took open and scandalous part in the election in Edmonton, distributing whisky and herding whisky and voters together as proved by affidavit after affidavit. And to-day Wagner is in the public service at an increased salary. What punishment did my right hon. friend mete out to Wagner, what punishment did he mete out to Nixon, who was promoted and paid a higher salary ?

Mr. BERGERON. And Jackson.

Mr. FOSTER. What punishment was awarded Jackson?—who is not however a Dominion official—what punishment has gone to Leech. Is there a single instance where a Liberal who has been proved to have interfered in elections has received anything in the way of rebuke or punishment. What is the Prime Minister going to do about it ? To-day he has not expressed himself a bit less strongly than he did two years ago, but I challenge my right hon. friend to allow an investigation into the actions of these civil servants in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. I tell him right to his face that they are partisans, that they have accompanied his canvassers and have been his canvassers in local and Dominion elections, that they have gone with his own ministers and interfered in every conceivable way, as can be most abundantly shown if an investigation is granted. But affidavit after affidavit has been produced in this House to show that these officials have been guilty of partisanship and active interference, and the Prime Minister has done nothing except to promote them and give them more pay out of the public treasury.

Motion (Mr. Foster) to adjourn House negatived.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to take advantage of the presence of the Minister of Public Works as he may go down to New Brunswick again at any time, to inquire about a return to an order of the House of December 16 as to dredging at Rivière à la Graisse at Rigaud. These are very short returns and although I have asked several times for them they have not been brought down.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The return has just been handed to me by the Prime Minister and I lay it on the table of the House.

Mr. BERGERON. I did well to speak about it ?

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND SEED GRAIN.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture has any agent been appointed by the government to see about the purchasing of seed grain in Prince Edward Island ?

Mr. FISHER. The officials of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture have spread the information relative to this matter in Prince Edward Island, so that the people there may know the conditions generally. I think the people down there understand the situation.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The local people down there ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, the local people.

COLD STORAGE PAPERS.

Mr. FOSTER. I call the attention of the Prime Minister—I do not know how I am to get at it otherwise—that in the cold storage papers there is a letter sent by Mr. Williams to the then Minister of Railways, which incloses a memorandum which Williams asserts is a memorandum form of agreement between himself and Mr. Macoun at the dictation of the Minister of Militia and Defence. It is not private by any means, it was ordered by the return and it has not been brought down. The present member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) stated he had brought down all the correspondence that was public. I think that was altogether public correspondence because it has had to do with the cold storage business. The member for Westmoreland is now outside of our jurisdiction I suppose, and I would like the First Minister to think if there is any way by which I could get that document as ordered by the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understood my hon. friend the Minister of Militia the other day to deny the exisence of any such agreement.

Mr. FOSTER. No, he denied that he had dictated it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At all events, I do not know whether this document is in the department or in the archives or not. We will look into the matter.

HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE CLAIM.

Mr. BARKER. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to direct attention to an order of the House passed on the 22nd January, for a return relating to a claim of M. J. Haney in connection with the Hillsborough bridge. This has been asked for again and again. I hope we shall soon have the papers.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have called the attention of my department to that once or twice,

and the officials assure me that they are getting the return ready with all possible speed. It is a very large one.

Mr. FOSTER. The case will be over before it is ready.

Mr. GRAHAM. I imagine that the case is over now, so far as the arbitration is concerned.

Mr. BARKER. The order of the House for the papers has been made, and I would like to have them produced.

Mr. GRAHAM. They are being produced as rapidly as possible. My officials assure me that there is no such communication in the department as the hon. member for North Toronto says there is.

Mr. FOSTER. That raises the question how far it is allowable to a retiring minister to take away public correspondence with him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is public and what is private is a matter for the minister to decide.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that not a dangerous doctrine ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let me discuss it with my hon. friend. The minister is in receipt of a certain document. Who is to determine whether it is public or private? I assume that there are documents which are in their nature public, others which are in their nature personal or private, and others which are on the border line between public and private. Who but the minister is to decide ? If the minister decides that a document is private, we have no authority over it. In this case, if the minister thought the document was private how can we get at it ? My hon. friend will agree with me that under such circumstances the government cannot be made responsible.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we have to take the context as a guide. This was an application from Williams for a subsidy under the Cold Storage Act. While he was pressing his application he came up, as he alleges, against the minister, who was also an applicant for the subsidy, and the arrangement, he says, was made at the dictation of the minister, which the minister denies, and put in the shape of a memorandum. That memorandum was dictated, in the presence of other persons, and he sent that by mail to the minister, not marked private at all. So the context should be taken into account ; and in this case it would seem to show that that was a public document.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would not like to express an opinion just now.

Mr. GRAHAM.

PRIVATE BILLS.

HAMILTON RADIAL ELECTRIC RAILWAY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 25) respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company.—Mr Clarke.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not know that the discussion of the clauses of this Bill ought to go on at present. There is a preliminary matter to be decided first. The other day the leader of the opposition said to the Minister of Railways, 'All I wish to ask is that we may be informed a few days in advance.' The Minister of Railways answered, 'Surely.' The matter stood over upon that understanding. On Friday night the minister mentioned that probably this Bill would be proceeded with to-day, but some hon. gentlemen have mentioned to me that they are not ready to proceed to-day, as they have not received the notice they anticipated would be given. But the preliminary question to be decided is whether this Bill should not be referred back to the Commitee on Railways and Canals, and that question might as well be disposed of now. I brought this matter up a week ago to-day, when the Bill was in committee of the whole. At that time the Minister of Railways had made a motion that the committee rise and report progress, and he said that I would have to make my motion when the Speaker was in the chair. When the committee rose and reported progress and the Speaker took the chair, I moved my motion.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I understand that the ruling was that this motion was not one that could be discussed in the committee.

Mr. LENNOX. I am quite aware that the motion cannot be disposed of in the committee, but what I propose to do—and I am acting in accordance with what the Speaker has told me—is to move as I did the other day :

That Bill (No. 25) be not now proceeded with, but that it be reported back to the House in order that it and the report of the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines thereon, be referred back to the said committee, with instructions to the committee to amend their said report by stating the alterations made in the committee in the preamble of the said Bill, and the reasons for said alterations, as required by rule 106 of this House.

I need not take up a great deal of time at this stage of the proceedings, nor am I disposed to do so in any case, for the responsibility for the conduct of the business of the House rests with the government, and particularly with the right hon. gentleman who leads the House. So I am pleased to have the opportunity to bring the matter up when he is present in order that he may take the responsibility of it and send it back to the Committee on Railways and Canals for an amended report. The rule provides

that the alterations must be material alterations. If they are merely verbal or clerical alterations I apprehend that rule 106 does not apply ; but in the case of a material alteration, reasons for the same are to be stated in the report and such were the alterations made in this Bill. As originally brought in, the preamble, after the ordinary recital as to incorporation by the provincial legislature, said :

And whereas the said company has been advised that under and by virtue of the provisions of sections 306 and 307 of the Railway Act of 1888 and sections 91 and 92 of the British North America Act, 1867, its railway, on crossing the line of the Grand Trunk Railway at Burlington in the year 1897, became and has since been subject to the exclusive legislative authority of the parliament of Canada.

Down to that point the alteration which was made was this. Instead of the words in the eighth line 'the company has been advised that,' these words were substituted in the committee 'doubts have been raised whether'. Then the preamble goes on to say :

And whereas applications have been made to the legislative assembly of Ontario for Acts extending the time for constructing the said company's lines of railways and such Acts have been passed.

Down to that point it was not changed, but these words were in the Bill as it went to the committee:

As the said company has been advised, without authority or jurisdiction.

These words of the preamble were struck out in the committee. Then, as introduced in the Railway Committee, these words were in the Bill:

And whereas the said company has by its petition asked for authority to carry out certain extensions and works beyond provincial jurisdiction; and whereas it is advisable that all questions as to jurisdiction should be set at rest.

Then these words were struck out commencing in the twenty-second line:

That everything done by the said company in pursuance of the several Acts relating thereto should be confirmed.

These were struck out in the committee. The importance of the first words I have referred to, those relating to the jurisdiction of the local legislature, will be all the more apparent, if I refer the House and the committee to the end of section 1 in the third line, which reads:

In this Act the expression 'the company' means the body politic and corporate created by chapter 88 of the statutes of Ontario, 1894, and continued by the said amendments thereof.

Referring to amendments made by the Ontario legislature giving the extension of time which has been recited above as being outside the authority or jurisdiction of the local legislature. As this conflicts with the first enacting clause of the Bill, it was very important it should be struck out. As to the other amendment striking out these words :

That everything done by the said company in pursuance of the several Acts relating thereto should be confirmed.

It was recognized by everybody that this was a very important statement particularly with reference to the concluding portion of section 1, namely :

And all rights, privileges and immunities which the company has heretofore been entitled to under its Acts of incorporation and amendments thereof, and not inconsistent with this Act, are hereby continued and confirmed.

So much as regards the importance. I think the importance is sufficiently apparent by the alterations made, and I am quite content to rest upon what the First Minister may think as to the materiality of those amendments.

As regards why that rule has been enacted, I have nothing to do with that question. At the same time I might refer the committee to two or three sentences which appear in Bourinot, the latest edition. At page 773:

As the preamble of a private Bill sets forth the facts upon which it is founded, it is necessary that they should be fully and truly stated and substantially proved and admitted.

Then at page 774:

The promoters or their agents will first address the committee on the preamble; and then, if required, proceed to call witnesses and examine them.

I read these extracts to show that the preamble is a most important part of a private Bill. If there be any question about the facts alleged, those facts must all be established. On page 775:

When the arguments and evidence upon the preamble have been heard, the room is cleared and the question is put: 'That the preamble has been proved,' which is resolved in the affirmative or the negative, as the case may be. If the committee decide the foregoing question in the affirmative the parties are called in and made acquainted with the decision, and the clauses are then taken up one by one and dealt with just as in the case of committees of the whole on public Bills.

That practice has not to my knowledge been followed in our parliament, although it is laid down as the British practice and may have been on some occasion followed here. On page 776 :

If the committee decide that the preamble has not been proven, no further proceedings

will be had in the committee on the Bill, but the fact must be reported to the House in conformity with the following rule.

The committees on private Bills have reported against the Bills on various grounds.

Because no sufficient evidence was offered in favour of the preamble.

Because legislative interference is not desirable or necessary. Because the Bill would interfere with lawsuits pending or with existing rights. Or that the power sought for would not advance the interests of the locality. Or that the Bill asked for an extension of the powers of a certain company to purposes entirely foreign to its original charter. Or that it contained most unusual provisions. At page 778:

A committee will sometimes make changes in the preamble, and in such a case they must also report the fact to the House in conformity wtih the rules as follows:

The committee to which a private Bill is referred shall report the same to the House in every case, and when any material alteration has been made in the preamble of the Bill, such alteration and the reasons for the same are to be stated in the report.

Then it shows on page 780 that if the title to a Bill is changed, that must be specially reported to the House. If it appears to the committee that the consent of the Governor General is necessary for the passage of the Bill that fact must be specially reported to the House.

I have thought it my duty to call attention to this omission because it is recognized as of substantial importance in dealing with private Bills. It is very important that all the recitals contained in the preamble of a Bill as questions of facts should be proved to the satisfaction of the committee. The attention of the House should be called to the fact that the preamble has been changed and then the reasons for the change should be stated. It is most important that the alterations made by the committee should not only be stated to the House but also the grounds upon which they were made. My own opinion is that it will be a matter of some considerable difficulty to show logical reasons for the alterations in the preamble without going a good deal further, as I submitted at the time, and striking out that part that deals with questions of law. Therefore, I submit the resolution which I have already moved.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I must say that the matter is somewhat new to me. The point is evidently one of some importance, and, so far as the law affecting the present case is concerned, it seems to me that the observations of my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) are to the point. The rule is plain and cannot be controverted in any way that, if in a Bill of this kind material alterations are made in the preamble, they must be reported to the House with the reasons that have influenced the committee in coming to their decision. The rule has been stated by my hon. friend in the speech which he made the other day as follows :

The committee to which a private Bill may have been referred shall report the same to the House, in every case; and when any material alteration has been made in the preamble of the Bill, such alteration and the reasons for the same are to be stated in the report.

No reasons have been stated in the report. Therefore, it is for this committee to decide whether or not the alterations which have been made are or are not material. If the committee does not deem them material, the report is correct and should stand ; if, on the other hand, the committee is of opinion that the amendments are material, this rule must apply. I could have hoped that my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) would give more reason than he has given to satisfy the committee whether or not they are material. Let us look at the alterations. In the original Bill, the preamble reads in part as follows :

Whereas the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company has by its petition represented that it was incorporated by chapter 88 of the statutes of 1894 of Ontario, whereby and by subsequent amendments of the said Act the said company was authorized to construct various lines of railway from the city of Hamilton to different places in the province of Ontario as in the said Act and amendments set forth; and whereas the said company has been advised that, under and by virtue of the provisions of sections 307 and 308 of the Railway Act of 1888 and sections 91 and 92 of the British North America Act, 1867, the railway of the said company on crossing the line of the Grand Trunk Railway Company at Burlington in 1897 became and has since been subject to the exclusive legislative authority of the Dominion of Canada.

Now, this recital has been altered by substituting for the latter part the following :

—and whereas doubts have been raised whether, under and by virtue of the provisions of sections 306 and 307 of the Railway Act of 1888,——

And so on. So far as I am concerned, I say, with all due deference to my hon. friend, that I cannot see, until better advised, that the alteration that has been made is material. It seems to me to substitute one form of language for another but does not change the intention of the preamble as at first drafted. It seems to me very much the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. If the Bill had been left as it was, I think it would not have been in essentially different shape from that in which it is now before us. I come now to the other sentences referred to by my friend (Mr. Lennox) which, thus far, I have had no time to look into, but which I shall be prepared to discuss after recess.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. GUTHRIE. As chairman of the Railway Committee and in that respect responsible to a greater or less degree for the report which was made to the House on the Bill now under consideration, I desire to make a few remarks on the motion now before the committee. It will be remembered that the preamble of this Bill was discussed at great length by the Railway Committee, the discussion occupying some seven or eight days, and at the conclusion of that discussion, before the preamble in its amended form was adopted, the usual motion was put 'shall the preamble as amended be adopted,' and it was carried. I submit that if any member of the committee or the committee had deemed that any alterations or amendments were material, some motion should have been made or some action should have been taken at that time. Before the Bill was finally reported the usual motion 'shall the Bill as amended as reported' was put. Once more there was an opportunity in committee to take any exception or move any amendment in regard to a special report on the amended preamble. No such action having been taken, and the Bill having been reported in its present form, we may safely assume that the Railway Committee in their judgment did not deem the alterations or amendments to the preamble material. All we have before us on that is the report, and the report being silent, I think we may take it for granted, that the Railway Committee, at all events, did not view the amendments as material. That is the first forum to decide on this question. It is true the question can be decided by this committee or this House.

I may say at the outset that I think the motion is highly technical and the discussion on it more or less academic in its nature, because whether or not the report be sent back to the committee with instructions to the committee to give a reason for their report, will not affect the Bill in its scope or operation.

The first amendment is in the eighth line, the words——

The said company has been advised that.

——have been struck out and the following substituted :

Whereas doubts have been raised whether.

I submit that this is merely a formal change, not a material change in any sense of the word. The preamble of the Bill, or the meaning of the preamble as it formerly stood, was that there were doubts, that the promoters of this Bill had been advised that they were a Dominion company and should seek legislation here. It was not well or concisely drafted and it was considered by the committee that the whole object which the promoters sought to achieve by the somewhat involved language they had used could be achieved by the simple statement that doubts had been raised. That applies to the third amendment as well as to the first, the third amendment being to strike out the words:

But, as the said company has been advised, without authority or jurisdiction.

It was simply a question of doubt and the language was greatly simplified by the clause as amended by the committee.

The second amendment is purely formal, the words:

Its railway.

are struck out, and the words:

The railways of the said company

are substituted. No argument is necessary upon that point. The fourth amendment is to strike out the words:

That everything done by the said company in pursuance of the several Acts relating thereto should be confirmed.

That was simply to make that portion of the preamble conform to the language of section 1 as amended by the committee.

On the third or fourth day of the discussion it was pointed out that the advertised notice of this Bill did not make mention of the last portion of section 1, which reads:

And all rights, privileges and immunities which the company has heretofore been entitled to under its Act of incorporation and amendments thereof, and not inconsistent with this Act, are hereby continued and confirmed.

No notice had been given of that amendment, and it was the opinion not only of the minister but of the committee in general that that portion of section 1 should be eliminated; and in order to make the preamble conform to the section those words were struck out. They were struck out merely for the sake of conformity which makes the amendment purely formal.

The English rule corresponding to the Canadian rule 106 is somewhat different. It provides that all alterations to the preamble have to be specially noticed in the report and reasons have to be given for all alterations, the language being:

And when any alteration shall have been made in the preamble of the Bill, such alteration, together with the ground of making it, shall be specially stated in the report.

The language of our rule is:

And when any material alteration has been made in the preamble of the Bill, such alteration and the reasons for the same are to be stated in the report.

The question then becomes whether the alterations or amendments are material or merely formal. My contention is that in

this case they are all purely formal. An alteration to be material must be more or less fundamental, one of substance and not of form. We contend that there is no substantial amendment to the preamble of this Bill. Anything we have done in the amendments does not increase or diminish, limit, curtail or advance, the powers of the company. Any difference is not fundamental or substantial; it is only formal. It has been pointed out by the clerk of the Railway Committee, a very experienced officer, that it has never been the practice of the committee in the last twenty-five or thirty years to give any reasons for any changes in the preambles of Bills. The fact that it has not been the practice may stand for nothing as the rule is there; but as a matter of fact it has not been the practice, and only in very few instances has it been done by any committee of this House. There is only one instance where the preamble has been amended and a special report presented to the House. There have been important changes in preambles by way of enlarging them by way of increasing their scope and only in one instance has a special report been put in where the amendment has been by way of eliminating some language in the original preamble.

The cases we have been able to find are as follows: There is one in 1891 reported in the Journals at page 414, where the Banking Committee amended a preamble, adding certain clauses practically reviving the charter of a bank which had ceased to do business; in that case a special report was made, giving reasons.

In 1894, the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee specially reported on another Bill where the preamble had been amended and words had been added more clearly to indicate the objects of the proposed Bill.

In 1900, the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee (page 202 of the Journals) presented a similar report, giving the same reasons for additions to the words of the preamble.

In 1900, again (Journals 174), the Private Bills Committee amended that preamble so as to more clearly express the facts upon which certain powers granted by the Bills are placed. These are the only four cases which I have been able to find where the preambles have been amended by adding words and in the report of the committee to the House reasons have been given and the reason in each instance has very clearly explained the object and provisions of the Bill. In 1883 there was a Bill of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Church in Canada in which some words of more or less importance were excised or eliminated and in that instance there was a special report, but the special report of the committee in that case was merely that 'words are unnecessary.' If this Bill were referred back to the committee I submit that a proper report for the committee to make is that the words which have been eliminated from this preamble are unnecessary. Upon this statement of facts and upon the precedents I have been able to give to the House I think the proper judgment of the committee should be that the amendments are formal and not material. They do not go to the root or substance of the matter; they do not enlarge or curtail the operation of the Bill and no report that the committee could make would have any effect upon it. As the matter is more or less technical, as the committee must be taken to have passed upon it, and as the report is silent in regard to reasons, I think this committee may well follow the example of the Railway Committee and hold that it is a matter of form and not material.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a few observations in reference to the present position in which this Bill is. My first observation has reference to proceeding with the Bill to-night. I think it was understood pretty generally by the members of the House on this day last week that a few days' notice would be given before proceeding with the Bill. The discussion relating to the matter on that occasion was as follows. On the opening of the House on Monday last the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) said:

> As this is a very important Bill and as there are certain matters in connection with it which are now under consideration, I would ask that it be laid over for the present. I move that the committee rise.

The discussion was concluded as follows:

> Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Railways has truthfully said that the Bill is an important Bill, and I would suggest that we have a few days notice of the time it is to be taken up. I understand that the present intention is to bring it on a week from to-day.
>
> Mr. GRAHAM. I want to meet the convenience of hon. gentleman as far as possible. It strikes me that it would be better to let it stand for a few days, so that everybody may be in a better position to discuss it.
>
> Mr. R. L. BORDEN. All I wish to ask is that we may be informed a few days in advance.
>
> Mr. GRAHAM. Surely.

The discussion dropped and that is the position in which it was when on Friday evening the Minister of Railways proposed that this Bill should be taken up to-day. I assumed, when speaking of a few days, as did my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and the Minister of Railways and Canals, that they intended parliamentary days. A few days in advance would be parliamentary days. There should be no two opinions upon that. Not one parliamentary day has intervened since. It is a matter of surprise to a good many that the Bill should

be taken up to-day. Several amendments have been moved. These amendments have only recently been put on the Order Paper. I myself put an important amendment on the Order Paper to-day which I desire to have discussed and upon which I desire to have the opinion of this House. That amendment may not be dealt with because of the manner in which the Bill is being taken up.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will excuse me. I know he does not want to leave anything out. At page 3336 he will find the following:

Mr. LENNOX. I would ask the minister to let me know when this Bill is coming on again, as I would like to be here.
Mr. GRAHAM. It will probably be a week from to-day.

I was sure that I had named this as the day. The hon. leader of the opposition then, imagining possibly that we might be able to take it up sooner, I infer, asked that I would give notice before bringing it up. I said: 'Surely.' If we were going to bring it up before Monday I would have felt that I ought to give three or four days' notice, but that there should be no misunderstanding I said that we would bring it up on Monday and I anticipated that we would not reach it until Monday night when most of the members would be back. I not only mentioned to-day when we were talking about it a week ago, but on Friday last I called attention to the fact that we would take it up to-day.

Mr. LENNOX. It is quite clear that the minister was not sure when he would bring it up. In the discussion which took place on Monday last he said:

It strikes me that it will be better to let it stand for a few days, so that everybody may be in a better position to discuss it.

Then my hon. friend the leader of the opposition said:

All I wish to ask is that we may be informed a few days in advance.

Up to that there was no time definitely stated:—

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, up to that time there was a definite time stated.

It will probably be a week from to-day.

Mr. LENNOX. But no definite time had been fixed. A time may have been suggested, but neither the minister nor any one else was prepared to pin himself down to a day. What my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and I asked was that notice would be given. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition said:

All I wish to ask is that we may be informed a few days in advance.

We were not informed anything more about it until Friday night and at that time several hon. gentlemen who wanted to discuss the matter were not in the House and, of course, no day at all intervened between that time and to-day. But we have another point to deal with before we come to that.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) has made the very point that I was about to make, namely, the uncertainty of the day. The minister said himself that:

It will probably be a week from to-day.

The discussion concluded as follows:

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. All I wish to ask is that we may be informed a few days in advance.
Mr. GRAHAM. Surely.

A few days in advance certainly means a few parliamentary days. I repeat that in so far as many hon. members are concerned they are not prepared to-night to go on with this discussion. I doubt very much if it will advance the interests of the Bill, in view of the inadequacy of the notice given, to attempt to force the Bill on to-night.

Mr. CONMEE. We have heard that too often; that does not go any more.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Does the hon. gentleman desire to interrupt me for the purpose of interrupting me or for the purpose of getting some information?

Mr. CONMEE. No, but I desire to inform the hon. gentleman that that bluff is played out.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I think the hon. gentleman's language is unparliamentary. Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman should be obliged to take that back. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if the word 'bluff' is a parliamentary term?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman wishes you, Mr. Speaker, to rule on the point of order which he has taken. If he does not, I would suggest to him that at this moment we are engaged upon a preliminary objection whether the Bill can go on or whether it should be referred back to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. If the motion of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) carries, the Bill will have to be referred to the committee and my hon. friend will have an opportunity of moving the amendment that he wants to move. If the motion of my hon. friend from South Simcoe does not carry, then it will be time enough to urge the objection that he has made as to proceeding with the Bill on its merits.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Very good, I will take the right hon. gentleman's sug-

gestion. I merely referred to this because the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution made this argument. Referring to the motion, the reasons given by the hon. member for South Wellington are not sufficient reasons why rule 106 should not apply. In the first place the hon. gentleman says that no objection was taken in the Railway Committee, that no request was made to have this preamble contain any special reference as required by rule 106. But, it is quite apparent on the very face of it that it was not for the Railway Committee or for any one in the Railway Committee to take objection there. There is no doubt that the Committee of the Whole is the first place in which an objection of that kind could be taken. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has given as a reason why the rule should not apply, that it has never been invoked for 25 years, and he tells us he has the authority of the clerk of the committee for making that statement. But a moment later he gave no less than four instances in which special reports had been made to the House from the Committees of the House in cases in which substantial alterations had been made in the preamble. If the rule is clear the fact that it has not been invoked in one special committee for years is no argument against it. The rule is there and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) has shown us that other special committees have taken advantage of it. I quite agree with the Prime Minister that the whole question is as to the relevancy of the alterations and as to whether they are material under rule 106. There is no doubt in my mind that the last two alterations are not only most material but that they are most vital. The right hon. gentleman was not in the Railway Committee and I would like to point out to him in what way these two alterations are relevant. The Bill as originally presented to the House contained the following statement in the preamble.

And whereas applications have been made to the legislative assembly of Ontario for Acts extending the time for constructing the said company's lines of railway, and such Acts have been passed, but, as the said company has been advised, without authority or jurisdiction.

In view of that recital in the preamble, that the company had obtained Acts from the legislature of Ontario extending the time for the construction of its lines and in view of the statement which immediately followed :

In the opinion of the company the said Acts were passed without authority or jurisdiction.

The Ontario government sent a representative to Ottawa largely to protest against that portion of the preamble which attacked the power of the legislature to pass these Acts. These Acts of the legislature had been passed years ago and had been acted upon by the company, and under them they had constructed their lines, and the legislature of Ontario said it was a very strange thing if a railway company could obtain an Act of incorporation from that legislature and proceed under it and its amendments, and then repudiate the legislation which gave the company its origin. Naturally the Ontario legislature very properly took the view that they would not permit any renunciation of their power without making protest. The promoters of this Bill had accepted the Ontario Acts for years, but when they had served their purpose they proposed by a statement in this preamble to say that these Acts were passed without authority or jurisdiction. Counsel for the province of Ontario was heard in opposition to that feature of the Bill as well as others, and finally the committee decided to strike from the preamble these words :

But as the said company has been advised, without authority or jurisdiction.

That was a very important, a very material and a very proper amendment to the preamble, indeed one can hardly imagine an alteration more material.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The words stricken out were : 'the company has been advised.' That is what raised a doubt.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. You were crystallizing that into the preamble and that was objected to. The Bill came into the committee with a statement that the province of Ontario had not authority or jurisdiction and it left the committee with that statement stricken out. Surely that was an important and material alteration. The next amendment made to the preamble, and it is a very important one, was that these words were stricken out :

That everytihng done by the said company in pursuance of the several Acts relating thereto should be confirmed.

It was argued by the province of Ontario and others in the committee that the committee should not confirm by such an omnibus declaration in the preamble every past Act of the company. This company had been incorporated for a great many years. and no one in the committee pretended to know what the company had done in the past, and most of the discussion which took place for half of the nine days that Bill was in the committee was over the preamble, and these important changes were made in it. I am not pretending to say that anything was added to this preamble, but a great deal was taken from it and surely whether you add to or take away, so long as that which you add to or take away from is material, it causes a material alteration to be made and if it is a material alteration surely rule 106 should apply. It does seem to me that this is a proper case for the application of the rule.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I think the hon. member (Mr. Macdonell) does not quite understand the function of a preamble. Under the Interpretation Act it is provided by section 14:

The preamble of every Act shall be deemed a part thereof intended to assist in explaining the purport and object of the Act.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. So far as the application of the rule is concerned does it make any difference what the definition of a preamble is?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I think it does.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I would like to know how.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The interpretation says that the preamble is a part of the Act intended to assist in explaining the purport one reason—to conform with that amendment to the preamble would have explained the last part of section 1, and that is no doubt the reason why it was put in the original preamble. But when the last clause of section 1 was struck out by the committee—because it was not advertised for one reason—to conform with that amendment, the fourth amendment was made to the preamble, and it was to conform with section 1, and it was not necessary to assist in explaining section 1; it is only a matter of form.

Mr. LENNOX. I would point out that although it is stricken out of the position it occupied before, the last part of section 1 is restored in the last part of section 2.

Mr. BRISTOL. So far as I am personally concerned I want to say that I thought we received most courteous treatment from the chairman of the Railway Committee in connection with this Bill, and in the objections at present raised we are not reflecting in any way upon the committee or the chairman. The real question is whether or not the changes made in this preamble were material. How is this materiality to be judged? We must assume that the promoters put these recitals in the preamble because they considered them material. That is one ground. That they were discussed for five or six days in the committee is another ground. We fought this preamble because we thought it a most injudicious and improper one. We thought it unwise to spread on the record that there was in connection with this matter a question of doubt as to whether or not this railway came under the Railway Act of Canada, because some small street car line crossed the Grand Trunk or Canadian Pacific Railway. Many of the gentlemen held that it would be ridiculous to assume that because the Toronto Railway crossed the Canadian Pacific Railway, as it does, in two or three places, it should be considered a railway for the general advantage of Canada. A great deal of discussion took place over the question of legal advice, the result of which was that the statement that a company had been advised was changed to the statement that a doubt was raised. The statement that everything that was done pursuant to certain Acts should be confirmed was considered so broad and sweeping that it was persistently attacked throughout. To-night for the first time I have heard that that was stricken out because of any informality in the notice. Certainly the argument presented to the committee was that it was an injudicious and improper recital to put in the Bill, and, after several days' discussion, I think it was the Minister of Railways who made the suggestions which were eventually accepted by the committee. So that if we are to judge of the materiality of the changes by the contest the promoters made over them, we must regard them as decidedly material.

Mr. BARKER. It appears to me very clear that the first alteration in the preamble is not material. It is merely a better form of expressing what was intended to be expressed as the preamble was drawn. The whole question raised is as to the preamble; we are not discussing any of the clauses of the Bill, but simply whether the alterations made in the preamble required any special report. As drawn, the preamble recited that whereas the company has been advised that under certain circumstances it occupied a certain position. I think that was a very bad form of draftage. I do not think we ought to have counsel's opinion introduced into Acts of parliament; it would only be necessary to get the opinions of half a dozen to have them both ways; and then they could have simply said in plain language that doubts had been raised. These words as to counsel's opinion have been very properly struck out, and the statement that doubts have been raised has been put in its place, and I think there is not a lawyer in this House who will not say that that is a better form of expression than the one originally used. In that I do not think there has been any material alteration, but there has been an improvement in the phrasing of the clause. The second change is this: 'but as the said company has been advised, without authority or jurisdiction.' That is, that the Ontario legislature has passed certain Acts, but, as the company has been advised, without authority or jurisdiction. The committee, I presume, thought again that it was not desirable to insert in the preamble of an Act of parliament counsel's opinion, and, for the same reason, that if they had got the opinions of two or three more counsel, they would have got opinions on both sides and doubts would have been raised. By striking out these words, the committee do not say that the two Acts that have been passed are either good or bad. They simply state the plain

fact that the Ontario legislature has passed certain Acts. Can there be any objection to that? As to the third sentence which was struck out, namely:

That everything done by the said company in pursuance of the several Acts relating thereto should be confirmed.

I can quite understand that if these words were not in the preamble of the Bill but had been inserted by the committee, their insertion would be an important alteration. But the case is just the reverse. The promoters of this Bill asked for the confirmation of certain Acts. That has been struck out and consequently there is no confirmation. The Acts are left as they were and they are neither confirmed nor disaffirmed. Can it be said that by omitting these words, we have made a material alteration? I could quite understand the company complaining of their omission, but cannot understand why hon. gentlemen who are protesting against the Bill in toto should complain. How can they say there has been any material alteration requiring any special report? The company has consented to the elimination of those words. Where then is the Bill altered to the detriment of anybody, even the company? This is really a most technical form of objection. Suppose the company had inserted a provision in the preamble to enable it to deal generally with electric power, and on some question being raised they consented to that being struck out. Would it be seriously argued that that was such a material alteration of the Bill as regards the preamble, as would bring it under rule 106?

In my experience it has not been at all uncommon to strike something out of the preamble when the committee found more asked for than it was willing to grant. The preamble of this Bill asks us to confirm certain things. We strike out that request and thereby limit the scope of the preamble. Surely the objection raised that that is a material alteration which brings the Bill under rule 106 is the most technical form of objection imaginable.

Mr. LENNOX. A great deal of what the hon. member for Hamilton has said has proved the position I took, namely, that this is a very material alteration in the Bill. He says if we had enlarged the scope of the preamble, that would be a material alteration, but as we have restricted it, the alteration is not material. That is bad logic as applied to this rule, for the rule does not say that the alteration must be in the way of expansion or restriction but simply that it must be material. A technical alteration need not be reported, but any material alteration must be. The chairman of the committee has said that as the committee virtually concurred in these amendments, we should not go back on it.

Mr. BARKER. But the committee had nothing to do with confirming the report. On every question we voted. I moved to strike out the part beginning with 'whereas the said company has been advised' down to 'parliament of Canada.' I also moved to strike out the other two clauses that were struck out. This amendment was voted down. Then I moved to strike out the words 'that everything done by the said company in pursuance of the said several Acts and relating thereto should be confirmed.' Then the hon. gentleman who is promoting the Bill moved in amendment to that amendment that instead the words 'the company has been advised,' we should change these to the words 'doubts have been raised,' and strike out the other two clauses I proposed to strike out. It was argued that this had been framed by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) and would get over all the difficulty regarding the question of law. And then that we should enact as in section 1:

And for the removal of all doubts the lines of railway which the company is empowered to construct are hereby declared to be works for the advantage of Canada.

We argued that the effect would be to declare what was the state of the law as regards that and all other railways in a similar position. This amendment was made in order that we should not do that but merely say that doubts had been raised and therefore not commit ourselves to a distinct proposition of law as we would have been doing had the matter stood in the shape in which it was before. That is the position to-day. A material alteration has been made. Instead of parliament declaring that by reason of that railway crossing the line of the Grand Trunk at Burlington it is subject to the exclusive legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, we merely declared that doubts have arisen. That is a material alteration.

As to the next proposition, we have it recited in the preamble:

Applications have been made to the legislative assembly of Ontario for Acts extending the time for constructing the said company's lines of railway and such Acts have been passed, but, as the said company has been advised, without authority or jurisdiction.

These were Acts passed after 1897 when this crossing of these two railways was effected, and the suggestion is made there that these two Acts, the Act of 1900, chapter 12 and the Act of 1904, chapter 77, both being Acts of the legislature of Ontario passed after, this railway is said to have become subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of parliament, were void. It was pointed out that that was inconsistent with what the company

wanted, because they asked, in effect that these Acts should continue in force. Section 1 provides :

In this Act the expression 'the company' means the body politic and corporate created by chapter 88 of the statutes of Ontario, 1894, and continued by the said amendments thereof; and for the removal of all doubts the lines of railway which the company is empowered to construct are hereby declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada.

Now, I point out to the Prime Minister that, had the words remained in the preamble stating in effect that the Acts of 1900 and 1904 were passed by the legislative assembly of Ontario without jurisdiction, it would not be consistent to pass section 1 which says that these Acts and amendments shall be continued. And section 2 says :

Nothing in this Act, or in the Railway Act, shall invalidate any action heretofore taken by the company pursuant to the powers contained in the Acts mentioned in the preamble, and the powers and privileges granted by the said Acts are hereby confirmed.

That includes these two amendments that are said in the preamble to have been passed without jurisdiction. So, we see that the statement in the preamble must be eliminated in order to pass not merely section 1 but section 2.

It was proposed in the original Bill to have a clause in the preamble providing that everything done by the company in pursuance of these Acts of the Ontario legislature shall be confirmed. This was most material for the railway company to get, but it was strenuously opposed and was, in the end, struck out and remained so. We have to look at this from the attitude of the company as well as from the attitude of the country. We have a right to have sent to this House a statement showing the reason why this was struck out. Analyse this and you will see whether it is material or not. The preamble of the original Bill contained these words :

—and whereas it is advisable that all questions as to jurisdiction should be set at rest, that everything done by the said company in pursuance of the several Acts relating there to should be confirmed——

—and so on. That is the gist of what is asked. This the committee refused, and it is struck out. Is it not material whether we do or do not in this Act affirm that we think it advisable that everything done by the company in pursuance of these several Acts be confirmed or not ? Surely it is as plain as anything can be. The importance of this matter does not rest on my shoulders ; the result of this discussion is not material to me. But it is most material to this House, and most material to the right hon. leader of this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), that a plain rule shall be observed. No harm will be done to the company, and no great benefit gained to the country in this instance. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) says that for twenty-five years we have been ignoring this rule and sending from the Railway Committee, though not from other committees, amendments to preambles without referring to the fact that——

Mr. GUTHRIE. Will the hon. member (Mr. Lennox) allow me to ask him : Who should, in the first instance, judge whether the alteration is material or not ?

Mr. LENNOX. Probably the chairman.

Mr. GUTHRIE. As chairman, I decided that they were not material.

Mr. LENNOX. The chairman of the committee should have some supervision, and should see to it that his report comes in in proper form. He does not appear to have paid a scintilla of attention to the matter or to have thought of it at all. He did not think of it at all. The clerk of the committee did not attend to it, because this rule has been ignored persistently. But the people who have to decide absolutely in the end whether it is material or not are the people who fought persistently over this question for eight or nine days and who are here, and particularly the First Minister and leader of this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who is responsible for our proceedings. I do not need to say more. I brought the matter up because it is important that the rules of the House should be observed The very fact that such a decided difference of opinion is expressed in the committee is good reason why the First Minister should send this back in order that the committee may give its reasons for these changes. If we infringe the rule in this instance, we shall be expected to do so in others. Is it not better that the Railway Committee should understand, as others do, that any except verbal alterations in the preamble of a Bill must be reported with the reasons for making them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the difficulty has arisen in this case for the reason that we do not conduct our private Bill legislation with quite the same system, or quite the same regard for the judicial nature of the proceedings, as prevails in Great Britain. The preamble is regarded as the foundation of a private Bill.

And the evidence—because evidence is usually given there upon these Bills—is given with regard to the preamble. The petitioners have the right under certain conditions to offer evidence. Persons may come in and petition against the Bill if desired, but they have to prove their status before they are allowed to oppose it. The question is then determined like a judicial proceeding. You do not have there an enormous committee of 100 or 160 people ; you have a small committee for the most part who deal with the question in a judicial

manner, and they report that the preamble is proven or not proven and that must and does determine the fate of the Bill. They may report the preamble 'proven with amendments' and the English practice, as has been observed, requires that the reasons for these amendments shall in every instance be reported. They also report on many other matters. For example, in Great Britain, where a committee has to consider the applicability of some legislative enactment or some departmental regulation based upon the authority of legislative enactment, where they depart from any such regulation or enactment it is the practice—I do not know whether it prevails by reason of a standing order, but it is their practice—to report the reasons why they depart from the regulation. They are much more careful and particular than we are in regard to all these matters, and I trust that we may be a little more particular here in the future.

Of course with respect to the third alteration which seems to be the one of particular importance if one desired to look at the question strictly, under the words of the rule, it would seem to me that the reasons for striking these words out, should be alleged. The reasons have been mentioned by the chairman of the committee and by the hon. member for Hamilton; that portion of the Bill to which they apply have been omitted and they of course become unnecessary, irrelevant and out of place and therefore must disappear from the preamble.

It does not seem to me that the reason why that particular portion of one section of the Bill has been omitted, is very much in point one way or the other. It is sufficient to know that it has disappeared and that by reason of its disappearance certain words in the preamble must also disappear, and that would have been a good reason to be assigned by the committee as a ground for leaving out that portion of the preamble, and in strictness I would have thought that would have been the proper course. It has been truly observed by the chairman of the committee and other members that this rule has not been regarded. Matters have gone on for the most part so far as this House is concerned, as if no such rule was in existence; the matter has now been brought to the attention of the House and the House must deal with it. I would suggest, in the first instance, if any regard is to be had to the suggestion of the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Claude Macdonell) it would be far the easiest way to send it to the committee and let the committee give the reasons, which are pretty obvious reasons but which as a matter of form should be stated in the report of the committee. It would be better instead of discussing this matter here, to send it back to the committee if the objection of the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) is to prevail.

I may say to the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) that I was not quite certain whether he would bring it on to-day, as the date was left somewhat indefinite, and on the suggestion being made that there were members on both sides interested and that they should have a few days' notice, the minister with his usual courtesy assented and I suppose some members depended on that arrangement.

Mr. HENDERSON. To my mind the whole question hinges on the definition of material alterations. Are these alterations material or not? I regard them as quite immaterial. I stated in the committee and I have the same view now, that it was quite unimportant whether there was any preamble to this Bill, the whole preamble might have been struck out, it might have been introduced without a preamble. Therefore I hold that the change made in the preamble was not at all material and consequently the rule does not apply.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a matter as to which it becomes my duty to state to the House what I think ought to be the rule which should guide it in a matter of this kind. Of course it is a matter which has to be approached solely on the judicial side and for no other consideration than the judicial interpretation to be given to this rule. I find that four alterations have been made to the preamble of this Bill. The first alteration substituted for the words:

The said company has been advised that.

The words:.

Doubts having been raised whether.

I stated before six o'clock and I repeat that in my opinion they are absolutely immaterial; they are merely, as stated by the hon. member for Hamilton, substituting a different drafting; they do not substitute any other line of thought than that first expressed in the Bill and so far I do not think the change there is material.

The second one is purely a verbal and therefore requires no consideration.

As to the third and fourth, I look upon them as one single amendment to carry on the same idea.

The object of this Bill was, among other things, to confirm two Bills which had been passed by the legislature of Ontario; it was doubtful whether the province of Ontario had jurisdiction to pass those laws and one object of this Bill was to confirm this legislation and give it the sanction of the Dominion parliament. The two alterations really effect the same object. These alterations are certainly very important but are they material? That is a question. An amendment may be a very important one,

and yet not be material to the Bill. The view taken by the committee was evidently, as has been explained by the hon. member for Hamilton a moment ago, that the powers which were sought to be obtained by this Bill by the company promoting it, were curtailed by the committee and their powers having been curtailed, that is to say a provision which had been intended to be carried——

That everything done by the said company in pursuance of said Acts relating thereto is confirmed.

—was eliminated, and the amendment in this respect was very important, because it took away from the powers proposed to be granted by the Bill. But the hon. member for Hamilton argued, and I think with great force, that these amendments although important were not material, because they did not make any more charge on the public than was contemplated by the Bill ; on the contrary they removed charges which had been intended and therefore they were not reported, because in a Bill of this kind the rules which have been set down have been set down for the purpose of protecting the public. The alteration is admittedly not important, and does not involve a new charge on the public but takes away one which was sought to be imposed on the public and it may well be said that an alteration of that kind is not material. I take the view of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). I suppose he is one of those who fought the Bill. He fought it why ? Because it was an encroachment upon the rights of the province, because this parliament should not attempt to confirm an Act which had been passed by a province if it had not power to pass it, that the remedy should be to go to the province. He has succeeded in his contention, his view has prevailed before the committee, he has succeeded in getting that removed from the Bill and, therefore, if the Bill is sent back to the committee, what will he do ? Will he fight the Bill again to have this restored ? On the contrary the amendment is on the line of what he is seeking and if the Bill is sent back to the committee my hon. friend will not ask to have this restored.

Mr. LENNOX. It does not preserve one iota to the province of what the province would not have and has not always had.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, but does not my hon. friend agree with me that if this Bill is sent back to the committee he will not attempt to have these words restored ?

Mr. LENNOX. I could not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Exactly; he does not find fault with them, he accepts them, he is satisfied with them. That is the reason why, I presume, the change was not considered material and that is the reason why it was not so reported by the committee. The committee thought that if a change was made taking away from the powers which were intended to be given to the company it was not material to the company or to the Bill.

Mr. LENNOX. But there was nothing taken away from the company.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the meaning of the words ? My hon. friend will not attempt to have these words restored to the preamble.

Mr. LENNOX. I cannot have them restored. All I ask is that the Bill shall be sent back to the committee in order that they shall make the full report that they are bound by the rule to make.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. After all is this not highly technical ? If you have simply to send back this Bill to the committee in order not to have anything altered but simply to give a certain reason, which the company say is of no importance at all, what do you accomplish ? If my hon. friend could say : I want this to be sent back to the committee in order to make changes to it that I want to have made, then I could understand his reasoning. Otherwise his reasoning has no meaning. But the question is not free from doubt. When you see eminent counsel disagreeing upon this point, the hon. member for South Simcoe arguing that the amendment is material and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) arguing that it is not material, when it is a matter of doubt the rule has been always to side with the committee and I would be disposed to do, as we have always done, side with the committee under similar circumstances.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The only thing we can do is to report progress.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. BRISTOL. The rule says that :

When any material alteration has been made in the preamble of the Bill, such alteration and the reasons for the same, are to be stated in the report.

Does the right hon. gentleman contend that it is to be confined to alterations that are material to the public only and not to the people who bring in private Bills ? Does the right hon. gentleman confine the meaning of the word 'material' to the public interest ? I would have thought that any change that was material, whether it was material to the promoter or the public, would be a material change ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. BRISTOL. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) admitted that it was material to the company but he said it was

not material to the public. I think it is very material to the public that they should have this word stricken out. I do not think it should be regarded as being material to one or the other but that if it is a material alteration the reason should be stated.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The argument of the hon. gentleman was that it was an important amendment but not material to the Bill because it was not such that anybody could suffer from it except the company.

Mr. BARKER. My statement was that it might be an important amendment but the company are not raising any objection. The only persons who are raising any objection are the gentlemen who have got what they wanted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that we can report progress and make a motion when the Speaker is in the chair.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The question is that the Bill be referred to the House and therefore we have to decide whether we shall refer it to the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Those in favour of the motion will please signify.

Mr. LENNOX. Let it go; they do not want to vote.

Motion negatived.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals if he is going to consider the matter that I raised about delay. I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that there are a number of amendments which have been put in before it was known that this Bill was coming up to-day. These amendments cannot be discussed to-night. They might be discussed to-morrow or at any subsequent day; but hon. gentlemen certainly relied upon the conclusion of what took place when this Bill was up, namely that a few days notice would be given and it was presumed that these would be parliamentary days. No parliamentary day has since intervened, and I take the objection that the Bill should not be proceeded with on insufficient notice in view of what took place.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think that the hon. gentleman's point that no notice has been given is sufficient. Notice, in the parliamentary sense, is two days. However, if my hon. friend says that he has been taken by surprise and that he is not prepared to go on with the Bill I do not think we should press it to-day.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I have prepared and handed in to the clerk of the House a very important amendment that I want to have discussed and that I want to obtain the opinion of the House upon.

Mr. BRISTOL.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the amendment be to the first clause ?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, to the first clause.

Mr. GRAHAM. I want to establish the fact that I have kept perfect faith with my hon. friend. A week ago to-day my hon. friend was prepared to go on with this Bill.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I took no part in the discussion a week ago and I gave no indication of my intentions one way or the other. My hon. friend himself immediately rose when the Bill was called and asked that it should stand.

Mr. GRAHAM. I was just remarking what took place and what was ready to take place. The matter came up. I suggested that we postpone the debate. The promoter was ready to go on with the Bill and every person understood it was going on until these questions were raised. I stated that probably we would go on a week from to-day. That was a week ago. My hon. friend has known for a week that the Bill was going on to-day. A little further on, after I had stated that probably it would go on to-day, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) suggested that I might give him three or four days' notice. Any one would have expected that if we were going to bring the matter up a day before that which I had mentioned I would certainly have given notice. So that there could be no idea that any advantage would be taken of any person on Friday last when I stated that we would probably go on with this Bill on Monday. My hon. friend understood on Friday last that we would go on to-day and it is only a technical point when he speaks of parliamentary days. He has prepared his amendments since Friday last and he could have prepared his speech along that line in that time. It is only technical to say that since Friday last we have had no parliamentary days. If any hon. gentleman says he has been taken by surprise I think that we should give fair consideration to that objection, but merely to say he is not ready is not a fair reason for postponing this discussion for another week. He might not be ready in a week from to-day. Could we not go on with some other clause to which my hon. friend does not want to move an amendment ? Let us do something.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I find that this Bill has not been reprinted in French. According to rule 71 all Bills should be printed in both languages before going to their second reading.

An hon. MEMBER. Read the rule.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. The rule is this :

All Bills shall be printed before the second reading in the French and English languages.

The French version is more expressive still, it says :

Tous les bills doivent être imprimés avant leur deuxième lecture en Français et en Anglais.

I therefore raise this question of privilege and it is a very important one. I have fought this Bill strenuously in the committee; I have given a great deal of attention to it; I want to understand it thoroughly and it is my privilege to have it printed in the French language so that I may understand it thoroughly and give an intelligent vote on it. I understand that the objection will be taken to this question of privilege, that the question should be raised before the Bill came to a second reading, but I can find no rule to show that such is the case. There is only one decision by Speaker Blanchet in 1879, and that does not say that objection should be taken before the second reading. The rule says that the Bill should be printed in both languages before coming to a second reading, and Bourinot says it is the undoubted right of any member of the House to have a Bill printed in both languages before he votes on it. My objection is well taken, and I ask that the consideration of the Bill be postponed.

Mr. BERGERON. Hear, hear; until it is printed in French.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The custom, I understand, is that this objection must be taken before the second reading. After the second reading the objection is too late. The notices of the proposed amendments which I have here are in both languages.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. The Bill I have here is only in the English language, and I asked for a French copy and I could not get it. I don't think the Chair can cite any rule to show that the objection must be taken before the second reading.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is the custom that this objection be taken before the second reading.

Mr. BERGERON. The objection of my hon. friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne) is well taken. The Bill has been greatly changed; it must be reprinted any way, and if it is allowed to stand the objection of my hon. friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne) will be met.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not understand that the Minister of Railways was guilty of any bad faith whatever, but the member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) says he is taken by surprise, and the Minister of Railways and the First Minister have said that if any one is taken by surprise the Bill would not be proceeded with. The notices were given on Friday night and two days have intervened on which we could do nothing, so that we are in the same position to-day as we were on Friday night as regards giving notice. We could not give notice on Friday night; we could not give notice on Saturday; we could not give notice on Sunday; we could only give notice to-day. There has been a misunderstanding, and I hope the Bill will not be pressed now.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I wish to say that I am taken by surprise, but I am not asking for any favour special or otherwise, and I am not urging that as a reason for the Bill to stand. On Monday last the Minister of Railways concurred in Mr. Borden's request that a few days' notice would be given of the Bill being proceeded with, and not being in the House on Friday night I knew nothing of the intention to bring it up until this afternoon, when I immediately prepared my amendments and sent them to the clerk. I do want to discuss these amendments of which I have given notice and I am taken by surprise.

Mr. CLARKE. Do your amendments appertain to the second clause?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I have moved my amendment to clause 2 and it covers the objection to the whole of the Bill.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I rise to a point of order. It is only since the second reading that this Bill has been reprinted and therefore I could not take the objection on the second reading that it was not printed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have ruled that the objection is taken too late. You can appeal to the House if you wish.

Mr. BERGERON. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways have said that if any one were taken by surprise the Bill would stand. My hon. friend (Mr. Macdonell) is taken by surprise and if it is allowed to stand it can be reprinted in French before it is taken up again, and that will meet the objection of my hon. friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne).

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not want this Bill postponed on the ground that the members did not have notice. I said distinctly one week ago to-day that this Bill would be brought up on Monday next, and the leader of the opposition asked if two or three days' notice would be given, inferentially, if it were going to be brought up before to-day. So that there could be no misunderstanding I said last Friday that nothing intervening we would proceed with the Bill to-day. If there is some other reason for postponing it all right, but it cannot be postponed on the ground of want of sufficient notice, because I have kept faith absolutely with the House.

Mr. LANCASTER. I asked the leader of the opposition what was said about the Bill, and he told me and the inference I drew from it was that if it was to proceed to-day two or three days' notice would be

given. I drew an inference opposite to that which the minister draws from what took place.

Mr. CONMEE. I hardly understand how the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) can be taken so much by surprise. That hon. gentleman discussed the Bill in the Railway Committee for a considerable number of days and he gave us his views and Macdonell law on the subject by the hour and by the yard, and if he now says that he is not ready to discuss the Bill of course I must accept his statement. But something very serious must have intervened to take his mind off this Bill, because he did not seem to think of anything else for two or three weeks. I do not wish to cast the slightest reflection on the good faith of any member of the House.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. You had better not do it on the member for South Toronto; you have attempted to do so already this afternoon.

Mr. CONMEE. I made a statement this afternoon which I thought was perfectly justified and under similar circumstances I would repeat it. I may be wrong in my idea, but it would appear to me that there are two or three gentlemen who are inclined to try and talk this Bill out. I have no objection to these hon. gentlemen discussing the Bill as long as they wish; I have no objection to them taking all the advantages which they think will accrue to them. They have had that already; they have been glorified to a certain extent in certain sections of the press, but I do think the time has come when these gentlemen ought to be constrained to realize that after all there is such a thing as a parliamentary majority and that a few gentlemen ought not to attempt to hold up a public measure or to hold up the House day after day and week after week. I think we have been held up on this Bill long enough in committee without being held up here.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Why are you so keen to pass it ?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend from South Toronto says that his amendment has reference to clause 2. Suppose we take up some other clause, and let clause 2 stand, could not we make some progress ?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. The remarks I made were not intended to reflect on the minister. I do not think anybody could have extended more courteous treatment than the minister extended to us during the progress of this Bill through the committee, and I am not hinting that he has not given ample and just notice according to his view of the matter. I am not criticising him in the least. I am willing to facilitate the passing of this Bill in every possible way, but I would like to discuss the amendment of which I have given notice.

Mr. GRAHAM. Then we will go on with the other clauses and let clause 2 stand until my hon. friend can move his amendment.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. That is quite agreeable to me.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Am I to understand that I am to be forced to vote on a Bill that is not printed in French ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Certainly.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. My hon. friends take this matter with levity, but it is a most serious matter. By the British North America Act the French language is placed on a footing of equality with the English language, according to the declaration of the Prime Minister last year ; and yet I am now to be forced to vote on a Bill not printed in both languages on the technical ground that objection was not taken on the second reading. I think we are entitled to a declaration of policy on this point, which is a most serious and vital point, one based on the very essence of the constitution of our country.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minority are entitled to no rights here.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. It seems so, but as long as I have a breath I intend to claim the rights of any minority in this House. I think this is the most shameful treatment the minority have ever received in this country.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall we proceed with section 1 ?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. No, certainly not.

Mr LENNOX. If the amendment of the hon. member for South Toronto is to be proceeded with on section 2, I know the nature of that amendment, and it will involve the same discussion that we shall have on section 1. Therefore I would suggest that we do not discuss section 1 at present, because if we do, we shall have to go over the same discussion again on section 2.

Mr. GRAHAM. If we go on with section 3 and let sections 1 and 2 stand, will that meet my hon. friend's objection ?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes.

Sections 1 and 2 allowed to stand.

On section 3,

Mr. BRISTOL. The object of section 3 is to give to a company which to-day has full power to construct and operate certain lines of railway under charters received from the province of Ontario, and various amendments, either the same or extended

powers by the parliament of Canada. Now, so far as I am personally concerned, I desire to express my absolute disapprobation of this legislation. The present company get a charter from the Ontario legislature in the year 1894, under which they constructed certain lines of railway. In subsequent years they got two successive amendments from the local legislature giving them extended powers. The undertaking was and is a local undertaking within the province of Ontario, and I wish to present this proposition as the principle upon which we should deal with this and all other legislation of a similar character. I venture to think that the parliament of Canada, as regards all local undertakings that have had their origin within the province and are, under the terms of the British North America Act proper works for provincial legislation, should take the position that they should be left within the jurisdiction in which they have been brought into existence, except to such an extent as it may be necessary for the purposes of their business to give them legislation by the parliament of Canada. If that principle were adopted, there would be very little if any legislation needed for this company or the various other companies now seeking federal legislation; and as the principle is one of very great importance to all the provinces of this country as well as to the people of the country at large, I think it is only fair, as it is raised under this section, that we should give it the consideration which its importance deserves, because it goes to the basis of all the legislation which we are now or may be later called on to enact. As far back as 1883 this matter was up for discussion both in the parliament of Canada and in the legislature of Ontario, and I dare say other provincial legislatures. The Liberal party at that time was in favour of what are called provincial rights. As the question then arose, it was connected with our transportation system, at that time operated by steam. I think it arose over the passage by the parliament of Canada of the first Bill which dealt with the making of provincial railways, railways for the general advantage of Canada, by virtue of the fact that they might cross certain named Dominion railroads. The Ontario legislature at that time, in a very strong memorial, adopted after a very full discussion, took most decided and clear objections to the parliament of Canada taking any such course. The argument was made that while there might be under the British North America Act power to make existing railroads wholly within a province railways for the general advantage of Canada, under certain conditions named in the Act, it was not possible and was not proper to make a declaration which, if effective, would make railways which had not then been thought of, but which might later come into existence, railways for the general advantage of Canada, in case they later on were incorporated and crossed certain named railroads. The parliament of Canada passed that legislation, and the Ontario legislature objected to it. The question now is practically whether you propose to take the whole transportation system of this country and bring it down to Ottawa. Because if you do not pass this legislation on some broad principle of public policy, you will be leaving it open in the future for all classes of provincial undertakings, whether for the general advantage of Canada or not, to come here and seek legislation which is not in the interests of the people as a whole.

It might be a very simple matter, if we were going to continue a people of 6,000,000, to have all this class of legislation brought here and have these companies come under the jurisdiction of our Board of Railway Commissioners, more especially as we are about to appoint three additional commissioners, which will make six commissioners for a people of 6,000,000. But we are looking to a large increase of population. Would it not therefore be more wise and politic to leave local works and undertakings in the jurisdiction of the provinces rather than have them come before this parliament which has all the federal business it can attend to? If a railway company, which has a provincial charter, comes here to be brought under the jurisdiction of a federal parliament, we should be in the position of saying to that company: We do not propose to declare that you are a company for the general advantage of Canada simply because you ask it, but you must have grounds for your application, and the onus is on you to show the necessity for your leaving the jurisdiction of the province, under which you have operated for years, and bringing yourself under our jurisdiction.

In the State of New York they have a railway commission to deal with the state railways. Should we get the population in this country which we hope to get, should we later on have an enormous population in the various provinces, surely it is in the public interest that, so far as is reasonable and practicable, those various provinces should be allowed to deal, and deal absolutely, with local works and undertakings. What earthly gain is to be accomplished by bringing these local corporations under Dominion jurisdiction? The parliament of Canada has adopted, as a principle of legislation, that where a provincial railway crosses a Dominion railway, it comes under the jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament only so far as that crossing is concerned. In the Railway Committee we had considerable discussion about the difficulties of divided jurisdiction. If it was necessary to give a company power to have a bridge at Niagara Falls or a ferry at Detroit river, it would be unwise to have divided jurisdiction. But if the

Dominion parliament has seen fit to declare that local railways crossing Dominion railways are, only so far as that crossing is concerned under the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada, the same principle should be adopted as regards the crossing at Niagara river or Detroit river. In that respect the undertaking should be a work for the advantage of Canada but not otherwise. If you adopt that principle, you leave each province in absolute control of its local works and undertakings and save this parliament the necessity of supervising and passing upon the various regulations in the various provinces as regards these railways intended particularly to serve local needs. The parliament of Canada has enacted that where local works and undertakings of this kind desire to interchange traffic with Dominion railways, that portion of the work shall come under the supervision of the Dominion Railway Commissioners so that, under the present Railway Act, it is perfectly clear that if provincial railways desire to interchange traffic with trunk roads, they shall, as regards that traffic, come under the Dominion Railway Commission, but in other respects shall be left with the provinces.

I do not propose to argue the question of doubt. That could be very easily settled by a declaration that it was not intended to bring this company, and that the company did not in fact come under the general Railway Act by virtue of its crossing the Grand Trunk Railway in 1897. But I would point out this fact, that from 1897 up to 1907, this railway extended its lines, issued its bonds, borrowed money, and conducted its business without apparently the least trouble under provincial jurisdiction, and that it was only in 1908 that it became seized with doubts as to whether it should remain in Ontario or come here for legislation. In Ontario to-day there is a general electric Railway Act dealing with matters of this kind, and certain commissioners have been appointed to carry out the provisions of that Act. Under that Act, if an electric railway company does not give the people proper service, the commissioners have the right to take over the road and operate it under certain conditions so that the public shall at all times have a continuous and proper service. What would be a proper fare for an electric road to charge in Ontario might be a very unreasonable fare to charge in British Columbia, Quebec, Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. The province of Ontario has seen fit to fix this rate at the sum of 2 cents a mile. This railway took its charter subject to that rate, and now it asks to be made absolutely free from the jurisdiction of the province which gave it birth. There are besides many agreements which the municipalities made with this company on the basis that it was a provincial company and that there was an Ontario board which could enforce their rights. But the moment this company becomes a Dominion company, it becomes an absolutely new and different entity from that which entered into the contract with these various municipalities. I submit therefore that we should not give this creature of the province Dominion powers and change its condition, to the detriment of the interests of these municipalities, unless there be some ground of public policy which forces us to say that this is a road for the general advantage of Canada and we must bring it here. The proper policy for this parliament to adopt in respect to local works is to leave these works to the provinces and only pass such legislation regarding them as may be necessary for the purposes of their business and not otherwise.

If this is done, you have a fixed, plain principle upon which all these matters can be dealt with in the future. These people cannot possibly be hurt. Ten years ago they were satisfied to take their charter from Ontario. They accepted that charter; they floated their bonds and built their road. Well, why not stay there? Their attitude here is: We have the pull in this parliament to get this change and we are going to get it without rhyme or reason. I submit that they should give us the best of reasons why we should interfere with their provincial existence and bring them here and make them absolutely a Dominion company. If there are doubts we have a right to remove those doubts. But we should remove them in the public interest and not merely because these people want them removed, and as they want them removed. They want their railway to be declared a work for the general advantage of Canada, not because it is so, but because they have doubts whether it is so or not. If they have doubts, that is a matter for the courts and not an argument why parliament should assume jurisdiction over the work. The only reason they give is because there are these doubts about their business existence. But the fact that they have done their business for ten years since the crossing occurred which is said to raise the doubt, shows how immaterial these doubts have been until they raised them for their own purposes. So I say, with all the force I have, that I believe it in the interests of the country that all railways of a similar character should be left under provincial jurisdiction, where they got their existence, where they are carrying on their business, and where they will be amenable to the legislation of the province and to the control of the people who are affected by them, and should not be brought to this jurisdiction. In years to come, if this principle be not accepted, the pople of the whole Dominion will be legislating with regard to railways of a purely local character and which do not

require Dominion legislation, except for the crossing of a Dominion railway or to build a bridge at one end or the other. If it was a sound principle to confine local works and undertakings to the province where they belonged, why should we declare a local railway to be a Dominion railway simply because it wants to build a bridge at one end of its line or the other ? If parliament was right in passing legislation ten years ago, and saying that these local works should remain in the province except so far as they cross a Dominion road, and should be brought under Dominion jurisdiction only for that purpose, on what principle can you distinguish and say that, if they want to build a bridge at one end of their road or have a ferry at the other end, the whole line should come under the jurisdiction of the Dominion for all time? Why, if this principle be admitted, this country will be paying commissioners to look after the electric railways of the whole country. When we have a population of fifty or sixty millions, as we shall have, we shall need a hundred or so of railway commissioners appointed under the jurisdiction of this parliament running all over the country supervising these local railways. The fact that a local railway is two hundred miles long and has some through traffic is no reason why the whole road should be taken over under Dominion jurisdiction. Suppose there were a practical amalgamation of all these lines, that fact does not make these lines works for the general advantage of Canada under the British North America Act unless parliament so declares them. The principle is that these roads should be left where the British North America Act put them, and should not be brought under the jurisdiction of this Dominion.

Now, under the British North America Act, the first provision relating to railways is in section 92. There is no general power given to the Dominion on the subject of railway legislation at all—it is by way of exception and not by way of a general provision that the Dominion has its rights. You find that under section 92 the railways as to which the provinces have exclusive jurisdiction are all local works and undertakings. The exception arises when the Dominion chooses to intervene because the railways connect two provinces or go outside the boundaries of one province, or, under subclause 3, under which this parliament is given power to declare any work it may see fit to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. I submit that if it were a wise policy at the time of confederation to make that distinction, it is a wise policy for us to-day, looking to the future, not to load up the parliament of Canada with various local works of any province or provinces, but to follow the British North America Act which lays it down, I believe wisely, that these local works and undertakings should be left with the provinces, and brought under the jurisdiction of Canada, only where it is necessary to do so in the public interest and to that extent only.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would point out that this Bill is essentially an evasion of the Ontario law which provides a two-cent a mile rate of fare over this and other similar roads. When an evasion of that kind is attempted and an attack is made on the public right of a province as under this legislation, some protection ought to be afforded to the people of that province. There are two ways to meet it. Perhaps the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) will come to my way of meeting it, and that is by making the maximum passenger rate in this country two cents a mile.

Mr. GRAHAM. That would cover it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That would cover, largely, my objection; for the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knows that I have often discussed across the floor whether we are gradually going in the direction of a legislative union or not. I believe we are going headlong in that direction. It may be in the interests of Canada that we should do so, but leaving that aside and coming back to the question, I rise in order to ask the Minister of Railways to state whether he thinks that we ought to pass legislation of this kind interfering with the operation of a provincial railway and enabling that railway to evade what it undertook to do under the Ontario Act. If there is any fact that is clear beyond a doubt, it is that these railways, created in Ontario, were satisfied to perform the duty of giving the people, are giving the people, a two cent a mile transportation. And they come here and ask to be brought under Dominion jurisdiction for the purpose of evading that obligation. We must deal with that one way or the other, either by making a maximum passenger rate of two cents a mile —and I hope that this will have the support of the Minister of Railways, for he must move in my way if he wishes to maintain his stand before the people as the friend of public rights—or let this legislation go through. For that reason, I call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) and of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to the issue raised, which certainly ought to receive attention from the House on this occasion.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM. (Minister of Railways and Canals). I did not know that my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) would put it in the form of a question, but I could guess what would be in his mind if he considered this Bill at all. Now, I will refer to the two cent a mile question before I sit down. What makes the difference of opinion, I find, in reference to this railway and other railways is this: During the last

ten years—yes, during the last five years—there has been almost a revolution in the application of electricity to traction systems. A few years ago it was not thought that any railway except in some town or city, or for short distances outside would be run by electricity. But to-day we find railway trains being taken from New York city to Albany by electricity; we find the Grand Trunk trains being drawn through the Sarnia tunnel by electricity; we find trains in various parts of the continent run by electricity. My hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) surely will not say that these roads, because they are run by electric power——

Mr. BRISTOL. May I correct the hon. minister? I did not make any such argument. I took purely the provincial and local character of the work as a reason.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend mentioned electricity several times. I attach no importance whatever to the propelling power of a railway but rather to the functions that the railway will perform. If a railway is going to perform a duty to the public of such an enlarged character that it ought to be brought under Dominion jurisdiction, then it makes no difference what the propelling power is. In a few years from now, and it may be a shorter time than most of us think, we may and probably will find the American roads running across the peninsula of Ontario operated by electricity. Will any one say that these ought to be excluded from general jurisdiction merely because they change from steam to electricity?

We come to a very important question about this railway. It has been under provincial jurisdiction so far as it has been constructed, but the chief part of the construction, which will be the most expensive part, is bringing it into the city of Toronto underground. When the Bill was first discussed a year ago in this House and elsewhere this was not contemplated, but let me point out to my hon. friend that the question raised and raised as the paramount one both by the city of Toronto and others was that the municipalities were not going to be protected if this road were allowed to go from provincial jurisdiction to federal jurisdiction. To-day the city of Toronto, which raised many objections to this Bill before, has come to an agreement and given its consent to this railway entering that municipality on terms agreed upon. The city of Hamilton has done likewise. In order to protect other municipalities that did not take the pains to make any agreement, we have placed one clause in the Bill saying that this line, although a Dominion line, cannot run on the streets or highways of any municipality, township, village, town or city without first getting the consent of that municipality as expressed by by-law. We have inserted another clause which says that this company cannot distribute or sell power to any person in any municipality owning its own light and power plant. We have protected the municipalities, but my hon. friend says that we have not the machinery. I believe that when the Railway Commission, the servant of this parliament, is enlarged and has its duties fully outlined, in the amended Act, it will have all the powers necessary to enforce an agreement between any railway company under federal jurisdiction and any municipality or individaul. If that be the case my hon. friend must agree that the municipalities are protected.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Then the minister agrees that there is no existing or present machinery or powers vested in the Dominion Railway Commission to safeguard and protect these municipal rights?

Mr. GRAHAM. Oh, I have not said that at all because I think the experience of the last two or three years is proof to the contrary, but I am saying that when the commission is augmented and its duties are enlarged there cannot be any doubt as to the time and power of this commission being sufficient to attend to these duties and to enforce agreements as between the municipalities and the railway companies or between individuals and the railway companies. That being true, the municipalities are protected.

The greatest objection to this Bill as heretofore brought out, has been in this way removed. I might say to my hon. friend who is zealous in protecting the interests of the provinces, that he is no more zealous in that protection than I am. I think he will agree that even so far as his own city is concerned, I have gone to the extent of using my influence to protect it from encroachment by a province in provincial matters on several occasions. But we come to the point: Is this road entitled to Dominion legislation? If it is then any question as to provincial rights or federal rights must stand aside in the light of that fact. I have studied this question as carefully as a layman can; I think I have given to the subject as much attention as any one in the House possibly could, because I am very anxious that such friction as has arisen in the past shall not arise again between the Dominion and the provinces—not only Ontario but the different provinces. We ought to be able to arrive at some policy by which people who wish to invest money in these enterprises could be encouraged to do so, and the work expedited without our quarrelling as to who shall have jurisdiction. There must be some way of doing it and a right way. I am free to make an acknowledgement on behalf of this parliament, as to its past sins because I was not here. I am free to admit that in my opinion Dominion legislation has been given to enterprises that might well have remained under provincial jurisdiction. I

am free to admit that; but if there was ever a road propelled by electricity that was entitled to federal legislation, this road now under consideration is one. I am not discussing for a moment the legal aspect, I know the force of the objection raised by hon. gentlemen as to passing an Act of parliament confirming a legal decision. I am not discussing that; but if there be force in that it would be one reason, small or great as we look at it. Some people have said this road is under Dominion jurisdiction per se by a certain court decision. I will not argue that, that is one reason small or great according to the point of view.

There is another reason, that is the international character of the road. Some hon. gentlemen say that is only advanced as an excuse to get the road under Dominion jurisdiction. I cannot bring myself to the point of believing that any person comes to this House seriously and presents a Bill not in good faith. I am prepared to take hon. gentlemen who discuss these matters and gentlemen outside the House who present these Bills as acting in good faith with us as fellow-citizens. That is another reason. If these two reasons do not weigh, I offer the opinion, humble as it may be, that the functions which this road will perform and the character of the road itself entitle it to Dominion jurisdiction. Originally these electric roads were run along the highways, they were built with a light rail, with a comparatively inferior car, not carrying freight to any extent; and these roads were the creatures to a certain extent of the municipalities, because they had to run along the highways, and had to get agreements with the municipalities. They were not well graded but were cheap roads, running up and down hill, with comparatively cheap rolling stock. I find that this road is altogether different. For almost its entire length it has its own right of way purchased; it will have an 80-pound rail equal to the rail on the great transcontinental roads. It has heavy rolling stock that can be exchanged with the rolling stock on the other great lines. In that connection it is a through road and its equipment and all these things must come under Dominion jurisdiction.

As to the question of rates, it is estimated that this road will expend $3,000,000 in its terminals and its entry into the city of Toronto. That takes it altogether out of the region of the ordinary electric road that runs along a highway and spends a few thousand dollars in its equipment. Does not that put it under a different classification? As to the rate mentioned, if this road is to perform the function of a Dominion road, if it is to have the rolling stock necessary, if it is to carry passengers like the other great roads, why is it not entitled to come under the jurisdiction of the Railway Board of Canada which can say, after thoroughly investigating the matter itself, because of the character of the road and the duty it performs, that the rates it shall charge both for freight and passengers, shall be the same as those charged on a like road which is not run by electricity?

Now, Sir, there is another question which my hon. friend raised that I think ought to be referred to. The Ontario government and this government has been discussing this question back and forth and I tell the House frankly that both sides are honestly endeavouring to come to some arrangement which will obviate any friction. This identical Bill has not been made the fighting ground for negotiations. It could not be made the fighting ground for negotiations between the governments because these negotiations will be of a far wider character than anything that is contained in this Bill. Possibly this Bill would not come under any arrangement that we would arrive at. But, the provincial government made certain suggestions. I could not agree with these suggestions. I am not at liberty, through courtesy, to tell the House what these suggestions were as the negotiations are still proceeding. We have in turn submitted a memorandum to the Ontario government. I can tell my hon. friend from Centre Toronto that, leaving out this Bill altogether, a great deal of the difficulties that he perceives as to what may happen as to a lot of small and purely provincial roads and street railways being brought under Dominion jurisdiction, if we come to an arrangement between the two governments may not be encountered and that may be his fears will be altogether groundless. Further than that I dare not go at the present time. This is not a government Bill. I am merely expressing the opinion I have formed on this Bill after studying it for hours. I believe this company is entitled to legislation at the hands of this House. I am firmly of the opinion that it cannot get the legislation that it requires from any other source than from the federal parliament.

Mr. BRISTOL. I do not want to delay this discussion merely for the purpose of discussing the Bill but I do not think I have heard, and I have listened very attentively to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, any statement as regards the policy I was endeavouring to suggest as a fair and reasonable policy upon which legislation of this kind should be granted. If an electric railway—and I am not using the word 'electric' in any special sense—but a railway of this character gets its powers from a province, I take it that it is essentially a railway which the province declares to be a local work and undertaking; therefore it cannot be said that it is not a provincial railway, and it cannot have any special object in coming here. The mere fact that it is going to expend $2.000.000 or $3.000,000 in terminals in the city of Toronto is no reason why we should grant it legislation.

Terminals in New York and other cities are provided at the cost of a great many millions of dollars. The only ground that the hon. gentleman suggested in regard to which there was doubt on the question of local jurisdiction was one which he said he declined to argue. The fact of a railway of this character being extensive and covering all parts of the province is no ground in the world for coming to this parliament for legislation. Why ?—because the powers of these companies are got from the local legislature and they can get legislation there as they are within the limit of the province. Upon what principle should we adopt this Bill? The only principle upon which we could adopt this Bill is that the company needs federal powers and I would say to that extent we should give it power, but not otherwise. Hon. gentlemen talk about agreements with provinces, but the question I am trying to argue is a question that has been long ago settled by the British North America Act which left this local work to the provinces. It gets its charter from the province and it can get its legislation from the province. If it is that it wants to cross the Niagara or the Detroit river that will not enter into the principle at all.

Mr. HARTY. How do you place your securities ?

Mr. BRISTOL. I will not object to giving it power to cross these rivers.

Mr. HARTY. You divide the jurisdiction and you make the bonds sell for less money.

Mr. BRISTOL. I do not want to repeat my argument to the hon. member for Kingston because I know he does not need it and I think that this question of divided jurisdiction is perfectly well understood. I think that we might as well place a street railway under Dominion jurisdiction because passengers get off a street car and get on to the cars of the Grand Trunk or Canadian Pacific Railways. But, they have dealt with this question in the Railway Act all through. Parliament has said that where a provincial road crosses a Dominion road only in so far as the crossing is concerned shall it be subject to the jurisdiction of this parliament.

Mr. CONMEE. Pardon me.

Mr. BRISTOL. Let finish my statement.

Mr. CONMEE. I want to ask the hon. gentleman a question.

Mr. BRISTOL. I object to the question until I finish my sentence.

Mr. CONMEE. I merely want to put the hon. gentleman right.

Mr. BRISTOL. I will let him put me right as soon as I finish my sentence.

Mr. CONMEE. All right.

Mr. BRISTOL. I say that parliament has, by the general Railway Act, declared that a local work or undertaking which crosses a Dominion railway only becomes subject to the Railway Act of Canada in so far as a crossing is concerned. Why should that principle be different or cause any trouble if you simply give this company power to cross the Niagara or Detroit rivers if it chooses to do so? If my hon. friend wants to ask me a question I will give him an opportunity to do so.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentleman, I remember, made the statement in the Railway Committee, and he has stated it here several times that the Railway Act provides that where another railway——

Mr. BRISTOL. Local railway.

Mr. CONMEE. Local railway crosses a Dominion road it becomes a Dominion railway as far as that crossing is concerned.

Mr. BRISTOL. Under Dominion legislation.

Mr. CONMEE. At the crossing only ?

Mr. BRISTOL. Yes.

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend is wrong. The word 'only' is not there. The section has not any such meaning as that.

Mr. BRISTOL. The hon. gentleman is dealing with the Railway Act of 1888. It certainly is just as he says, but I am talking of the present Railway Act—the Act of 1906. The hon. gentleman is qute right as regards section 306 of the Act of 1888.

Mr. CONMEE. Does the hon. gentleman pretend that the Act of 1888 which was passed by this parliament and which brought local roads under the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada by reason of connections and crossings has been changed by subsequent legislation ?

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, by the Act of 1903.

Mr. CONMEE. I would like some hon. gentleman to show that.

Mr. LANCASTER. The statute that we passed in 1903 does what the hon. gentleman says he wants to know about. I will read the whole section. It shows distinctly that that was the purpose and although the word 'only' is not in the section the meaning is quite clearly stated.

Mr. CONMEE. There are some gentlemen who can read any meaning into a statute.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think the hon. gentleman who is asking the question is perhaps one of them. Perhaps he has been looking in a mirror and fancies others are like himself. I will read section 8 :

Every railway, steam or electric street railway or tramway, the construction or opera-

tion of which is authorized by special Act of the legislature of any province, and which connects with or crosses or may hereafter connect with or cross any railway within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, shall although not declared by parliament to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, be subject to the provisions of this Act relating to:

(a) The connection or crossing of one railway or tramway with or or by another, so far as concerns the aforesaid connection or crossing.

(b) The through traffic upon a railway or tramway and all matters appertaining thereto.

(c) Criminal matters, including offences and penalties; and

(d) Navigable waters.

We have here in section 8 an enactment saying how far and how far only these railways shall be connecting or crossing under this Act, and it is as plain as it can be that it is for these purposes only they are under the Act.

Mr. BRISTOL. That Act was not in force in 1897, and I am not claiming it was.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the point.

Mr. BRISTOL. I have too much respect for the feelings of my hon. friend to go into a long argument on that point. But I want to get some expression from the minister of his view on the question of policy. I am trying hard to argue as a matter of principle that the money expended, or the function, or whether it is run by steam or electricity, has nothing to do with the question. If it has its charter from the province as a local undertaking the principle we should adopt is the public welfare first, and for that reason only should we assume jurisdiction. As a matter of public welfare I argue that it is better now and in the future to leave railways which do local work as far as possible in the hands of the province which brought them into existence, and if they have outgrown their clothes and want to go outside of the province, we will look after them to that extent only, and the Railway Act does that to-day .

Mr. CONMEE. I cannot agree with the learned gentlemen opposite that this Act wipes out the legislation of 1883. There is nothing in the Act which repeals the previous legislation.

Mr. LANCASTER. It says: 'Which does or hereafter may.' The words 'which does' are surplusage if it does not mean roads which were then doing it.

Mr. CONMEE. After the passage of the legislation of 1883 was there not an action arose where a man got hurt and it was claimed that the provincial courts had no jurisdiction as the road was for the general advantage of Canada?

Mr. LANCASTER. Because it had a special Act of parliament afterwards.

Mr. CONMEE. I do not so understand it.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is so, and it makes all the difference.

Mr. CONMEE. I have heard some pretty good lawyers for whose opinion I had respect, Sir Oliver Mowat and Christopher Fraser, discuss the question in the legislature, and the hon. gentleman will find if he looks back far enough that this enactment was because of the very fact that these doubts did arise. It was not that this parliament had not jurisdiction to declare a road for the general advantage of Canada by reason of its crossing a Dominion road, but that these minor details which are enumerated were not covered by the previous legislation.

Mr. LANCASTER. If these railways were under the jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament that section would not apply to them. It applies to roads which are provincial in their character. If they were works for the general advantage of Canada they would be under the jurisdiction of this Act for all purposes, and it is only because they are not works for the general advantage of Canada that we say they should be under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission for these purposes.

Mr. CONMEE. Was that dealt with previously by any legislation ?

Mr. LANCASTER. In 1903 we said that these provincial railways should become subject to the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission for the purposes enumerated in that section and for these purposes only.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentleman stated that the legislation of 1893 wiped out the legislation of 1883.

Mr. LANCASTER. I did not put it as broadly as that.

Mr. CONMEE. We have the opinion of the Minister of Justice, the guiding legal mind of this House to say that we cannot divest ourselves of the power which we took in 1903.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is a different thing altogether.

Mr. CONMEE. I say that the one Act is an elaboration of the other and to make the other more clear.

Mr. BRISTOL. It is conceded that if we once have legally declared that a railway comes under federal jurisdiction, it is here to stay. The legislation shows that on this question of through traffic and crossings we have exercised a divided jurisdiction, and I was arguing by analogy that you could do the same thing with the bridge at Niagara or the ferry at Detroit. This

railway comes to us and says it has doubts whether it is under the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada or not, and it wants this parliament to declare that it is. Well, that is not one of our functions in this parliament; that is a question that we have power to refer to our friends in the supreme court to let them decide. If the supreme court decides this railway is under our jurisdiction, the argument is concluded; if the Supreme Court says it is not, it is a question of policy, and as a question of policy I have been urging that we should not bring them under the jurisdiction except so far as it is necessary in the public interest.

On section 4,

Mr. BRISTOL. I might say, in order to avoid repetition, that the same objections which I have taken to section 3 I wish to be considered as taken to the Bill from beginning to end.

Mr. GRAHAM. The agreement with Toronto is all right?

Mr. BRISTOL. I am arguing from a provincial standpoint, as a matter of public policy.

On section 10,

Mr. HENDERSON. I have given notice of an amendment which I propose to move to this section. The section provides:

Nothing in this Act contained, or done under or by virtue of the powers hereby granted, shall alter or affect the provisions contained in any by-law of any municipality heretofore passed relating to the company, or to any portion of the company's railway heretofore or hereafter constructed, or contained in any agreement between any municipality and the company; but all such agreements and by-laws shall continue and remain in full force as between the municipality and the company as continued and incorporated by this Act; and in case of any inconsistency between the provisions contained in any such by-law or agreement and the provisions of the Railway Act, the provisions contained in the by-law or agreement shall prevail, and all such by-laws and agreements and all rights, franchises, privileges and exemptions of the company thereunder are hereby confirmed.

The question has been raised whether or not an agreement made between a railway company which is declared to be for the general advantage of Canada and a municipality, can be enforced, or whether there may be difficulty in enforcing such an agreement; and in order to make it more binding upon the company to observe the agreements and by-laws made with the different municipalities, I propose to move an amendment which would penalize the company if it failed to give effect to these by-laws and agreements. I may say that I have in my hands copies of by-laws and agreements made between the Hamilton Electric Railway Company and the village of Burlington and also the town of Oakville in the county of Halton. I am informed that the township of Nelson and the township of Trafalgar in that county also have agreements of a somewhat similar character. My desire is to provide beyond all doubt that these municipalities shall get all the benefits that accrue to them under these by-laws and agreements, even although the railway is declared to be a railway for the general advantage of Canada, assuming that prior to this it was not so. These agreements bear on different matters. I shall enumerate only a few. For instance, in the Burlington by-law provision is made that the railway company should run at least six passenger trains a day between the city of Hamilton and the village of Burlington, that it should run an early train about six o'clock in the morning; provisions with regard to the construction of sewers; provision that cars should stop at certain places, that the company should make certain street repairs, that it should remove snow and ice on certain conditions; provisions with regard to the running rates, whether four miles an hour or less, in the village; provisions with regard to the price of tickets, that from Burlington to Burlington canal the price should not exceed five cents, and from Burlington to the city of Hamilton and return not more than twenty-five cents; provision that the company was to employ careful conductors, and other provisions. In Oakville the company was to macadamize certain streets, pay certain damages, carry school pupils at a special rate from such places as Bronté and other points east of Oakville, the cars were to have certain headlights, and in Oakville they were to have a limited rate of speed. What I desire is to make sure that the company will carry out these agreements with the different municipalities, and I propose to penalize the company if it fails to do so. If the company carries out the agreements which it has made with these municipalities no harm can possibly come to it from my amendment; therefore I contend that I am not doing an injury to the company. At the same time, it would satisfy the people of the county who have given certain privileges to this railway company. With this provision I want to see this railway constructed from the city of Hamilton to the city of Toronto; I do not wish to block it in any way. I therefore beg to move, seconded by Mr. Blain:

That the following proviso be added to section 10 of the said Bill:

Provided that in the event of the company at any time failing to conform to, or carry out any of the provisions contained in any such by-laws or agreements as are herein referred to, or as may be hereafter made between the said company and any municipality, then the powers of operation granted to the company, or vested therein, shall cease and be null and void, so long as said company fails

to conform to or carry out such provisions as aforesaid.

Mr. CLARKE. This section was very carefully considered by the committee, and the committee were of the opinion that the amendment was one which ought not to be inserted in the Bill ; and if my hon. friend will consider the amendment he proposes, in view of the paragraphs of the agreement which he has pointed out, I think he will find that the amendment would really defeat the object he has in view. For instance, one of the provisions is that the cars shall run six times within a certain length of time. Suppose there is a default in that provision ; his amendment is that if they do not run six times within that time, then their right to operate shall be null and void so long as they fail to perform that agreement ; that is, they would have no right to run the cars at all so long as they do not run them at that rate. That would be the effect of his amendment. I quite appreciate the desire of these municipalities to have the agreements carried out, but it seems to me that this amendment would seriously affect the powers of the company. Suppose anything should happen, it is always a matter of doubt whether there has been a breach of the agreement or not. The municipality may say there has been and the company may say there has not. Who is to determine whether or not the power of operation will cease ? The dispute will have to come before a court or some commission, and this amendment would lead to great confusion. Because of a dispute with one municipality, this road, which will affect a great many other municipalities, would have to suspend operating, and consequently the amendment proposed would not carry out what is desired. Either the powers already given are ample, or if not, there ought to be a general amendment applicable to all railways and which would affect all municipalities. Last year this clause 10 was offered to meet the views of the municipalities with which agreements had been made, and I understood it was satisfactory to them. Should there be a breach as regards the selling of tickets, surely, if there be no remedy in the Railway Commission, there is always a remedy to be found in the courts, and I do not think that the running of the road should cease on account of that dispute.

Mr. BLAIN. Does clause 10 cover the point suggested by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson).

Mr. CLARKE. I think it absolutely confirms all agreements that have been made. If there is a breach, there is a proper remedy, and it would be dangerous for us to say that the remedy should be the tieing up of the service to all the people because of a dispute with some particular municipality.

Mr. HENDERSON. The illustration given by the hon. gentleman is not a very happy one. In one of the by-laws, the provision is made that the company shall run trains, say from Burlington to Hamilton, six times a day every day. If they run a train five times a day, that would be undoubtedly a breach of the agreement.

Mr. CLARKE. Then you would compel it to stop running?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, until they run six times a day. If they run six times a day they are keeping up to their agreement. The breach then would be healed. There is only a breach so long as they fail to conform with their agreement. The same may be said with regard to the railway fares. There is a provision made for the carrying of school children at reduced rates, quite under 2 cents a mile. Should they exact a higher rate, that would be certainly a breach of the agreement, and they would have no right to run under their charter unless they ceased to charge the extra price.

Mr. CLARKE. Would the hon. gentleman favour the tieing up of the road and depriving all the people of its use just because there is a dispute as to whether or not the tickets are sold at proper fares? I know a railway in Essex which had a dispute before the Railway Commission as to whether or not certain pupils of a certain age came within the privileged fare. Such a dispute might arise, and you would deprive the whole public of the use of the road because the company in good faith insisted on what they considered their rights.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have no desire to block the road or to prevent it running. My desire is to see it built from Hamilton to Toronto, and I do not want at all to interfere with its operation. But the people in my county are apprehensive. They have certain agreements with that company, and say the company have not lived up to them, and this is the only way I could suggest to force it to comply with them. So long as the company lives up to its other agreements there is no danger of their power of operating being interfered with.

Mr. TAYLOR. Might I suggest that as the Bill has to stand over for clauses one and two, this clause should also stand over and let the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. GRAHAM. These clauses are not objectionable at all except this one. If we could clear up all the clauses except this one or two and adopt the others, we would make some progress. The question of railways being obliged to carry out their agreements and of providing some machinery for specific performance of their con-

tract, is a large one. I am inclined to think that while my hon. friend's object is good, his method of carrying it out would not be effective. That was threshed out in the Railway Committee, and it was finally decided that that would not be a good remedy. My hon. friend can be assured of this, that when the clauses amending the Railway Act are introduced, he will, I think, see one that will provide so far as is practicable, for the cases he suggests.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have no knowledge of what is in the mind of the Minister of Railways and of what provisions will be in his promised Bill. They may meet my approval and they may not, and my constituents want a safeguard of this kind, and it is better to be safe than sorry. I am willing to leave it to the committee to say whether this provision should be put into the Bill or not. True the committee is a small one, but I have no doubt it will do what is right and proper, and if the committee decides that this is a fair amendment I shall feel grateful.

Mr. CONMEE. I would ask the hon. member if he does not think the point he has raised is fairly well covered by section 10. That keeps alive all by-laws of the municipalities; it keeps in force all agreements as between the municipalities and the company. The company, if I understand that clause correctly, will not be in a worse position after the Bill is passed than it would be if the Bill was never passed.

Mr. HENDERSON. I quite understand that the intention of clause 10 is to keep in force all these agreements. But I want, beyond all doubt, to see that they are enforced, and I know of no better way than to say: If you do not live up to your agreement, you must lose your powers.

Mr. CONMEE. You want to put a new obligation on them.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think the company would allow themselves to get into default—they would have too much at stake. I noticed the other day an article on this resolution, I think in the Brantford 'Courier,' commending it as a splendid amendment, and stating that it was one that ought to be included in all railway charters. I do not know whether the Minister of Railways in the new legislation he proposes, will include it or not. But he will see that some of those outside this House regard it as a fair provision. As I said, if the committee think this a proper amendment, I should feel grateful; if they think it not a fair amendment, I must abide the consequences.

Amendment (Mr. Henderson) negatived.

On section 12,

The company may, subject to the provisions of sections 361, 362 and 363 of the Railway Act, enter into any agreement or agreements, for any of the purposes mentioned in the said section 361, with the Brantford and Hamilton Electric Railway Company and the Hamilton and Dundas Street Railway Company, or either of them; but it shall not, without the consent of the council of the city of Hamilton expressed by by-law, enter into an agreement or agreements for any of the said purposes with the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railway Company, the Hamilton Street Railway Company, or any other street railway company whose railway may be constructed or operated in the said city of Hamilton.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have an amendment here of which I gave notice three or four days ago, and which is to be found in the Votes and Proceedings. I move that amendment as follows:

To amend section 12 of said Bill by adding after the word 'with' in the fourth line of the said section 'the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railway Company,' and by striking out the words 'the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Company.' in the ninth and tenth lines of the said section.

We discussed this shortly in the committee just before adjournment on the day we reported the Bill. We did not vote upon it. I did not actually put the amendment before the chair, but I discussed the principle. But we were anxious to report the Bill as we had been several days upon it. If the clause were passed as proposed, the effect would be that the city of Hamilton could prevent this road from amalgamating with the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railway. I am one of those who support this Bill, and I do it because the railway is to run to the Niagara river and the Detroit river, and I believe that we should not have two capitalizations for the same company, and as the extension would make at least part of the railway a Dominion road, it is better to have it all under one jurisdiction. Now, for twenty-one miles from Hamilton, the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railway runs toward the Niagara river, within half a mile, or a mile at most, of the line over which this railway must build from Hamilton through the city of St. Catharines. This Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville road runs within twelve miles or St. Catharines. The ordinary way of dealing with this road would be to provide that the present railway might amalgamate with it and save twenty-one miles of building, subject, of course, to the consent of the Railway Commission. There is no reason why the city of Hamilton should have the say as to whether this amalgamation should take place or not. I do not wish to interfere with Hamilton, and section 5 of the Bill provides everything for the protection of that city within its proper limits. But there is no reason why the city of Hamilton should be able to say to the counties of Lincoln and Wentworth: This city must be

the judge of whether amalgamation shall take place between these two electric railways which run far beyond the limits of the city. If Hamilton were to prevent this amalgamation, it would mean that this road would have to parallel that of the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Railway or might be compelled otherwise to submit to most unreasonable terms. They would parallel each other within half a mile or a mile at the most through that territory. If they are given that right in this Bill that city would have such a power in the matter that they could dictate to this railway the most undesirable terms.

As the Prime Minister stated, we are here passing legislation in the interests of the people. Surely here is an objection from the people's standpoint. We want the railway constructed and surely it is not in the interests of the people that the city of Hamilton should be allowed to usurp the powers conferred on the Railway Commission by sections 361, 362 and 363 of the Railway Act to prevent the amalgamation of these roads in this fruit district. If Hamilton has any valid objection the city could state it before the Railway Commission in the ordinary way and no one would suggest that the city would not be given justice by the commission. The city under this bill could prevent the road from building to St. Catharines and the Niagara boundary. My amendment, if it carries, even if there was an agreement, between the city of Hamilton and the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville road, would save the duplication of twenty-one miles of track that has been operated for years; and if such an amalgamation should be proposed, the city could go before the Railway Commission, present their argument and take care that the amalgamation shall not affect any right of the city of Hamilton. It is not proper that this road should be treated as if it were a street railway in the city of Hamilton and made subject to the arbitrary power of that city.

Mr. CONMEE. How far does the amendment go? Does it go beyond merely providing the machinery, leaving it to the parties to agree as to the amalgamation ?

Mr. LANCASTER. Under my amendment, sections 361, 362 and 363, of the Railway Act would apply to the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville road, while the Bill as it at present stands would not.

Mr. CONMEE. Does the agreement force them to amalgamate or does it leave it to them ?

Mr. LANCASTER. Oh no, it does not force them. The section as amended would read :

The company may, subject to the provisions of sections 361, 362 and 363 of the Railway Act, enter into any agreement or agreements, for any of the purposes mentioned in the said section 361, with the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railway, Brantford and Hamilton Electric Railway Company and the Hamilton and Dundas Street Railway Company, or either of them.

These latter two roads are already mentioned in the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. And strike out the balance of the section.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is the last part to which I object :

But it shall not, without the consent of the council of the city of Hamilton expressed by by-law, enter into agreement or agreements for any of the said purposes with the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railway Company, the Hamilton Street Railway Company, or any other street railway company whose railway may be constructed or operated in the said city of Hamilton.

Mr. CONMEE. Suppose your amendment carries and an amalgamation takes place, I understand that this railway is, under the by-laws of Hamilton or agreements, not allowed to do a street railway business within the limits of the city of Hamilton. Would they by this amendment acquire that right?

Mr. LANCASTER. No, they have to make their agreement and to make it subject to the Railway Commission.

Mr. CONMEE. I agree that Hamilton ought not to have power outside of the city but would they have that power ? Hamilton has a right to protect itself and I want to find out how you propose to give them that protection.

Mr. LANCASTER. In the first place section 5 of this very Bill deals with some rights of the city of Hamilton; if it has any other rights not covered by section 5, they are protected by the general amendment discussed here to-night which preserves all the rights of municipalities under agreements or by-laws which shall remain in force. What would be the position ? The worst that could happen to the road would be that the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville road would make an arrangement, which this company would be willing to make because they would save the building of 21 miles of unnecessary road and would go to the Railway Commission and would ask for ratification. The Railway Commission in such a case would fully protect the rights of the city of Hamilton. There is a general clause in this Bill that any agreements they make are to be held absolutely binding. That general clause applies to all municipalities, in addition to the clause which specially protects Hamilton.

Mr. HAGGART. Agreements made in the future or in the past ?

Mr. LANCASTER. In the past.

Mr. CONMEE. I understand that there is an agreement ?

Mr. BARKER. Yes, certainly.

Mr. LANCASTER. I understand there is too.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. member is making the point that if the amendment carries, Hamilton would still be protected, because the Railway Commission in all reason would treat the city with justice.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman is asking something that the company never asked or applied for in this Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is no reason.

Mr. BARKER. You are trying to stick into a private Bill something of which the company never gave notice of application. The company did not ask it, the other company did not ask for it, it is the hon. gentleman, who has nothing to do with it, who asks it. This is a private Bill. The city of Hamilton gave the Grimsby road privileges that it would not give to this company, and yet the hon. gentleman, without understanding the situation or knowing anything about it——

Mr. LANCASTER. Oh I know all about it.

Mr. BARKER. You have no interest in it.

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, I have more than the city of Hamilton.

Mr. BARKER. The Hamilton and Grimsby road have a contract with Hamilton which the city would not give to the company that is applying here; and yet the hon. member says: Give it to them and you can enforce the agreement. That you could not do. The hon. member is seeking without notice to anybody to force on the city of Hamilton and on this company something that was never asked for at all. If that is the way that legislation is to go on here some gentleman might ask that any other company might be stuck into this and apply all the provisions of this Bill to it. These provisions are not drawn by either party with the view to amalgamation with the Grimsby road. The city of Hamilton would not grant to this company which is applying for this Bill privileges that it did once give to the Grimsby road.

Mr. CONMEE. Wherein would Hamilton be prejudiced if the hon. gentleman's motion carried?

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman want the agreement turned over to this company?

Mr. LANCASTER. All I want is that if you do make an agreement it shall be done by the Railway Commission.

Mr. BARKER. He is asking that the agreement which has been made with the Grimsby road shall be turned over to this company.

Mr. CONMEE.

Mr. LANCASTER. No.

Mr. BARKER. That is it if you amalgamate.

Mr. LANCASTER. You cannot amalgamate without you are granted the power to do so.

Mr. BARKER. If you give this company that is applying for this Bill the power to unite with the Grimsby company, and it does, it at once acquires for ever all that was once given to the Grimsby road, which the city would never agree to, and that is why this company, in agreeing with the city of Hamilton, expressly excluded this privilege.

Mr. LANCASTER. My hon. friend has not heard what I said. I am saying in my amendment that if these two railways do make an agreement it shall be subject to the control of the railway commission. If the hon. gentleman had not put this last clause in his Bill there might be some merit in his argument, but he has put in the Bill that if they do make an agreement the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission shall be ousted and the city of Hamilton shall be sole judge as to whether the agreement is good or not. Where is there any authority for any city coming and saying that it should oust the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission? He does not want this amendment because the company has not asked for it. Are we chartering railway companies because they want to be chartered or are we chartering them because the country wants them chartered? Surely the hon. gentleman will not say because the city of Hamilton does not choose to agree upon the Bill all precedents of this House must be set aside and that 214 members of this House shall have nothing to say as to the reasonableness or propriety of this legislation? The hon. gentleman is afraid that some agreement might be made between these two companies which would be violating an agreement with the city of Hamilton. He is afraid that a mile or a mile and a half of this road might be affected and he is willing to throw away the benefits of 21 miles by putting it all under such agreement. But it should not be forgotten that no agreement that these people could make could possibly have any effect except it received the sanction of the Railway Commission and of the Governor in Council. The Railway Commissioners can only recommend it and they have to go to the Governor in Council with the recommendation of the Railway Commissioners before the amalgamation of the two companies can have any effect. Would my hon. friend say that the Governor in Council is going to order that a wrong agreement be made and is not going to protect the city of Hamilton or that the Railway Commissioners are going to recommend to the Governor in Coun-

cil to deliberately throw away the rights of the city of Hamilton? If the hon. gentleman's arrangement is carried out all I can say is that, the city having absolute power, can wantonly and without any good reason say we will not allow these companies to amalgamate. The Bill says that no matter how much the amalgamation may be to the benefit of the country it shall be of no effect except the city of Hamilton permits it. But has the city of Hamilton the right to usurp the powers of the Railway Commission? Surely the hon. gentleman can trust the Railway Commission to recommend to the Governor in Council not to allow the amalgamation to have any effect if Hamilton is going to be hurt by such an amalgamation. If they fully protect the rights of the municipalities then the ordinary provisions of sections 361, 362 and 363 shall apply to these two companies. The stock of the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railways is owned by the people who are building this road. My hon. friend says the company have not asked for it. What was said in the Railway Committee? They said that the only reason why they did not like my amendment was that they were bound in honour not to ask for it. The promoters of this road would like to have this amalgamation if it were properly made, but they said that the city of Hamilton would not agree except it was removed from the Railway Commissioners. Hon. gentlemen who advocated this Bill in the Railway Committee were honourable men. Colonel Gibson, who was one of the promoters of the Bill, frankly and honestly said not that my amendment was not the right one, but that it would be showing bad faith towards the city of Hamilton who had received the pledge of the promoters not to amalgamate with the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville road without their consent.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am astonished at the argument of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). We have listened to the hon. member for Lincoln for hours and hours at a time pleading for provincial and municipal jurisdiction. Now he comes to this House and asks this committee to deliberately break an agreement that was entered into between this company and the city of Hamilton.

Mr. LANCASTER. No.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I beg your pardon, that is just what you are asking to-day. The promoter of this Bill, Lt.-Colonel Gibson, was before the committee when this amendment was moved by the hon. member for Lincoln, and Lt.-Colonel Gibson positively declined to accept it. He said it would be breaking faith with the city of Hamilton.

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, if it is this agreement it is certainly. I objected to the making of the agreement.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I for one, as a representative of the city of Hamilton, ask this committee to vote that amendment down. I have a letter here from the city solicitor of Hamilton. I will not read it all as it is not necessary :

Should the Radial be allowed to amalgamate with the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Railway Company a system of street railways could be operated in the city of Hamilton by the Radial Company, irrespective of the Hamilton Street Railway Company, and the city of Hamilton would have an additional street railway system under the Dominion jurisdiction (for the general advantage of Canada) which company would operate on the streets of our city without paying any percentage to the city corporation.

I desire to impress upon you the fact that the provision in section 10 respecting the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railway Company was inserted in the Bill pursuant to an agreement between the Radial Company and the city of Hamilton, the object being to safeguard the city of Hamilton in the operation of street railways in the city.

Mr. LANCASTER. At the expense of the whole Niagara district.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Not at the expense of any person, but to meet the wish of the city of Hamilton. This is a solemn agreement between the railway company and the city of Hamilton. The railway company has not asked it and the city of Hamilton has not asked for this amendment.

Mr. BARKER. Neither has the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Nor as the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Railway Company. I may say further to my hon friend that this Bill provides that the connection to be made with the radial railway shall be at the corner of Birch avenue and Wilson street, and consequently it is the intention of this company to build a through line on a different basis entirely from the lines of the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville.

Mr. LANCASTER. My amendment does not hurt you there.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I must ask the committee to keep faith in this matter with the city of Hamilton.

Mr. LENNOX. This is a matter of such importance that we ought to be very cool about it and we ought to have a larger attendance of members to deal with it than we have to-night. I have never before seen in a Bill a provision such as this—that we shall allow any city or any municipality to control the general policy of the Railway Act and that is what we are doing here. If Hamilton has rights which should be re-

spected and which would make it improper that we should authorize an amalgamation between the Grimsby railway and this road we are chartering, we should know exactly what that agreement is ; we should consider the effect of that agreement and define clearly what the rights of Hamilton are. We should not allow the city of Hamilton, or any other city to say hereafter that although this parliament says that there may be amalgamation between certain lines, that amalgamation shall not take place unless the city sees fit to allow it. We are discharging our duty now and if there is to be any qualification engrafted on this legislation so as to protect the rights of Hamilton under this agreement, let us know what the agreement is, so that we may respect those rights ; or, otherwise leave it to what has been said to be the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. But it is not the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission ; it is the jurisdiction of the Governor in Council as the board can only make a recommendation, and so you have the cabinet as a protection for the rights of Hamilton.

Mr. BARKER. How would the hon. gentleman like it for St. Catharines ?

Mr LANCASTER. I would not be so unreasonable as to attempt any such thing in this House ; no one but a man from Hamilton would either.

Mr. LENNOX. We have been arguing ourselves hoarse about protecting the rights of municipalities and respecting the bargains they have made. We can go too far in that because if the municipality of Hamilton is to control the rights which shall be exercised by a railway through the county of Wentworth you can see at once it is unfair. We say in section 10 that the agreement entered into by the municipality shall be respected and where there is a conflict, and in case of any inconsistency between the provisions of any such by-law or agreement and the provisions of the Railway Act, the provisions of the by-law or agreement shall prevail. If we enact that we are doing something that is pretty far reaching. We are saying that if any municipality has contracted for rights with this railway beyond its own boundary its by-laws and agreements are to prevail ; and in that we are going too far with regard to the rights of municipalities. It is not right that we should indicate in this Bill that the city of Hamilton should have the right to say whether or not these railways should amalgamate. As regards the Hamilton street railway there is no question raised, but the question is raised on behalf of the Grimsby railway and I say the first point to consider is : what are the rights of a municipality through which a railway runs ? And the policy of the government is this : That inasmuch as rates must be paid for the carriage of goods in proportion to the cost of building a railway, we should not allow a duplication of a railway system if we can avoid it. It would be well to leave this over and consider it when we have a larger number of members present.

Mr. HAGGART. In my opinion the clause is a very harmless one. This Bill empowers the Radial Company to enter into an agreement with these roads but it does not empower the other companies to enter into an agreement with the radial road, and before they could do so they would have to go to the local government to get power. We have never given these companies power to amalgamate unless they have petitioned for that power.

Mr. LANCASTER. Have you ever passed legislation saying that if these companies want to amalgamate you won't let them amalgamate unless a certain city says so? That is what this section says.

Mr. HAGGART. We would not give the power to these other companies to amalgamate unless they petitioned and we are not giving them that power under this Act.

Mr. LANCASTER. The power amounts to nothing until they make their agreement.

Mr. HAGGART. I repeat that the clause is a harmless one. Perhaps the parties who are promoting the Bill have an understanding with these two companies that they intend to ask for power from the provincial government to amalgamate and that is the only way it can be done. The danger may be this : the railway company may say they have better means of entering the city of Hamilton, and if we make an arrangement with this company to amalgamate, this company may ask the power from the local government and may get it. That may be the difficulty ; but that particular clause of the Bill is perfectly harmless so far as the two other companies are concerned.

Mr. GRAHAM. After hearing the full explanation of my hon. friend the ex-minister, I see that his point is well taken. I think this provision is really harmless. I have a good deal of sympathy with the view of my hon. friend from Lincoln, and if I were carrying out my own personal view, I would not allow the city of Hamilton or the city of Toronto or any other municipality to make such an agreement ; but as the cities of Hamilton and Toronto think that by some back door we might give a road the right to run over their streets without their making the bargain themselves, we desire to meet their objection and not violate an agreement made between the company and those two cities. I think no harm and perhaps no good can come from leaving the arrangement as it is. We have left the Toronto agreement as it is, and we might do the same with regard to the Hamilton agreement.

Mr. LANCASTER. While the hon. minister relies on the agreement of the ex-minister, the hon. gentleman has taken care to say that he will not discuss the very vice of the section which is that no matter who may want this thing done, we will not let it be done unless the city of Hamilton says it may be done.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. minister says that the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is probably right, that this section is harmless ; but it is not, for this reason. The hon. member for South Lanark pointed out that although we give certain railways power to amalgamate with certain other railways, that is ineffectual until these other railways get power from the local legislature to amalgamate. That is quite true. One party is bound first to make the application. But we give this railway company power under the Railway Act to amalgamate with certain named railways ; but we say that so far as the Hamilton and Grimsby Railway Company is concerned, it shall not amalgamate unless the city of Hamilton consents. The Minister of Railways will see that here is where the hon. member for South Lanark does not meet the point ; that when this Hamilton and Grimsby Railway Company applies to the legislature and gets power to amalgamate, then there is power from this parliament and from the local legislature, but they are confronted with this difficulty, that on the face of this statute it is provided that they shall not amalgamate except with the consent of the city of Hamilton, and that blocks the way. So that the argument of the hon. member for South Lanark does not meet the difficulty, in fact he admittedly evaded it, saying that he was not dealing with that branch of the question. So I submit to the minister that although this side does sometimes help him over difficulties, the hon. member for South Lanark has not on this occasion helped him.

Mr. GRAHAM. Then I will have to withdraw my confidence.

Mr. LANCASTER. On the minister's own argument, the latter part of my amendment should prevail. We should not put in a clause saying that no matter what people want in the future, it shall never be done unless the city of Hamilton consents to it. By this Bill the city of Hamilton is protected in all the rights that its advocates in this committee are arguing for. It is also protected by the Railway Commission, who will not make any recommendation without hearing it ; and it is protected by the Governor in Council, who will not act on the recommendation of the Railway Commission if it would cheat the city of Hamilton out of any of its rights. This road runs for nearly twenty miles before it touches the city of Hamilton, and you would prevent it amalgamating for those twenty miles entirely out of Hamilton's jurisdiction without the consent of Hamilton, because it runs for a mile or a mile and a half through the streets of Hamilton. The hon. junior member for Hamilton railed me because I have fought for several years for provincial rights. But I have not fought to enable the city of Hamilton to control Montreal ; I have fought for each locality to have the right to control itself and to mind its own business. The hon. gentleman is complaining that Hamilton's municipal rights are interfered with if it is not allowed to control the county of Wentworth and the Niagara district as well as itself. I shall divide the House on my amendment on the third reading if it is not carried in this committee. The city of Hamilton wants the chance to hold up these two railways for something for which it has no right to hold them up. If the words in the early part of the section do no harm, those in the latter part, which say that no amalgamation can be made, no matter who asks for it, unless the city of Hamilton assents thereto, do a lot of harm. The city of Hamilton has a right to be heard on any such application, but it has no right arbitrarily to say that because a mile or a mile and a half of this railway runs through the city, it will prevent it running the other twenty miles through the Niagara district.

Amendment negatived, and section 12 agreed to.

On section 13,

Mr. LENNOX. I would ask the minister to let that stand, as I have given notice of an amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM. What is the nature of the amendment ?

Mr. LENNOX. It is to make this section conform to the wording of several other sections in the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. There will be no departure from the principle of the section ?

Mr. LENNOX. No.

Section allowed to stand.

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. What business to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. Third reading of the French Treaty, Bill respecting co-operative societies, then the several resolutions on the Order Paper and after that Supply with the estimates of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur).

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 25, 1908.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Railway Act as respects the constitution of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. GRAHAM. The explanation is not very lengthy. This Bill is to provide for the enlargement of the Board of Railway Commissioners by three members, one of whom shall be called assistant chief commissioner and two of whom shall be members of the board.

Mr. SPROULE. The government has now a notice on the Order Paper to provide for the salaries of these commissioners, and I submit that this Bill cannot be introduced until that resolution is concurred in by the House.

Mr. GRAHAM. The resolution only deals with the salaries.

Mr. SPROULE. The Bill must be introduced by resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It stands.

THE RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Having the consent of His Excellency the Governor General, I wish to give notice that on Thursday next I will move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution :—

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Railway Act as respects the constitution of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, and to provide for the appointment of an assistant chief commissioner at a salary of $9,000 per annum, and of two additional commissioners at a salary of $8,000 per annum each.

Mr. SPROULE. Did I understand the minister to say he had not the assent of His Excellency.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He said he had.

Mr. BENNETT. And at the same time I give notice that I will move that the following words be added to the Bill :—

And that being a member of parliament or senator shall prove a disqualification to membership on such board.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask the government with respect to the Japanese as to whom habeas corpus proceedings have been taken in British Columbia, how it comes they obtained entrance into Canada in spite of the order in council recently passed by the government. And also, if it is intended to deport them, can they be deported in the face of the terms of the recent treaty with Japan.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I wish my hon. friend would give notice of his motion.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND SEED GRAIN.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (P.E.I.). I wish to make further inquiry with regard to the purchase of seed grain for the west from Prince Edward Island. I was told by the Minister of Agriculture yesterday that there was no agent appointed for Prince Edward Island but that the officials of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture had spread the information about this matter in Prince Edward Island. I can find no announcement of it in the island papers. nor do I know of any one who has been made cognizant of the arrangements under which the seed grain is to be bought, and whether it is to be bought by tender or otherwise. How was this information spread?

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend puts his inquiry in the regular form of a question it will give us an opportunity to get an answer to it.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I have heard that the purchase of 100,000 or 200,000 bushels of seed grain has been arranged for in Prince Edward Island. Is that true ?

Mr. OLIVER. The purchasing of grain is in the hands of Mr. Cassil, warehouse commissioner of the Trade and Commerce Department in Winnipeg, and we are not aware here, except from time to time as we get information from Mr. Cassil, as to what his transactions are. He has been attempting to purchase grain in Prince Edward Island, but at present I am not able to say to what extent he has been successful.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Has Mr. Cassil authority without any regulations from the department to act in the matter as he sees fit ?

Mr. OLIVER. The regulations which give authority to Mr. Cassil have been before parliament for about a month.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Well, I wish to know——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior when I may expect the return moved for about the 3rd of the present month with regard to colonization lands.

It is not a lengthy return and it should be brought down within a reasonable time.

Mr. OLIVER. I am unable off-hand to say, but I shall be able to tell the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

HORSE RACING ON SUNDAY.

Mr. PETER ELSON (East Middlesex). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice a question, and to make the question plain I would like to have the privilege of reading a short paragraph from a newspaper. It is headed 'Ice Racing on the Sabbath,' and is as follows :

At a special meeting this morning of the Methodist ministers of the city in conference with Rev. W. G. Hanna, of Toronto, provincial secretary of the Ontario branch of the Lord's Day Alliance, the question of prosecuting the parties engaged in holding an ice race meet on the Ottawa river yesterday, was fully discussed and action decided on.

Races, games and sporting practices were carried on there, it is alleged, in violation of the statute governing. Steps were taken yesterday to secure the names of the offending parties, one of whom is said to be a judge of one of the Quebec civil courts, and other evidence necessary to secure a conviction.

What I want to ask is this. Evidently horse racing and betting and gaming appear to have been carried on——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has merely the privilege of asking a question.

Mr. ELSON. I merely want to ask the Minister of Justice if the Lord's Day Act, which was discussed so fully in this House, will prevent a recurrence of events of this kind, as it happened just on the boundary line between Ontario and Quebec, a part of the race track being in Ontario and a part in Quebec? Does the Lord's Day Act cover a case like that, and has it sufficient virtue and strength to prevent a recurrence of such things?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I am not able to answer the question propounded by my hon. friend otherwise than by pointing out that parliament has enacted as a feature of the Lord's Day Act that infractions of its provisions can be proceeded against only with the assent of the attorney general of the province in which the infraction takes place. If there has been in Ottawa, or anywhere else in the Dominion, any infraction of the provisions of that statute, it is a matter which should be brought to the attention of the attorney general of the province in which the infraction took place. With his assent, and only with his assent, may a prosecution be brought.

MAIL SERVICE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the Postmaster General whether it would not be possible for him to improve the postal arrangements in British Columbia? I have a communication representing a number of people living in Hazleton, Skeena river, British Columbia, in which the following statement is made :

At present we only get a semi-monthly mail service, with a weight limit of 200 pounds for each trip. This necessitates leaving behind most of the newspapers and other bulky mail matter, until navigation opens in the spring, when we get all the back numbers of newspapers, &c. Consequently the news of the outside world is scarce during the winter.

Is it possible for the Postmaster General to improve that service in any way?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I think I answered the other day a similar question put by the hon. member who represents the Yukon district. In these far-away districts it cannot be expected that during the winter months, when navigation is necessarily closed, we can carry the same amount of mail matter as we do in the summer. We have adopted a certain scale for the winter, and up to the present time we have not received any complaints. However, if the hon. gentleman will send me that letter, I will see to it at once.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Will the hon., gentleman say who signed the letter?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not think there is any occasion for giving the name. If the hon. gentleman doubts the authenticity of the letter, I have no objection to letting him see it ; but I do not suppose that it is necessary for me to put the name on record or to state who is represented.

THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is not ready to go on with the third reading of the Bill respecting the French treaty. Can we set a date for it?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. member for North Toronto desired to say a few words on the motion for the third reading. He had to leave town this morning, and will be back Thursday evening. Any day after that will be agreeable to us.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In that case we might fix Friday.

Mr. FIELDING. While we desire to meet the convenience of hon. gentlemen opposite, there is an inconvenience in the

matter being delayed too long. Business men have been writing to me asking when the treaty will go into effect. I only mention that as a reason why there should not be any delay that can be avoided. I shall be glad to fix Friday if that is suitable.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Friday will be suitable, or Thursday evening.

Mr. FIELDING. Either day that will suit the convenience of hon. gentlemen opposite.

SURVEYS AND SURVEYORS.

Mr. OLIVER moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 9) respecting the surveys of public lands of the Dominion and the surveyors entitled to make such surveys, be now read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What are the amendments? Are they material?

Mr. OLIVER. There is one material amendment. The Senate has struck out the clause which provided for the admission, on certain terms, of surveyors from other British colonies.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why do we concur in that amendment if the clause was a good clause? The minister defended it, I thought, quite successfully here. Would it not be well to have a conference with the Senate, in the hope of bringing them to a better frame of mind?

Mr. OLIVER. I have no authority or jurisdiction over the Senate; and, of course, as we cannot pass the Bill without the consent of the Senate, and as they will not consent to it as it went from us, I suppose the only thing for us to do is to consent to it as it comes from them. I do not know any other way to get it passed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend has forgotten the method to which we resorted three or four years ago when we appointed a committee to go over and confer with a committee of the Senate and when we exercised our persuasive powers to some effect, because the Bill passed with certain concessions from each chamber. But the senate should give some reasons for rejecting this section. Does the hon. gentleman know what their reasons are?

Mr. OLIVER. Only indirectly and in a general way. They seem to have the idea that the section gave an undue advantage to surveyors outside of Canada, which they were not willing to concede, but which, in my estimation and that of the Surveyor General, were proper provisions and to the advantage of Canada. The other two amendments are merely verbal.

Amendments read the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING.

LAND GRANTS TO SOUTH AFRICAN VOLUNTEERS.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolutions:

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant two adjoining quarter-sections of Dominion lands available for homestead entry to every volunteer who at the time of his enlistment for military service in South Africa under Her late Majesty Queen Victoria, in 1899, 1900, 1901 or 1902, was resident or domiciled in Manitoba, or in the provisional district of Assiniboia, Saskatchewan or Alberta, or in the Yukon Territory.

2. Resolved, that every such grant shall be subject to the conditions that the grantee, or his duly qualified substitute, shall select and enter for the said two quarter-sections in the Dominion lands office for the land district in which they are situated on or before December 31, 1910; that he shall perfect his entry by commencing actually to reside upon and cultivate the land within six months after the said day; and that he shall thereafter reside upon and cultivate the land for the period, and in accordance with the terms and conditions prescribed by the homestead provisions of the Dominion Lands Act.

3. Resolved, that any person entitled, under the foregoing provisions, to select and enter for either by himself or by his substitute, land as a homestead, may, in lieu thereof, if he or his substitute so choose, receive scrip for $160, which shall be received from the bearer at its face value in payment of any Dominion lands open for sale; provided that any person choosing to take scrip shall notify the Minister of the Interior of his choice on or before December 31, 1909.

4. Resolved, that every such grant of land or scrip shall be made by the Minister of the Interior, upon a warrant issued in favour of the volunteer entitled thereto, by the Minister of Militia and Defence, which shall be recorded in the Department of the Interior, under section 94 of the Dominion Lands Act; and all such scrip shall be subject in all respects to the provisions of sections 94, 96, 97 and 98 of the Dominion Lands Act.

5. Resolved, that the entries made and the patents issued under the foregoing provisions shall be exempt from all fees and charges exacted in the case of an ordinary homestead entry.—Mr. Oliver.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not intend objecting to this, but why should we grant something to the volunteers of the western provinces when those of the other provinces are not given anything? Many went from the other provinces to South Africa as well as from the western provinces, and there seems to be discrimination against them. If the reason be, as I understand it is, that in the western provinces the lands belong to this government, the grant would seem to be a federal affair, and if so, it should be made by the Dominion government. If so Canada must do something, but whatever it does should be done for the volunteers from every province and not only for those from the west.

Mr. OLIVER. I would refer the hon. gentleman to his right hand neighbour (Mr. Sam. Hughes) for further information. The resolution now before the committee has been introduced in pursuance of a resolution of this House passed last session proposed by the hon. member for Victoria. That resolution was debated on the 10th December and was as follows :

That in the opinion of this House, grants of Dominion lands should be set apart for those who took part in the South African war of 1899-1902, residing in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

The question was discussed very fully at that time and the resolution agreed to, I think, unanimously, and in pursuance of that resolution the present Bill has been drafted. If there be an error, the error was made by the House last session and not by this government, because we are merely following the direction of the House.

Mr. BERGERON. What I complain of is that Canada, as a whole, should do something for the men who went to South Africa from our western provinces and do nothing for those who went from the eastern provinces.

This is the first intimation we have had that something will be done. But this resolution applies only to some parts of the country. I believe that Ontario and British Columbia have made grants to the veterans from those provinces but the other provinces have done nothing. The Dominion government should do everything possible to encourage the man who, when called upon to defend the flag, does so cheerfully. The government of Canada should aid men who volunteered from any part of Canada, not from the west alone. If the government would do something for the volunteers from every province we would not be obliged to pass this resolution which applies only to one section of the Dominion, not to the whole country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) that there should be no discrimination, but there has already been discrimination; the provinces of Ontario and British Columbia have appropriated a certain amount of land to the volunteers from those provinces who served in the war. If the Canadian parliament were to-day to make a grant to the volunteers, those from Ontario would be receiving the bounty of Canada plus the bounty of Ontario and those from British Columbia would be receiving the bounty of Canada plus the bounty of British Columbia. These grants have been made in land and therefore my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) last year introduced a resolution providing that in those provinces in which the Dominion government is the owner of the land, the same policy should prevail, and that we should do for the volunteers of those provinces, what has been done by the provinces of Ontario and British Columbia with the lands owned by them. This might also be done by the other provinces which are the owners of the lands. This resolution is brought in in compliance with the mandatory resolution unanimously passed by this House last year and for which my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) voted. Therefore in this respect we are simply obeying the mandate placed by this House upon us.

Mr. BERGERON. I will vote three or four times, nay ten times, to do anything for these men. My complaint is that there seems to be discrimination. The Prime Minister seems to fear that if the Dominion government took action the volunteers of Ontario and British Columbia would share twice. I do not see any harm in that ; it might shame the local governments in the other provinces into doing what Ontario and British Columbia have done. But by this Bill it is not Saskatchewan or Alberta or the Yukon Territory as such that is making the grant, it is the Dominion government. Those lands belong to us, we are, out of our own assets, doing something for a few volunteers but not for all the volunteers of Canada. We need not consider whether the local governments will take action or not. They may say that they have nothing to do with rewarding the men who go to defend the country and the flag. But we have something to do with that ; the defence of Canada is a duty placed upon this parliament and the man who volunteers to go at the call of the country to defend either the country or the flag should be taken care of by this parliament. Something should be done for every man in Canada who volunteered and served in that war. I remember when the call came for volunteers to go to South Africa, in Montreal, English Canadians, Scotch Canadians, Irish Canadians, and French Canadians—French Canadians probably in the majority—offered their services. Are these men to be told to-day that we will grant rewards to the men in the western provinces, but that they will be abandoned ? It is a bad example. We should encourage in these men that sentiment of patriotism which we are proud to find when the call for men goes forth. That is the only objection I have to this Bill, that it is but a partial measure and that by it we neglect many of those who deserve recognition. Every man who did his duty should be rewarded, and no man should be discriminated against.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I agree with my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) that there should be no discrimination against any volunteers who served in South Africa. I have actually a demand from a man in the county of Montmagny

who served in South Africa, for a grant of land in the west. As has been pointed out, it is our lands that we are giving, and I see no reason to discriminate against the provinces. Of course there is the other argument that lands have been given by some of the provinces to the men who have served. To carry out that principle, the man who resides in Manitoba should receive a grant of land in that province and those residing in other provinces of the west should receive their grants within the borders of the province in which they reside. The resolution is not so worded ; I understand that all the men are to have strips somewhere in the western territories. If you grant land to the western volunteers without the borders of the provinces in which they reside, you tear to the ground the reason for your discrimination against the men of the other provinces.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. The House will remember that about the close of the South African war I drew attention to this question. The First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) at that time declined to accede to my request on the ground that it was not yet decided whether the federal government or the provincial governments in the west should own the lands; and session after session the question was delayed on the ground that it had not been determined to whom the public lands in the west belonged. Finally the First Minister did determine in his own mind—I do not think he did it constitutionally, but that is neither here nor there now—that the lands should remain in the possession of the federal government, and the new provinces in the west were denied the right enjoyed by the other provinces to control their lands. I felt that there was no excuse for the First Minister longer refusing this request and I brought in my resolution. He then objected to it on the ground that Ontario was giving land to her volunteers and that the other provinces which controlled their lands were at liberty to do the same, and that thus, as the hon. member for Beauhornois (Mr. Bergeron) has pointed out, the volunteer would be getting scrip from two sources, the Dominion and his own province. At that time I did not see it would make much difference. The following year, willing to meet every objection of the First Minister, I brought in a resolution which was carried, that scrip might be given to volunteers from the Territories and provinces where the Dominion government controlled the land. That resolution carried. I knew at the time that it could not rest there, because the injustice of the arrangement from the viewpoint of the Dominion would be apparent to every one, and I felt that the first Minister would later on be brought to see the injustice of the position he had taken. What difference does it make to the Dominion what is done by a province or a municipality? The Dominion government should not bother about that. The proper attitudde for this government to take is to say: here are the boys who fought for the empire in South Africa, we are going to recognize them in some way; if they want scrip well and good, if they want to go on the land, well and good, but we will treat them all alike. I shall be glad to support the resolution with some amendments which I shall bring up when the occasion arises; but I will support it on the understanding that the First Minister has not heard the end of it, that he is going to have a hornet's nest about his ears and an agitation from end to end of this country, on the ground of simple justice to the volunteers who went to South Africa. What difference does it make where a man went from? They were all under one flag, they were all under the man who now claims credit from end to end of Canada for having sent them to South Africa—although he may remember that he was at first very emphatic in saying that not a man should go to the war.

I am delighted to hear my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) take the part of the volunteer who has been in active service for the defence of his country. I am told that during the war he was not so enthusiastic in encouraging the men who went to the field from his country.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) will allow me, it was the man's own affair who went to the war. I only did not approve of the country paying the expense.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am delighted to find that he is willing to do anything to assist the volunteer movement. This only goes to prove what I have previously told the hon. gentleman that as he gets older he will get wiser. And I am quite ready to believe that, if he lives long enough, he will become a very sensible man. I do not know whether it can be done under this resolution but I would ask the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to do justice to every volunteer who went to the field from Canada.

Mr. BERGERON. I think it could easily be done by simply inserting the words 'the Dominion of Canada' instead of these restrictive words confining this to volunteers from the west. The effect of this amendment would be to give compensation to every volunteer for the sacrifice he made when he went to South Africa.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. As coming from the west, I would like to make a few remarks on this subject. It seems to me that the resolution does justice to all parties who took part in the war. I do not understand that this Dominion has the absolute sovereignty over the land as hon. members

would have the House believe. As I understand it, these lands are administered by this government, it is true, but only administered——

Mr. BERGERON. And sold.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) to the fact that, as soon as the land is alienated in any way, it falls under the jurisdiction of the province. And, in this particular instance, the province not having the land to give, the strongest plea we had was that the land was being administered for the province if you will, and the residents of this province had no rights outside of the province, and consequently we asked for an equal fair square deal in that particular for those residents of the province to get the same benefits as the residents of other provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. If my memory serves me well, the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. McIntyre) presented a schedule to this House showing what the provinces were getting in lieu of the land and made a comparison between what was realized out of Crown lands in other provinces and showed that they were getting ample out of the lands.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is mistaken. I was not here at that time. Moreover, that has nothing to do with the matter under discussion now. Whatever conditions were given in lieu of the land, surely the hon. gentleman does not conclude that the land should be given indiscriminately to people in all parts of the country. The land is to be administered, as I understand it, for the benefit of the provinces, and not for the benefit of the whole Dominion or for particular individuals in the Dominion. The administration of these lands is more particularly for the benefit of the people who are there, and, if you are going to alienate these lands on conditions under which they may remain unoccupied, I do not think the government is carrying out its full duty of administration. I think the provisions laid down here will give everybody a fair square compensation for the services rendered in South Africa, but to give to those outside the provinces would be to give these persons extra remuneration. For instance the province of Ontario, and also the province of British Columbia have already given lands to volunteers. These people having received remuneration in that way for their services, if you include them in this resolution, you will give them a double quantity as compared with that which is given to the residents of my province. I am exceedingly anxious that the men in the west who put up with the conditions there shall not stand at a disadvantage as compared with other citizens of Canada.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Could not we provide for that by amending the resolution so as to except from its provisions those who have already received lands ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). If the government of the Dominion of Canada is going to reward any volunteer who went to South Africa, it should reward all ; one volunteer should not be on a different footing from the others so far as this Dominion is concerned. It should make no difference if the provincial governments are in a position to supplement the grant. But there are provinces in this Dominion whence men volunteered for service in South Africa which provinces are not in a position to reward their men with a land grant. In what position would these men stand ? There is a good deal in the point raised by the hon. member for Strathcona. But if the Dominion of Canada is not in a position to give land grants in the Northwest to all, and, if they give these grants to some, possibly they might take into consideration the giving of an equivalent in some other way. But it strikes me very forcibly that all should be treated alike.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is a little difficult to follow the argument of my hon. friend from Strathcona, when he says that these lands are being merely administered by the Dominion government for the benefit of the provinces. If that were so I should imagine that the proceeds of any lands sold would go at once to the provinces. But that is not the case.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. If the hon. member will excuse me, I would refer him to the argument of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) a moment ago.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know to what the hon. gentleman is referring, but I am dealing with what the hon. gentleman himself (Mr. McIntyre) said—that the Dominion government was administering these lands for the provinces, and therefore this grant was to be regarded in the same way as if the lands had been handed over to the provinces. If that argument were true, it would follow that the proceeds of any lands disposed of by this government must be handed over to the province or accounted for. The hon. gentleman knows that that is not the case. Moreover, how can his argument have any effect when he is aware that under the constitutional Act of each province, compensation for these lands was, in terms, made, a certain subsidy being allowed to each province in lieu of the land, the ownership, for that reason, being retained by the Dominion government. If there is any foundation for the argument it is in the imagination of my hon. friend alone.

The government, in reply to my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) took a rather extraordinary position having regard to certain events of the past. The

Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) placed the responsibility for this legislation upon the House. He said the House had passed a certain resolution and that on account of that resolution it became incumbent upon this government to bring in this legislation; therefore, the House and not the government is responsible. Might I recall to the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior that about three or four years ago this House unanimously passed a resolution to prohibit the sale, manufacture and importation of cigarettes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not unanimously.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, by a very large majority. My right hon. friend knows that according to the doctrines of his government a minority has no rights in this House; therefore it is exactly the same in his view as if it had been passed unanimously. So, the House upon that occasion passed that resolution. We have not seen any Bill up to the present time. I would like to know what distinction between that case and the present one is in the mind of the Minister of the Interior. About four or five years ago the House, unanimously this time, passed a resolution that the British preference would be extended only to goods coming into Canada by Canadian ports. There was no division of the House at the time, it was unanimous, but up to last year, we had never seen any legislation upon that line, and when we did get legislation it was merely placed upon the statute-book as an academic matter, and it will not go into force, according to the declarations of the government, for several years. Every one who is familiar with constitutional history knows that on a dozen occasions at least within the last 15 or 20 years the British House has, by large majorities in some cases, unanimously in other cases, passed resolutions calling for legislation, and that in no one of these has the resolution of the British House of Commons been followed by any legislation. Ten or twelve years ago the British House of Commons passed a resolution by a large majority favouring an indemnity to members of the House. Up to the present time no such legislation has been introduced, nor is it likely to be introduced in the very near future. And so in regard to many other subjects. Legislation of this character must depend upon the government of the day, for the reason that only the government of the day can come to the House and announce that His Excellency the Governor General has given the necessary consent for the introduction of the legislation.

Well, what is the present situation of this matter? The present situation is that the government, after having hesitated and vaccilated from time to time until the matter became complicated by provincial intervention finds itself now in front of a rather difficult situation. If the government had dealt with the subject immediately after the South African war as it should have done, there would have been no question at all about it. That would have been before any of the provinces had felt called upon to make a grant of land to any one of these men. As far as I am concerned I do not see that any intervention of any of the provinces could make the slightest difference. Each province in Canada which owns its public domain is at liberty to deal with it, as it sees fit, to withhold or to give, and it is no concern of this government whether that particular province has dealt more or less generously with the men who went to South Africa to fight for the British flag. But, when we come to deal with these men it seems to me that we should deal with them upon terms of equality, that we should reward them out of the public resources of this country according to the services they have rendered to the country and according to their willingness to go to the front. These men who enlisted should all be treated alike according to their rank and services. and I say that a feeling of very great bitterness indeed might be engendered in the minds of some of these men who went to South Africa if the government treats them otherwise, with the result that some of them shall have received land, whether from a province or from the Dominion, and others will not receive any such reward. I think it would be a very disastrous precedent to create, a most unfortunate precedent, and I for one would very strongly urge upon the government to treat all the men alike. Why should a volunteer from Prince Edward Island, from Nova Scotia, from New Brunswick, or from Quebec go absolutely without any recognition whatever of his services in South Africa and men in other provinces, in British Columbia and Ontario, from the provincial governments and in the three provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, from the Dominion government, receive that recognition which every one of these men deserves as much as any other. I would regard it as a very unfortunate incident indeed if any discrimination were allowed to prevail by reason of the hesitation and vaccilation of this government which has resulted in an unnecessary complication of the situation.

It is impossible for any hon. member on this side of the House to move any amendment to this resolution because the resolution, having been assented to by His Excellency the Governor General, can only be amended at the instance of the government and it can only be amended by obtaining the consent of His Excellency the Governor General. But I think it is a matter of very grave consideration on the part of the government

as to whether they should take a step which undoubtedly will create dissatisfaction and ill-feeling in the minds of some of these men. And, we cannot say that that ill-feeling will be at all unreasonable. I trust that before this resolution passes the government will take the matter into their consideration.

Mr. TURRIFF. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the idea advanced by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) will get us out of all the difficulties by any means. Supposing that the government did agree to do as suggested you would have dissatisfaction in all of the provinces except Ontario and British Columbia. The western prairie provinces and the eastern provinces would come back at the government and say: Why should we be discriminated against; why should we not be treated as well as the volunteers from British Columbia and Ontario?

Mr. BERGERON. They could not come here. They would have to go to their respective governments.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) understood me. All I suggested is that the government of Canada should treat all the men alike, so that as far as we are concerned there could be no complaint.

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, but I am just pointing out that that would not do away with the dissatisfaction throughout the Dominion of Canada because that would result in two different treatments, or in one condition for the western prairie provinces, Quebec and the lower provinces and another condition for Ontario and British Columbia.

Mr. BERGERON. It would be better than what we have to-day.

Mr. TURRIFF. That is a question. To my mind it would not be nearly as good, and for this reason: The volunteers engaged under certain agreements and these agreements were carried out. The provinces of British Columbia and Ontario undertook to give them additional compensation in the way of land grants. Then the volunteers from the western provinces applied to have the same treatment given them, and the government decided that in those provinces where the provincial governments do not hold and control the land it would be advisable to give a grant of land to the volunteers who fought in the South African war in the same way as British Columbia and Ontario had done. If the other provinces of the Dominion which own their lands, with the single exception of Prince Edward Island, want to do something for their own volunteers, well and good. This puts the other provinces on the same footing exactly as Ontario and British Columbia with regard to making a land grant and everybody is satisfied. There was no demand from Ontario and British Columbia to this government for a land grant. Prince Edward Island has no land, but that province can do exactly as it is proposed in this resolution to do; it can give a cash bonus in lieu of land if it so chooses. It seems to me that the proposal in this resolution will cause the least difficulty in the future of any solution of the matter. The government here proposes to give the volunteers a land grant in these provinces which do not own their own land. I would see no objection to amending the resolution so that the Manitoba volunteers should get their land grant in Manitoba, the Saskatchewan volunteers in Saskatchewan, and the Alberta volunteers in Alberta. That might simplify it and there could be no objection that I can see to that proposal.

Mr. SPROULE. The first starting point is that the Dominion owns the land, and the volunteers were volunteers of the Dominion of Canada and not of any particular province. The Department of Militia and Defence is maintained by the Dominion out of the consolidated revenue, and the volunteers went to South Africa as Canadians and not as men from a particular province. Every South African volunteer, no matter from what province he be, is entitled to equal recognition from Canada for his services to the country and the empire. Canada takes the land that belongs to Canada, and is not the Ontario volunteer or the Quebec volunteer just as much entitled to the land of Canada as is the volunteer in Saskatchewan or Alberta? I therefore say that all should be treated alike. If any particular province wishes to show an additional recognition of the services of her sons, let that province do so and it is not our concern. But it is our duty to see that equal justice is meted out to all Canadian volunteers. It may be that the volunteers from Ontario and British Columbia will fare better than the others, but that is a matter which can easily be remedied by the other provinces recognizing the services of their men just as Ontario and British Columbia have done.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. It seems to me that these volunteers might very well be satisfied with the glory they got. It may be a patriotic action to give them lands or money, but it cannot elevate their idea of the profession of a soldier. However, there seems to be a general desire to give a land grant to the South African volunteers and I need not discuss it. I can answer my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) that if his province has no land to give the volunteers his province can give them a cash grant in lieu of the land. However, it seems to me that the best resolve is to say that those who have already received lands from a province shall not now receive lands in the

Northwest, and then there will be no discrimination.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I think that would be the worst form of discrimination.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens) I support the idea that all the South African veterans should receive some recognition from the Dominion of Canada, and I submit that it is not fair to discriminate against the others in favour of the men from the western provinces. The land belongs to the Dominion and the men in the western provinces have no more right to it than the men in the other provinces of Canada. The hon. member from East Assinboia (Mr. Turriff) said that the province of Prince Edward Island could give a cash bonus in place of land. But I would ask him to take that advice for his own province and let Saskatchewan give a cash bonus of $160 if she chooses to do so. These volunteers were sent by the Dominion of Canada to South Africa and they should all be treated alike by the Dominion. I believe, Sir, that is the sentiment of every man in this country to-day. Even if Ontario and British Columbia have made some recognition of the services of the men from these provinces, the other provinces can do likewise if they wish, and that does not make any difference in the recognition which the volunteers should receive from the Dominion parliament.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) said that the volunteers should be satisfied with the glory they got. I do not know if the hon. gentleman had himself gone to South Africa that he would have been satisfied with the glory alone.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I would not go ; I am in favour of liberty.

Mr. LENNOX. I quite agree that the hon. member would not have gone and in that respect I do not know that he will be any more sensible in his future years than he has been in the past. As to the men who did go we can only deal with them from the Dominion or national aspect of the question; and we should recognize all the men who fought for us equally or not at all. We have been shamed into action by the example of Ontario and British Columbia, who, because of the neglect of this government to do its duty have been driven into doing something in recognition of the volunteers. It is up to the Dominion parliament now at this late date to do tardy justice to our South African volunteers and they must render that justice to all or to none. No more unsatisfactory method could be adopted than is suggested by the resolution submitted to us. The lands are not the lands of the western provinces, they are the lands of the Dominion of Canada. The sacrifices made by the South African volunteers were not made for a particular province but for the glory and in defence of Canada and the British empire, and Canada must recognize that. What the leader of the government should do is to withdraw this resolution for the present and frame it upon broader and more statesmanlike lines. How absurd it will be if the relatively few volunteers in the western provinces are favoured by this government and the larger number throughout the other parts of Canada are not recognized at all. This is tardy action of the Dominion government ; they have failed to act within a reasonable time and they have compelled some of the provincial governments to act so that now they cannot complain if the volunteers from Ontario and British Columbia receive greater recognition than the others. It is also true that the provinces which have not yet recognized the services of these volunteers can very readily follow the example of Ontario and British Columbia. This is a question for the Dominion parliament and it is the duty of the Dominion parliament to recognize equally the services of the Canadian volunteers, and not to discriminate against the men who came from one province or the other.

Mr. BARR. It is gratifying even at this late hour to find the government taking up this question, notwithstanding the fact that they are at least ten years behind the times. In looking over the different provinces of Canada, we find that Ontario was the first as she is the first in almost every movement, to substantially recognize the services of the veterans of 1866, which was done when I had a seat in the legislature of that province. We have before us at present a measure to recognize the services of one section of the volunteers who served in the Boer war—those who came from Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta—while we are leaving out in the cold those from all the other provinces. I am surprised to find hon. gentlemen opposite taking the ground at this late hour that this government do not own the lands of the Northwest provinces. Only three years ago the First Minister took the ground that those provinces did not own the lands, and were paid by this Dominion a substantial amount equal to their full value. With that evidence before us, I think hon. gentlemen opposite cannot go back on the record of the present government and say that this parliament does not own those lands and is merely holding them and disposing of them for the benefit of those provinces. Now, as this Dominion owns those lands and proposes to give the right to these volunteers to take up 320 acres each, or to take scrip in lieu thereof, I would ask what better claim have the volunteers in those provinces to that land or scrip than the volunteers in the eastern

provinces? I think it would be most unjust discrimination between the different provinces to proceed along these lines. I do not know why all should not be included. I think it is of the greatest importance to this fair Dominion that we should recognize the rights of those young men who took their lives in their hands and went to fight the battles of their country. We do not know when the time may come when their services will again be required, perhaps in some foreign land, and we should show that we appreciate their efforts and sacrifices and deal with them in a liberal manner. We have nothing to do with the different provinces. Manitoba may yet recognize her young men who went out; the other provinces may also do so, and I think they would be doing nothing more than their duty, even if the Dominion had done the same. But to leave out some of the provinces I think would be a most dangerous principle, as it would place the volunteers in one part of the Dominion in a different position from those in another. Therefore I think the government had better withdraw this measure and bring down one that will do full justice to all parties.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Although there can be no doubt, I presume, as to the ownership by the Dominion government of the lands in the Northwest provinces, it seems to me that this is an occasion on which we should recognize the sovereignty of those provinces over the lands. This is not a question of immigration or colonization; it is a question of rewarding men for a specific service, and it seems to me that we have a right to ascertain the views of the governments in those provinces where the lands are to be given away. Now, I remember very distinctly that the government of the Northwest Territories, before the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan were organized, passed a series of resolutions asking the Dominion government to give lands to the men residing in those territories who went to the war in South Africa. They did not ask that those lands should be given to volunteers who went from all the provinces, but specifically limited their request. This is the resolution :

Be it resolved that this assembly do urge upon the Dominion government the advisability of making a grant of land from and in the Northwest Territories to each volunteer, a resident of these territories, who engaged in such war.

Mr. LAKE. What is the date of that?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have not the date here, but I think it was in 1901 or 1902. I think also that resolutions were passed by the governments of the respective provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba since that date. Therefore the government had a specific request from the Northwest to reward the men who went from the Northwest to the war in South Africa, and it was with this view that the resolution offered by my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) was unanimously accepted by this House, and, with one single exception, without any dissent in the House, and my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior was perfectly correct in saying that he had the authority of this House for the introduction of these resolutions.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. minister this question: Does he not think that if Canada rewards a portion of the men who went to South Africa, it is equally in duty bound to reward the others as well?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is another question. I am pointing out that we have a direct request from the authorities in the Northwest to give these lands in a certain way and to limit them. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has disclosed to us to-day what he did not when his resolution passed. He has told us to-day that he was then only getting in the thin edge of the wedge.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I know that would be the result.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend, when moving his resolution, made use of the following language :—

I do not know that I would be justified in asking scrip for the men from Ontario and other provinces which gave them land from their own territory, but I certainly think that the soldiers from the provinces which have no land, the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, are entitled to the consideration of this government.

And I agree with him absolutely.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the hon. gentleman mind reading what I said about the other provinces ? Does not every speech I ever made show clearly that I thought they were all entitled to compensation ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I cannot read all the hon. gentleman's speeches, but I am reading from this particular one. It so happens that the province of Ontario and, I think, the province of British Columbia dealt with this matter themselves and gave scrip to the volunteers who went from those provinces. It is open to the other provinces to do the same. The province of Quebec has enormous areas of government land, also New Brunswick, and I think Nova Scotia has some public lands left. I am not sure about Prince Edward Island.

Mr. BERGERON. But if they do not.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Then must you go to the Dominion ?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think that is a very dangerous doctrine.

Mr. BERGERON. Who called for these soldiers—the provinces or the Dominion ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It was the British empire called for them. Our militia was not sent as such, but volunteers came from every part of the Dominion.

Mr. BERGERON. If the frontiers of Canada were assailed, who would call for soldiers ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Dominion gave extra pay to those volunteers who went to South Africa. It seems strange to me that after the policy embodied in this resolution was unanimously accepted by this House, we should have to-day exception taken in this way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The argument of the Minister of Militia apparently is that the Dominion is doing this as a delegate of the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Certainly, these provinces could not do it themselves.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is a most remarkable argument. This is either a provincial or a Dominion matter. So far as the sending of these troops to South Africa is concerned, that was a Dominion and not a provincial matter.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The provinces of the Northwest do not own their public lands, and they requested this government to give to the volunteers who went to South Africa, and who are residents of these provinces, some recognition in public lands.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I shall come to that before I get through. My hon. friend's argument is precisely another form of the argument of the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre). Does the hon. gentleman say that we are holding these lands as trustees for the new provinces and that we are acting in this matter as delegates of the new provinces ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There was no other means, except through this government, by which those provinces could give those lands.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not an answer to my question. I asked whether or not we are holding those lands as delegates and in trust for the new provinces. When the hon. gentleman meets that, he will meet the question fairly.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have given the only answer I can.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No doubt, but it is not an answer at all. The question we are dealing with is this. Is this a matter for Dominion or for provincial action ? So far as it is a matter concerning the people of Canada, it is a federal and not a provincial matter. It was the Dominion which took charge of the sending of those volunteers to South Africa. It is quite true that the enlistment was perfectly voluntary, but when these men did volunteer they volunteered at the call of the Dominion and not at the call of any of the provinces. The Dominion sent these troops to fight for the British empire, and no province sent any man of them. If there is to be any recognition, it must be federal recognition. The government has decided on federal recognition, but it has limited that recognition, and the reason given why it has limited that recognition to the volunteers residing in the western provinces is that the public lands in these provinces are being dealt with by this government as a delegate or agent of these provinces although these lands are in the sovereign right of the Dominion and were retained by the Dominion when the new provinces were constituted. But if these lands are held by the Crown in the right of the Dominion, in trust for the new provinces, then every dollar of profit derived from the sale of them would belong by right to the new provinces. But every one familiar with the constitution knows that there is not a shadow of a foundation for such argument. These lands, under the constitution, belong as much to the Dominion as any dollar of public money in the public treasury. I protested against that policy but protested in vain. The government retained the right to these lands and has the right to dispose of them without consulting the provinces. And they do so every day in the year. They pass timber deals under regulation in which the people of these provinces have no voice or word in so far as their provincial administration is concerned. Therefore it is idle to say that the government is dealing with these lands as the delegate or agent of the provincial governments. If there were any foundation for such argument, where would it land this government ? Just in this position—that, if it is not equitable for you to reward all these men who went to South Africa out of the lands in the Northwest, still you should reward them all alike, those who cannot get lands being rewarded in some other way. The lands in the Northwest, if they are to be regarded in the light suggested from the other side of the House, are not the only assets of this country. The government can, if it desires, treat all these men alike. What I am protesting against is any discrimination so far as the action of the government is concerned. It is open to any of the provincial governments to grant or withhold any remuneration to the men from that province who served in South Africa—

that is a matter with which this parliament is not concerned; it is a matter within the sphere of provincial jurisdiction. The provinces own their assets and their lands, and they have a right to grant them or not as they see fit. But when we consider the question, we must consider first whether there shall be recognition or not. Having decided that there shall be recognition, I protest against the discrimination under which some of these men will be given recognition, while from others, equally entitled to it, that recognition will be withheld.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I think this discussion ought to be a lesson to this government never to accept any resolutions offered by hon. gentlemen opposite, or supported by the leader of the opposition ; for, if we are to take this as a precedent, the government can expect to be attacked if it accepts that resolution and tries to carry it into effect. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) moved a resolution in this House on December 10th, 1906, as follows :

That in the opinion of this House grants of Dominion lands should be set apart for those who took part in the South African war of 1899-1902, residing in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta .

A little while later on he accepted the suggestion to amend the resolution so as to provide that these grants should be given only to those volunteers who had resided in the province at the time of enlistment. That resolution was supported by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton in a speech in which he stated, as pointed out by the Minister of Militia :

I do not know that I would be justified in asking scrip for the men from Ontario and other provinces which gave them land from their own territory.

That resolution was supported by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron), the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) and others on that side of the House. It was supported by the vote of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), who applauded the sentiments expressed by his supporters. The House, very foolishly, accepted the resolution of hon. gentlemen opposite. But now that the attempt is made to implement that resolution by legislation, the government is attacked and accused by the leader of the opposition of blowing hot and cold. Let us see who was blowing hot and cold. Why, the hon. gentleman himself supported last year the resolution to which he is viciously opposed to-day.

What are the circumstances under which this resolution is introduced? Surely hon. gentlemen would not argue that the volunteer who enlists to fight for his country expects 160 acres of land when he returns. The province of Ontario gave to each of its returned volunteers a grant of 160 acres. British Columbia did the same. Municipalities also made grants to show their appreciation of the valour of our volunteers. I know clubs that gave life memberships to these men ; everybody sought to show appreciation of the sacrifice they had made and the service they had rendered the country. The people of the Northwest wanted the same thing done for their returned volunteers. In the year 1901 the legislative assembly of the Northwest by resolution petitioned this parliament on the subject. This was the resolution :

That this assembly do urge upon the Dominion government the advisability of making grants of land free in the Northwest Territory to each volunteer, a resident of these territories, who engaged in the said war.

The people of Ontario had given lands, and nobody had found fault. The province of British Columbia had done the same. The people of the Northwest had not the lands to give, but they were extremely anxious that the volunteers of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan should be treated as generously as the volunteers of Ontario and British Columbia. And hon. gentlemen opposite supported that view, bringing in this resolution in favour of giving effect to it. This government accepted that resolution, and is now introducing legislation in accordance with it, and to-day every one of these gentlemen is opposing the very thing they asked to have done.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. BENNETT. We are putting an addition to it.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Let us see about that. Surely, if the provinces of Ontario and British Columbia give land to their volunteers, it is not unreasonable that the people of the Northwest would ask that the same be done for their volunteers. We are only doing for these provinces what the provinces are unable to do for themselves, not having the lands. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) suggests that we should do it for all the provinces, that there may be no discrimination. May I suggest to the hon. member who comes from the province of Quebec that if he thinks it a patriotic thing to do to give lands to the returned volunteers, he should suggest that the people of his own province make such a grant as the people of Ontario did. Surely Quebec has enough valuable land to make a grant to its returned volunteers, and surely Quebec is as generous as Ontario. This is not a matter of legal payment; it is a matter of showing gratitude for and appreciation of invaluable services that have been rendered. If the people of Quebec want to do this, why do they not do it ? And when they have refused to do it, surely it will be time enough for the hon. member for Beauhar-

nois to come here and say that the people of Quebec will not treat their volunteers as generously as the people of Ontario and British Columbia have done and so call upon the Dominion parliament to do what the people of Quebec might have done. So far as the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are concerned, there is no reason why they should not, if they wish, show their appreciation. They have lands, and if they have not they can show their appreciation in some other way than by giving a land grant. So it is idle for these gentlemen, after forcing this resolution on the government and inducing this government to present this legislation in accordance with that resolution, to criticise the government for doing what they asked it to do.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have been charged with taking a different course last year from that which I now take. Let me direct the attention of the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) and the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to my position in the matter. Having for years tried in vain to induce the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) to take this mater up, having done my best to obtain recognition for the volunteers all over Canada, and having been put off with one excuse after another, year after year, I decided that I would meet them on their own ground, and I asked a grant for the men who came from the very regions in which this government claimed to have jurisdiction over the public lands. You will search in vain for any statement by me indicating that the men in the other provinces were not entitled to the same treatment. On the contrary, in my remarks last year I said :

> Every session since 1900 I have brought this matter in one form or another to the attention of the government. In the earlier sessions, the First Minister and the Minister of Militia received the proposal very courteously, and pointed out that until autonomy was granted to the Northwest provinces, it was not certain whether this government would be in a position to make these land grants without being liable to the provinces for the lands given. I will not enter into the question of the reasons which induced the government to retain control of the lands in granting autonomy to the Northwest provinces; but I do not think the government have now any valid excuse for not making these grants to the men who served in South Africa.

I did not say what province they came from. I was endeavouring to make the government do something ; if I could not get a whole loaf I would take a half loaf.

Mr. CONMEE. I, I, I.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have written letters to the boys all over the country asking them to urge the minister to take a certain line and adhere to it. Was there anything in this resolution to prevent the First Minister extending the provisions of this grant? The First Minister could have brought in a resolution granting aid to every volunteer who served in South Africa, aye and to the thousands of British volunteers who had been brought to this country since the close of the war. Talk of the North Atlantic Trading Company and all the money squandered on it? Give the volunteers a tithe of the money wasted in advertising through that company and the volunteers will be satisfied. The best advertisement the Dominion of Canada ever received was the soldiers who went to South Africa. That action brought to us thousands upon thousands of men, not the offscourings of the continental countries of Europe but the best blood of Great Britain.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And I am satisfied there would be no objection throughout the country to having these men included so that they would get 320 acres instead of 160.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Do they not get free homesteads now ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I said 320. If he would keep his ears open and not let his brain buzz so he would hear better. In discussing the resolution which was adopted on December 10, 1906, I asked the First Minister and the Minister of Militia if they had not had hundreds of applications from the boys all over the country to make it general and to include the boys from all over Canada. The newspapers have been full of it and every member has had letters from the boys and their organizations, praying that the grant should be extended. I am not finding fault with the ministry for not doing this. But the ministers are in duty bound to extend this principle. What was in my mind, after having obtained recognition for the men from the west where the government retained control of the land was that it would be a short step until the government would be forced to give it to the boys from all the provinces. The government could have enlarged the scope of this resolution but they did not, although they had received ample notice and many requests from volunteers during the year and a half since the resolution was adopted. I am delighted to see the boys in the west obtaining recognition and I give the First Minister warning that this will be followed up by the boys in the other provinces. Had the government taken this matter up immediately after December, 1906, when the resolution was passed instead of delaying action for over a year while the best homesteads were taken up they would not have been so blameworthy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross) in

the observations he has addressed to the House called to my mind a piece of advice given to me by my old friend Joe Rymal in this House years ago. It was never to have anything to do with a Tory, because if you did, he would be sure to go back upon you—and I have an instance of it at this moment. Last year, when I accepted the resolution of the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) whom I would not offend if I should call him a Tory of the Tories, I accepted it in the innocence of my heart, but I should have remembered the Latin words 'timeo Danaos et dona ferentes'—'I fear the Greeks even when bearing gifts.' I should have feared the advice given by my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) who I supposed was a guileless Briton, but I find he is a wily, elusive Greek. When he gives advice it is not sincere. it is not British advice on which we can rely, but I find by his own words that there is something at the back of his head that he intends to use when opportunity presents itself. Last year his resolution was in these words:

That in the opinion of this House, grants of Dominion lands should be set apart for those who took part in the South African war of 1899-1902, residing in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why was that resolution worded that way?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know why.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The First Minister knows.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not know then, I know now. It was a trap, it was simply a catch resolution; it did not conform to his own views. He did not say last year as he says now: Enlarge it, make it applicable all along. No hon. gentlemen opposite took the ground they now take: enlarge the motion, it is not sufficient; but one and all assented to the resolution that the grants should apply only to those from Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister to some remarks which I made last year to the effect that it should be extended to the whole Dominion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I except my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey). He wanted to extend it to the whole Dominion,—but he could not convert one on his own side, he was like the last rose of summer, blooming alone. We therefore assumed, since the voice of my hon. friend was being raised in the desert, that he might be left aside. I am sorry for it, I must say my hon. friend showed more sincerity than others on that side, who holding the views they have expressed to-day did not then announce them. Had they done so we might have reconsidered our course, but finding them all siding with the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam Hughes) who wanted the lands to be given simply to those enlisting from Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, we acted upon that recommendation; and now that we have acted upon this recommendation all the gentlemen on the other side of the House, the member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) himself the very first, stand up and say, no, that is not sufficient; more, do not limit this to those from the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta but extend it to the volunteers from all over the Dominion. My hon. friend, however, forgets that when he used that expression he said: I do not know, I am not sure you could give aid to those from Ontario. These are the very words which he made use of:

I do not know that I would be justified in asking scrip for the men from Ontario and other provinces which gave them land from their own territory.

My hon. friend was not sure last year. He had some scruples of conscience—well, no, he had no scruples of conscience, but he had some reasoning power left in him and he used it. But this year he has discarded it altogether and he has said: Do not mind what I said last year; extend it to all; do not apply it to three provinces only, but apply it to every one. Why did we accept the suggestion of my hon. friend? We accepted this resolution—I must pay my hon. friend this compliment—because there was some common sense in it. The reason why we accepted the resolution was that he was undertaking to ask us to give lands to those volunteers who had enlisted from provinces which had no lands to give and in which we had lands to give. Therefore, we thought that the object of his motion was that we should put the volunteers coming from these provinces which had no land to give on a footing of equality with the volunteers from those other provinces which had land to give—those from British Columbia, those from Quebec, those from Ontario and elsewhere. Now, Sir, there would seem to me to be sense in that. We want to place all the volunteers on the same footing. The volunteers on this continent have been rewarded for their services either by lands or by pensions. If we were to give pensions to the volunteers we would be able to give them to all, but if we are to give land I think it is at any rate quite fair and reasonable that the land should be given by those who have land to give. We can give land in the prairie provinces, but we cannot give land in Ontario or Quebec or Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island. I am reminded by my hon. friend of the case of Prince Edward Island. Prince Edward

Island has no land to give and this government has no land to give. This land never belonged to the Dominion and that is a case which may have to be disposed of in some other way. But Prince Edward Island is on a different footing from some of the other provinces. We have lands to give in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, while we have no lands to give in Prince Edward Island. Notwithstanding the objection which is made, I think the resolution is well and that it should prevail. If we are to give more to the volunteers of these new provinces, if we are to give a money compensation, that is another consideration which should be debated on its own merits. but I think that as far as the land grant is concerned the position that we took on the advice of the hon. member from Victoria and Haliburton was a sound one after all.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has asked the question why I had the resolution worded in the manner in which it was. Need I answer him that for years, from 1900 onward to last year, the right hon. First Minister advanced one plausible excuse after another for putting off the duty of recognizing the men who went to South Africa to serve their country. He put it off from year to year. I determined last year that I would test his sincerity and I worded the resolution exactly as it was worded in order to meet the very argument that he had advanced year after year. I took that position without stultifying myself in the least. I took half a loaf when I knew that I could not get a whole one. Is there anything wrong about that? There is no one who can possibly contend that there is anything objectionable in taking a course of action in the hope of getting a half loaf nor is there anything objectionable in going out to secure the other half. We know that we cannot amend this resolution, but the right hon. gentleman, who professes to be so proud of the British institutions under which he lives, knows that all he has to do is to get the sanction of His Excellency to another resolution declaring that he shall extend this concession to every volunteer in Canada who served in South Africa. I rose, not as the right hon. gentleman says, to demand something more than this, but I rose in response to the remarks he made when he spoke in answer to my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). I spoke of being justified. Do the facts of the last six or eight years justify me in the course I took? Would I have been justified in pressing last year for a certain defeat when the right hon. gentleman had so often urged that he could not bring in legislation providing for a grant of land, and that Ontario and these other provinces ought to make it. Would I have been acting in the interests of the volunteers of the country if I had brought up a resolution which had been thrown down by the right hon. gentleman repeatedly and when we had no new arguments to advance in favour of it? Therefore, I met the right hon. gentleman on his own ground and he dared not oppose that resolution with any consistency or honour. He could not have opposed one line of it. Therefore I worded the resolution so as to leave him without one solitary argument to advance against it and he had to accept it. Now, I am going farther and I purpose in future asking that this consideration shall be extended to all volunteers all over Canada who served in South Africa. There is nothing inconsistent in that; nothing can be turned back upon me with regard to my conduct from start to finish.

Mr. BARKER. I am certainly extremely surprised at the tone of the right hon. the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in addressing the committee upon this subject. The right hon. gentleman seemed to treat it as a trifling subject, as a matter in regard to which the government has no duty and with which it has very little concern. He says he is introducing this resolution as a compliment to the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes). What in heaven's name is he doing about the unfortunate men that Canada would like to honour and reward? Is it to be that the government of this country will deal with a subject of this kind according to a resolution moved by one gentleman in the House and that the government has nothing to say as to what the resolution is to be? The hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. D. Ross) says that the government has been forced into this position and he asks with a sneer: Are these volunteers who went to Africa to fight for the country's flag asking for 160 acres? The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) says that they ought to be content with the glory. I think that the volunteers of Canada will be somewhat surprised to know the position taken by the government on this subject and they will even be surprised to know that the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) thought that the men who went to South Africa have been well treated. There are many of them who do not think that they have been well treated. At all events, it does not look well for the government to boast how well they treated these men. The right hon. gentleman perhaps thinks that he has done sufficient, if he has done all that the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton asked at a particular time. If the hon. gentleman had asked much less presumably there would be less to do. He seems to base the whole position he has taken upon the resolution moved and carried at

the instance of the hon. member for Victoria and Halburton. Surely in a matter of this kind the government and the right hon. gentleman have a duty to the men who went away to fight for their country even if no resolution had been passed. Where is the right hon. gentleman? Has he no duty to perform? If he has not why does he move any resolution at all and if a resolution has to be proposed why is it not a fit and proper one? The resolution, most unfortunately, in my opinion, casts a slur upon every volunteer from any of the provinces except those from the Northwest.

Let any man in after days look at the statutes of this country to find out what the Dominion of Canada did for the men who went to South Africa, and he will find a declaration that the only men who deserved any recognition were the men from the Northwest. The men from Ontario and Quebec; what about them? They are not noticed. Surely that is a subject which ought to have had a little more consideration from the right hon. gentleman. But, not caring to reward these men from the other provinces he did not care how the resolution was worded and so he puts upon the records of this Dominion a recognition of the men from a few of the provinces utterly ignoring those from other provinces. There are men who went to South Africa who do not consider they have been well rewarded. The Minister of Militia knows what happened to the last mounted regiment we sent there. Those men were sent to the Cape of Good Hope in a troop-ship with 400 horses in the ship with them; they crossed the equator with all the suffering that entails; they arrived at the Cape and if they had landed at their destination they would have been at the seat of war, but it suited the British general in command to order the ship to Durban and these regiments landed there, and crossed Natal, and rode northward to Newcastle and Majuba Hill, and having done their duty they returned home. During their journey from the Cape to Durban the preliminaries of peace were entered into and they were told that they were not at the seat of war and that they would get no medal and no recognition, and the men from Ontario and Quebec who were in that contingent do not even get the land grant under this proposal. And they are well treated, forsooth. Had they landed at the Cape as was intended they would have passed through the seat of war, but it suited the general in command to send them by sea to Durban and some of them returned ruined in health and absolute wrecks, others of them proud of having done their best to fight for their country, but all of them received no recognition. I do not blame the Minister of Militia that these men did not get medals for I presume he did his best to obtain them from the Imperial authorities, but all the more should these men be recognized by the Dominion parliament now that we are giving land grants. It is not to the credit of the government that they are treating these men in that way. The hon. gentleman from Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) says they should be satisfied with glory, and another gentleman sneers that they are not asking for 160 acres. And so it is; men who went 6,000 miles to South Africa and 6,000 miles back again in the cause of their country are passed quietly over, and all we hear from the Prime Minister is a rather trifling and somewhat flippant speech in reply to the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam Hughes).

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to advise the Prime Minister to withdraw this motion and to get His Excellency the Governor General to give his assent, as I am quite sure he will, to a motion which will treat all the volunteers alike. I appeal to the Prime Minister to include in that resolution a class of volunteers of which no mention has been made so far. I had a letter a few weeks ago from a lady now living in Vancouver who is the daughter of an old friend of mine living in Fredericton, New Brunswick, and who was one of the 40 ladies who went out to teach the Boers after the war had been concluded. I put a question on the Order Paper asking if it be the intention of the government to make any recognition of the services of these 40 lady teachers who volunteered for service in South Africa, and the Prime Minister answered that it was not the intention of the government to do so at the present. I sent 'Hansard' containing the reply out to this lady and I received a letter from her this morning in which she says:

14 Williams Building,
Vancouver, February 15, 1903.

My Dear Mr. Taylor,—I thank you very heartily for so promptly bringing up the case of the South African teachers in the House, and especially for putting the question in such a flattering form. I am sure the girls will all join with me in being very grateful to you. . . . It may be of interest to you to know that the greater part of the teachers were true to their love for Canada and came home. From my point of view many of the girls that went out suffered much more hardship than the last military contingent, who only landed at Cape Town and never went up country at all, and got a good grant for that. Speaking for myself, Miss McLeod and I lived for over four months in a marquee at Setlagoli and Mafeking. In the terrific storms it came down on our heads and left us to crawl out in the wet to seek shelter. We then went to Ottoshoop, where Miss McLeod stayed while I went on to a farm school, thirty-five miles from a town, post office, doctor, white English neighbours, or even an onion or a mutton chop; for six months I could not buy fresh meat, and had to grow thin on bully beef and Australian canned mutton. We had no vegetables for three months of that time. If we had been

taken ill there was no doctor within thirty-five miles, and no means of sending for one. We could not even hire a horse or a trap to drive into Zeerust. I had to depend on the Repatriation Department to get us in. We lived in a thatched roof house; two girls by themselves, among Boers none too friendly to us. The roof leaked and every time it rained we had to move our things all over the place to escape the drops, and sleep with waterproof sheets over the beds to prevent being soaked. Altogether, I consider the risks we ran were very great indeed, and we deserve some recognition where the men got substantial grants for taking a pleasant sea voyage. No one who has not been in South Africa could realize the isolation in which we were placed, cut off from all English among those lonely kloofs. All the girls who are married in Canada have the problem before them of helping their husbands to work up in some business or professions and surely they deserve government recognition as much as some United States or Galician widows who may settle on western lands.

Yours very sincerely,
WINIFRED JOHNSTON PLOWDEN.

I hope, however, that the government which has treated outsiders with the greatest generosity will see its way clear to a recognition of the first forty Canadian women who went half way round the world to impress upon a country shortly after its second birth into the British empire, something of the acknowledged excellence of the Canadian public school system.

Thanking you again for my own part and on behalf of the girls now widely scattered, I remain

Yours very truly,
WINIFRED JOHNSTON PLOWDEN.

Now, I am quite sure that the gallant Minister of Militia will ask the Prime Minister to withdraw this resolution and include in it these forty ladies who sacrificed their lives more than some of the soldiers who went to South Africa, and went at the call of the country—because this country did call for volunteer lady teachers to go there—and on their return received no medal, no brass band, no recognition of any kind; and they think that now, after ten years, it is high time that this government should deal with them in a generous spirit. I fully agree with the suggestion in this letter that they should be recognized in some way, either by a grant of land, a medal, or a money grant.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has got into bad habits lately. I notice that he never rises to address the House or the committee without in a fatherly way taking charge of everybody, including the right hon. gentleman who leads the House, instructing him what should be done, and he invariably reads a letter. The cause of distressed females seems of late to have enlisted his sympathies.

Mr. BENNETT. There is no monopoly over there.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend has about him so many hon. gentlemen interested in matters of that kind that I suppose he falls into the habit very naturally. But the extent to which my hon. friend has gone in his suggestions shows how ridiculous this discussion has got to be. Why can we not discuss a serious problem of this kind calmly and seriously? Why should the gallant colonel who represents Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) become so ungenerous whenever he strikes a question of this kind? Last year he was frank, square and straight in dealing with this question. He laid down the simple proposition, in which he asked this House to concur, that the volunteers who went to South Africa from the three western provinces, not being in a position to receive from them the recognition which had been extended by other provinces——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD—this House should practically do what the legislatures of these provinces would have done.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I must protest against the hon. gentleman putting words into my mouth. I never suggested that any of the provinces had the right to recognize these men. It was this Dominion that sent them, not the provinces.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend may be right in that, I will deal with that question in a moment. But I am not misstating my hon. friend's proposition one iota.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, you are.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. He suggested that the province of Ontario and the province of British Columbia having chosen to recognize the services of the men who went from those provinces to South Africa by giving them grants of land, we should do for the volunteers who went from Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, what the legislatures of these provinces were not in a position to do, by giving to those volunteers grants of land similar to those given by these other provinces. That was the proposition of my hon. friend last year; and the legislative bodies in those provinces asked the federal authority to supply the omission by doing what they could not do, and from the lands which form part of the territories of those provinces to make grants to the men who lived there at the time they went to the war, which they themselves would have done if they had had the power.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. You must not put those words into my mouth.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I do not wish to put words into the hon. gentleman's mouth which he would not stand for; but I

think that all the hon. members in this House will agree that I am not distorting what my hon. friend proposed to the House last year. All of us accepted that view, and when the government this year propose to implement that proposition, why can we not attend fairly and squarely to the consideration of the question ? The only questions before this House are these : Are the resolutions of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia wise and proper resolutions for this House to adopt? and : Was the resolution of my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton last year a wise and proper resolution for this House to adopt ? If it was, then these resolutions are proper resolutions. When we come to consider whether we are going to give federal recognition to the boys who went to South Africa, we shall deal with an entirely different question. Not a word has fallen from the premier or the Minister of Militia that would indicate that the government had made up their minds that there would not be that recognition. This resolution does not in the slightest degree involve that question.

Mr. BLAIN. If my hon. friend will refer to the debate of last year, he will find that the Prime Minister did intimate that there would be no federal recognition.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I will call my hon. friend's attention to a remark made by the Minister of Militia, in which he asked the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton to amend his resolution so as to limit the recognition to those living in those provinces at the time of their enlistment, in which he said :

If it is to go further, that is a question to be considered at a later date.

Mr. BLAIN. Will my hon. friend permit me ?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Perhaps my hon. friend had better discuss it later, as I have not the full debate before me. I say if we want to discuss the question of federal recognition, let us discuss it frankly. Do not let our friends opposite attempt to confuse the attention of the men in this country who are interested in this question by endeavouring to create the impression that this proposition is one which absolutely and completely settles this whole matter. I did not understand the ministers speaking here to-day to say that because they were giving effect to the resolution which the House adopted last year, by practically dealing with an extension of provincial recognition to the men who went to South Africa, they are by any means closing the door to some procedure of a federal nature that will recognize the men from the other provinces. For myself, I desire to say that I think the men who went to South Africa from provinces from which they have not received recognition, on account of the failure of the provincial governments in some cases to grant lands because they had not the lands to grant, should be considered by this government when they come to the point of deciding whether there should be federal recognition or not ; otherwise the men from those provinces would be placed in the anomalous position of having received no recognition at all. The province from which I come is not in a position to make grants of land of the character of those proposed to be made by this government to the boys from the Northwest. They are not in the same position as British Columbia because our Crown lands of a cultivable character are not to be had. But the question whether or not that should be done is a matter which hon. gentlemen should press on the attention of the government. If the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) had not been so disingenuous, if he had frankly said to the government : You have done what you ought to do and I accept that, but over and above that I am going to ask recognition for the volunteers from the other provinces——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Did I not make that an issue ?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend beclouded the issue. He did not make it as clear as he ought to have done. Had he said : This government, doing what I asked it last year to do, is entitled to full credit——

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is all legislation to be initiated from this side ?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman does not initiate so much that he need take any credit for it. If the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) had been frank and had said : The government having done what I asked them to do last year and what these provincial legislatures would do if they were in a position to do it, we will go on and press for federal recognition for the men all around, he would have been taking a course which we all could appreciate. But my hon. friends have been confusing the issue. To my mind, this resolution is one which should be adopted without hesitation. I have no disposition to say that, on a proper motion and under proper conditions, we should not press for federal recognition for all the men who went to South Africa and not simply for those who came from the new provinces. On the contrary I have no hesitation in saying that I would join in supporting a proposition of that kind, but I do protest against this beclouding of the issue by endeavouring to prove that the government are not doing what they ought to do because they are simply doing what they were asked to do last session.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Judging from the remarks of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr.

Macdonald) I am quite satisfied that he is willing to support the opposition in the position they are taking. That position is a sound one. The hon. member for Victoria merely placed on record, as far as I can learn, his wishes with regard to the men who fought in South Africa, and was ready to urge upon the government the necessity of granting them a reasonable recognition all around for their services. In dealing with this to-day, we are merely asking the government to include in their resolution a recognition of the men in all the provinces who went to South Africa. That is a very reasonable request, and the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Macdonald) practically admits that such a resolution would be the proper kind of one to bring in. Then is it unreasonable that we should ask the government to bring a resolution down in a proper form, one which would include all the men who served their country in South Africa? The volunteers from the other provinces have just as much a right to a say in the distribution of the lands in the Northwest as any one in this House. They have just as good a right in those lands as the men in the western provinces, because the lands referred to are under Dominion administration, and it is our duty to administer them in the best interests of the people as a whole instead of in the interests of a small section. In rising, I wished particularly to say a word in favour of Trooper Mulloy who lost his eyesight during the war. His name has been before this House several times. Time and again the government have been urged to give him some recognition for the services which he rendered and the severe injury he sustained. He is only one of the many men who have sacrificed their health and their future in support of the flag we all honour. I also want to say a word on behalf of the wives and children of the men who lost their lives in defence of that flag. I do not see anything in this resolution that touches this part of the question, either in the Northwest Territories or our eastern provinces. I know of some families even in my own county, who need some help for having given up their bread winners in support of the empire in South Africa. I sincerely hope that their claims will also be considered when the government are framing a resolution in the manner in which the opposition say it ought to be framed.

Mr. DANIEL. I think it does not matter so much to us to-day what was said in this House during previous sessions. When the matter was up on those occasions, there was no such resolution before us as we have to-day. The resolution now before us is precedent to a Bill to put it into effect. Any resolution which came before us before was more of an academic nature and was not at all precedent to an actual Bill. The resolution we are discussing this afternoon is very much more important therefore than that which we had before us in a previous session. The question is one of recognition of the militia who went to South Africa to fight on behalf of the empire. It refers indeed only to a portion of that militia, but by that very fact it affects the whole body of the force who went abroad. And there can be no doubt that while all of us would be very glad indeed to see those volunteers who enlisted in the three prairie provinces rewarded by a homestead in that country, should this parliament confine its action to those men alone a great deal of discontent will be created among the other volunteers who did not come from the prairie provinces. It is said that we are giving these lands to the men from the prairie provinces because these lands form part of these provinces though they are being administered by us. But it must be clear to every one that this is not a provincial but a Dominion matter. We all know that before confederation the various provinces had to look after the militia the same as after their tariffs and those other things which after confederation were passed over to this parliament, but since that time the Dominion has been entrusted entirely with the raising and equipping and with the administration of the militia force of this country. It is said that as the prairie provinces have no lands of their own, they requested the Dominion to grant lands to the volunteers in South Africa who enlisted from those provinces.

In other words, the prairie provinces ask the people of the Dominion to pay what might be considered the prairie provinces' debt. It is true that the prairie provinces have no ownership in the public lands. But, if these lands were not given to them, the provinces were given a quid pro quo, the subsidies from this parliament being made proportionately large. If, then, these provinces wish to give a present to their volunteers they should provide that present. This, I take it, is the crux of the whole question. If these provinces wish to recognize the services of the volunteers from within their own territory, let them do it at their own expense. But if this Dominion does it for one portion of the volunteers alone, it will create dissatisfaction in other parts of the Dominion. While I should be pleased to see these men given due recognition of their services, I think it would be an unjust discrimination for this parliament to give the public lands to a certain number only. It seems to me it would be a political and tactical mistake on the part of the government. While it would please the men from the prairie provinces who enlisted it would very much displease the others because of the discrimination shown against them. Therefore, I quite agree with those who have asked the government to withhold this resolution for a time, in its present

form at all events, and until it can be so rearranged that, if the government recognizes the acts of any part of the militia, it will recognize all suitably and equally.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I wish to reiterate the opinion I expressed on this question when it was before the House last year. I took the ground then that if a reward was to be given to the men who went to South Africa, the scheme should be a comprehensive one and should include the volunteers from all parts of the Dominion. I have not altered my opinion. The resolution upon which the present action is said to be based was introduced by a private member on the opposition side of the House last year. I did not cause a very active or general discussion. The right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) took no part in the debate. The resolution was introduced simply as an expression of the gentleman who presented it. I do not think that resolution necessarily implied that no reward should be given in tangible form to those volunteers who came from provinces other than the prairie provinces. My recollection is that the motion was not treated in a very serious manner by hon. members on the other side of the House. The resolution now before the House stands by itself and is not a mere continuation of the resolution passed last year. The lands proposed to be given belong to the Dominion of Canada. But, to my mind, if a reward is to be given to the volunteers from the west to South Africa, either equal land grants or a cash equivalent should be given to the volunteers from the other provinces. It has been stated that other provinces gave lands to their returning volunteers. Ontario, for instance, gave lands worth perhaps $50 to each volunteer. But the lands in the west which it is proposed to give, 160 acres to each volunteer, would represent a grant of something like $1,000 at present value. If we are to introduce a measure of justice in these grants to those who went to South Africa, all should be treated equally. We ought to deal with this subject, not piecemeal, but by a comprehensive scheme. And, if this cannot be carried out in fairness by means of land grants, let us use other means, if necessary cash compensation, in order that all may be treated with equality. The maritime provinces are the only provinces that are not able to give land. There is no way by which the Dominion can give a land grant to the volunteers from those provinces except by giving them land in the Northwest. Large slices of rich territory in the west are being apportioned to the provinces there. Ontario is to get a good slice, and Quebec is looking anxiously toward Ungava. In all these provinces are lands from which rewards can be given for such services as we are endeavouring to reward to-day. If we of the maritime provinces have access to these rich territories, we could remunerate our men in the same substantial way. But we have not these lands. That does not alter the fact that the men from the maritime provinces rendered the same service as those from other parts of the Dominion, and should be treated on an equality with them. Let us deal with this matter in a statesmanlike way, on a scheme that will cover the whole Dominion. When the subject was before the House in a previous session, I proposed, in view of the importance of the question, that some compensation was due to the men who had fought for the Empire and that we should recognize their services in a way that would suitably reward every man who had rendered service. I can only hope that the Prime Minister, who gave expression to some such idea will give further thought to the subject with a view to recognize the services of the volunteers from every part of Canada. The objection to the present resolution is that you may give 160 acres of land in the west possibly worth $1,000 and then if you are to carry out an equitable scheme, you must put a valuation on this land and give the same remuneration in cash to the men from the other provinces. I think, however, that the more statesmanlike and the better way to deal with this would be to treat all alike, on either a land or a cash basis.

Mr. LAKE. The Prime Minister endeavoured to twit gentlemen on this side of the House with not endorsing the proposals put forward by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey) last year. I can assure him that if I had had an opportunity of speaking after he made that proposal I would have endorsed everything he said. He said:

> While I do not at all wish to dissent from justice being done to the men from the Northwest Territories who did their duty in fighting the battles of the empire, I desire to say a word for those volunteers in the same service who came from the maritime provinces.

He went on to say:

> I think that if the government intend to take up this matter seriously and do justice to the men from the Northwest, it should be only as part of a comprehensive scheme which will result in justice being done to all.

I would be prepared to endorse every word of that statement. The volunteers of every province should be treated with like generosity ; all offered their services at very great sacrifice; all underwent great hardships in doing their duty to the empire and they should be generously rewarded by this government. I would be glad to see these men from all the provinces granted their land in the west; they are just the kind of men we wish to have settle amongst us. I would ask whether the government is prepared to implement the suggestions made on that side of the House that after the

adoption of these proposals, which I hope will be made a little more generous than they are, with further suggestions for the purpose of rewarding these volunteers from other provinces in Canada who went forth to take part in the battles of the empire.

I am more concerned, of course with the people of the west and with the proposal now before us. I trust that that proposal will be put through although in a somewhat modified form. The resolution cited by the Minister of Militia this afternoon is the one which I myself called to the attention of the House during the debate last year. That resolution was passed in June, 1901, when the South African war was still in progress and when there was great enthusiasm throughout the country and a feeling of great gratitude, especially in the Northwest, to those volunteers who had gone forward to fight the battles of the empire for us. The resolution was based on the feeling that the people of the Northwest were the only people in the Dominion of Canada who at that moment had not possession of the lands situated within their borders. It was based on the belief that the people of those provinces were entitled to and would receive their lands, a unanimous belief at that time. The resolution asked for a grant of land and we are told that a grant is to be made to these volunteers. The resolution seems to me to provide for a grant of land accompanied by regulations which will prevent a great number of volunteers from accepting the benefits it is proposed to confer upon them. If the regulations under the Dominion Lands Act are followed, a homestead is only to be granted to those who have not already obtained homesteads. If that is not the intention the wording of the resolution must be altered. Many of those who volunteered from the west were actual farmers who had homesteads of their own and these men who were prepared to sacrifice their lives certainly should not be called on to sacrifice their reward in the way of a land grant. Then many men working for farmers returned to the west and have subsequently obtained homesteads of their own. These also should not be deprived of their reward. Then many men engaged in other occupations in that country, store keeping, &c., will according to this resolution have to throw up their business and everything they have in order to hunt up land which may be in many instances hundreds of miles away from their homes, to uproot themselves from their present places of residence and to settle in new country in order to avail themselves of this resolution. The only alternative is that they should take money scrip for $160. It is clear that the majority will find themselves bound to accept the money scrip under these regulations as they are now framed, and will have to dispose of that money scrip as best they can. The result will be that the money scrip will be disposed of for a fraction of its real value. The men whom it is proposed by this resolution to benefit for the services they have rendered will not be the real beneficiaries, but the people who buy up the scrip and use it from time to time as payment on Dominion lands. I strongly urge that a change be made in the resolution in regard to the money scrip, and that instead of granting $160 of money scrip as an alternative to the first resolution, a free grant of 160 acres of land should be made. That would be a substantial and a real implementing of the resolution passed by this House last year and the resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories in 1901. I sincerely trust that this will be so amended that each of these men will receive his patent for 160 acres of government land.

Mr. TURRIFF. If the hon. member (Mr. Lake) had read the resolution more carefully, he would have found that it does exactly what he said should be done. As I read it, each volunteer entitled to participate under this resolution will have the right to select a half-section of land on which he has to perform settlement duties; and these settlement duties would give him a half-section instead of the homestead to which he would be entitled in the ordinary way. This gives the volunteer the right to secure a half-section whether he is entitled to homestead or not. Each man receives under this a free patent to 160 acres of land which my hon. friend suggested that he should receive.

Mr. LAKE. Under the proposed Bill to amend the Dominion Lands Act, which was introduced by the Minister of the Interior last year, the same privilege of taking preemption was granted to an ordinary settler. I do not know whether it is to be included in the Bill which is to be introduced this year, but this gives to the beneficiary of this resolution very little more than he would get as an ordinary citizen of the country. In the future he will be able to get that land without paying for it.

Mr. TURRIFF. Supposing that the Bill is introduced by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior and it becomes law, it would not affect this resolution. Under this resolution every volunteer who is entitled would have the right to locate a half-section of land, and the very class of men that my hon. friend says will not be able to take advantage of this will be able to take advantage of it. It will not be necessary for each man who is entitled to locate a half section to go himself and locate it. He has the right under this to sell to a substitute who may locate and earn patent to the half-section. If this resolution passes, every one of the volunteers from the three provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba will be entitled, in addition to what he does by

way of homestead duties, to earn a quarter-section, to a bonus from the government or to a free patent to 160 acres of land. Those who do not care to go and do homestead duties themselves have the right to dispose of the scrip, and their substitutes will be in the same position as themselves. Those who do not wish in any shape or form to either take up the half-section by themselves or through a substitute have the right to take cash scrip which will have a value of $160. I think this resolution covers the ground very completely, and will be absolutely satisfactory to volunteers from the western provinces.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

HAMILTON RADIAL ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 25) respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company—Mr. Clarke.

Mr. LENNOX. The notices have not matured, and I suppose this Bill will not be proceeded with to-night.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I did not anticipate that the notices of motion would be matured to-night, and so I did not expect the Bill would be proceeded with.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no objection if my hon. friend wants it to stand over till to-morrow.

Mr. SPROULE. That would be better, as some who desire to speak on it are not prepared to go on to-night.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is hardly a good excuse, that some gentlemen are not prepared. This Bill has been on the Order Paper for a long time, and I do not think we should have public business held up just because some hon. members are not ready. We have only an hour for private Bills to-night, and I am quite willing to let it stand over.

Mr. SPROULE. The government resorts so often to an excuse of that kind that they ought to be the last to object to it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would like the Bill to remain at the head of the list.

Mr. LENNOX. It will, as a matter of course.

Mr. HENDERSON. When will the Bill be taken up again?

Mr. FISHER. Friday at eight o'clock.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will it be thrown over again?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not trying to throw it over.

Mr. HENDERSON. Friday night is not a good night for a Bill of a contentious character.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am quite willing to go on with it now for an hour if hon. gentlemen opposite are.

Progress reported.

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 47) respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company—Mr. Stewart.

Mr. LENNOX. This Bill was discussed very fully the other night, and I do not want to delay its passage, but I would ask the hon. gentleman in charge of it to state briefly what amount has been expended by the company up to the present time.

Mr. STEWART. I have no further information than we had the other evening.

Mr. SPROULE. The government have been carrying on surveys of this route for nearly two years, and only a portion of the report has been presented to parliament. Until we have the whole of that report it is impossible to tell what the undertaking means and what is likely to be the cost. Can the Minister of Railways say when we may expect that report?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am at the disadvantage that this work was done by the Public Works Department.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Bill had better stand until the Minister of Public Works comes in. I object to Bills going through in the absence of the minister who should be here to give us the fullest information, and it is not fair to ask the House to commit itself to such an important Bill in his absence.

Mr. MONK. It does not seem to me to be altogether fair to delay the passage of this private Bill because the Public Works Department is not represented this evening to tell us what the government has done in the way of surveys. The petition of this company satisfied the Railway Committee that they were entitled to a continuation of their powers and to a delay in the commencement of their work, and that is invariably granted to companies under conditions of this kind. We saw fit to incorporate the company, we always grant delay when it is asked, and I do not see why this company should be discriminated against. This is a gigantic work and to my knowledge for the past few years the company has shown some diligence and incurred expense. Under these circumstances, I do not think the absence of the government representative should be a reason for refusing to pass this Bill.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I do not see why this Bill should be delayed because the

Minister of Public Works is not here. There are two distinct propositions. One is for the construction of a 14-foot channel, and it is on that basis that the money has been expended by this company. The scheme the government has in hand is an entirely different one. It is to construct a 22-foot channel. These private individuals have done a splendid work in keeping this matter continually before the public ; they have expended a large amount of money in the interest of the general public as well as their own ; and I do not see why they should not be allowed to carry on their scheme until we see what the government are going to do.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the best answer to that is this. If the government have reached the conclusion that to construct a 14-foot canal would be only throwing money away, then they would be justified in stating to the House their policy and in refusing to grant further delay to this company. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) says we have never refused a similar request to any company. I remember distinctly when we did so in the case of the Chignecto Ship Canal Company, which had a charter for years and was promised government support. It was afterwards believed that it would be throwing away public money to give that support, and it was refused ; and when the company asked for an extension of time for their charter, that also was refused by parliament on the ground that it would be improper to keep alive a charter and to endeavour to get support for a scheme which parliament considered indefensible. We might reach the same conclusion in regard to this charter ; but I am not particularly taking that ground. I think this is too important an undertaking and too valuable a highway of commerce to be in the hands of any private corporation. I think the government ought to have a policy in regard to it, and be prepared to announce that policy, and not keep this private company working and piling up an expenditure which will all have to be paid by the country at the time the government takes over the undertaking. We had a discussion the other day with regard to doing away with tollgates in the neighbourhood of Montreal. We shall be practically establishing a system of toll-gates along the highway of commerce if we leave the matter in the hands of a private corporation, because every toll it will impose on vessels passing through that canal will be a toll on the commerce of the country. It is an undertaking that the country should own and control. I think the Minister of Public Works ought to be here to give us the information we have asked for, so that we may be in a position to decide whether it would be wise to continue the life of this corporation or not. The Minister of Railways, if not prepared to lay on the table the information we desire, cannot complain if we ask that the Bill be allowed to stand until some member of the government is prepared to give us the information.

Mr. LENNOX. The position taken by the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Wright) to-night is very different from that announced the other night when we were discussing this Bill. The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. McCool), who seemed very familiar with it, referring to the company, said :

> They have had one of the most expert engineers of this country here the whole summer, going over all the surveys, making plans and specifications and estimating the cost, which he put at $80,000,000 for a twenty-foot waterway.

The hon. member for South Renfrew tells us to-night that what the company is working at is a scheme for a 14-foot waterway.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I know that my hon. friend does not want to misrepresent me. I spoke of what they originally undertook to do.

Mr. LENNOX. We do not care what they originally undertook to do. We want to come up to date if we can, and find out where we are to-night. Then the hon. member for Nipissing said :

> The government decided to make a survey on their own account for twenty-one feet of navigation, or twenty-two feet depth in the locks.

Certainly we ought to have information as to how much has been expended by the company on this work. The hon. gentleman promoting the Bill has not been able to give us that information. On the other hand, the government have been asked to give us full information as to what they have expended. I think it is reasonable that the Bill should stand until we get that information.

Mr. SPROULE. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, until the Minister of Public Works is here.

Mr. GRAHAM. Before that motion is put, I might say, in order that hon. gentlemen may understand, that this is a pretty large undertaking, and I am not at all of opinion that money is wasted in getting all the information that can be obtained in a scheme of the gigantic proportions of this scheme, both as to the cost and the results. My hon. friend says that the government must announce its policy. I think it is wisdom for the government to thoroughly investigate any large enterprise of this kind before they make a definite announcement. This company was chartered in 1894, not by the present government, but by the late government, and all the objections which could be raised to a private company would

hold good when the company was chartered. After a thorough discussion, it was thought wise to charter this company. It is now too late to discuss the advisability, because it has been chartered, and its charter has been renewed time and again. Has the time come when we should stop renewing that charter? I am inclined to think, in the present state of affairs in Canada, when it is no exaggeration to say that the entire world is looking on Canada as being enthusiastic and energetic in opening up waterways and improving our channels of communication in every respect, that we ought to hesitate before we refuse to grant the mere extension which this company has enjoyed for years. Last year, I think it was, a clause was put into the charter protecting the parliament of Canada. It enables the government to take over this work, I think, on a week's notice, on paying the company its actual outlay of money. On the financial side of the question, the cost cannot be very much enlarged by another extension of time. That clause is being inserted in this Bill, although it does not appear in the printed Bill. Personally I do not want to urge that we should go on with it at present, but I see no objection whatever to extending the time, as we have done before, for another term, as suggested by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think the hon. gentleman should understand that any one suggests this Bill should not go through but we ought to have reasonable information before it does go through. We should have the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) in the House and get some information from him, which we must assume he has.

Mr. GRAHAM. What information?

Mr. LENNOX. Information as to the amount the government has expended so far, what steps they have taken, what they propose to do, why these two organizations are at work at the same time, and why the government should not do the whole work itself of preliminary surveys and making the necessary inquiries.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I have some information which I can give the House:

Department of Public Works,
Ottawa, January 16, 1908.

Dear Mr. Wright,—Replying to your inquiries this morning. I beg to state that the total cost of the Georgian Bay ship canal survey, from commencement to December 31, 1907, is $654,390.42.

I wish to say a word or two more with reference to this. I believe that this ship canal, when constructed, should be owned by the people and operated in the interests of the people. Whether the government should construct this canal itself or not is a different proposition. But here is a company which has a charter for doing this work. They say to us: Allow this charter to be extended, then if the government decide to construct the work themselves, we will step out, but if the government think it advisable to engage us to do the work for them and then own the canal, we are prepared to do it. Therefore we would like to have our charter extended, so that if the government do not choose to undertake the construction themselves, we shall carry it on, and if required own it ourselves. I do not see anything unfair in that, and I consequently cannot see why the charter should not be extended.

Mr. J. D. REID. Before this Bill is allowed to pass, we should know what amount the company claim to have expended up to the present so that we may know exactly how we stand. From the letter just read by the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Wright) the government have spent some $654,000 up to December on surveys and preliminary information. That is a very large amount, and for that expenditure they ought to have all the information necessary to enable them to come to a decision. But the hon. gentleman says that this company want to be kept alive so that they may undertake the construction, if necessary for the government. Well, I do not think the government are going to give any company the expenditure of $150,000,000. If this work goes on, it will be divided up into sections and not given to any particular company. So far as this company is concerned, I am in favour of their being repaid any reasonable and just expenditure they have made; but before we consent to keep this company alive, we should have a statement showing exactly what they have expended. We shall then be in a position to let the Bill go through, and if necessary add a clause to remunerate them for anything they may have sepnt.

Mr. MONK. What my hon. friend requires is that we should do here the work which, I presume, was done by the Railway Committee. I was not in the committee when the Bill was discussed, but it is fair to assume that the preamble of the Bill was proved before the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. MONK. I quite agree with my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that this large work should be undertaken by the government. I have never had any doubt about that myself. I knew that the government had spent more than half a million dollars on the preliminary surveys, and any one who reads the report of the Transportation Commission must come to the conclusion that sooner or later this is a work which must be undertaken by the government. I am not in favour, as insinuated by my hon. friend from East Grey, of

placing in the company the power to levy tolls on our commerce. But this is a different proposition. Here is a company which has long been in existence and which desires a prolongation of its corporate existence, and we, after having received the report of the Railway Committee, are asked to stop the progress of this Bill until the government have not only made known exactly the amount it has expended but what its policy is. I do not think that is a fair proposition. I think we should have a declaration of the policy of the government, but do not think that their failure to make that declaration should interfere with the extension of a charter of a private company, when the Railway Committee has reported that it is entitled to such extension. I do not think it fair that we should block this Bill on the ground that we have not received a declaration of the policy of the government.

Mr. SPROULE. I have not taken that ground but only the position that that information was not given in the Committee of Railways. I was there when that committee agreed to an extension of the charter, and I know the information was not given.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member who is promoting the Bill cannot give it to-night.

Mr. SPROULE. No. We should know in what position we stand but no one can give the information. Here are two sets of men going on incurring expense at one and the same time, and both for the same purpose, but not amalgamating the information they are acquiring. We were told the other night that this company is still going on doing work and increasing the expense, and that expense, according to a clause we put in the Bill the last time the charter was extended, we shall have to pay when we take the work over from that company. Is it businesslike to allow that to continue? The government are going on making preliminary surveys in order to determine what the work will cost. To that we do not object, but why should a private company at the same time be continuing a similar expenditure from month to month and year to year, when that expenditure can serve no good purpose, so far as the government is concerned, because the government would no doubt rely on its own surveys and data should it determine to go on with the work? If this corporation desires to keep its corporate powers alive, it should be prepared to tell us what it has spent up to the present, so that we may know what we may be committed to by keeping it alive. and we are also entitled to have the full report of that government commission. A portion of that report only has been laid on the table and we were promised the balance very soon. We have not yet got that balance, and therefore can pass no judgment on the work as a whole or estimate about how much it will cost. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) says he is not in favour of putting a toll on commerce, but how is a private company to recoup itself for its outlay, if it is not allowed to charge so much a ton on every ton of freight that passes through the canal? Therefore we shall be putting a tollgate on one of the great arteries of commerce. That should not be. We should rather undertake to make it as absolutely free as possible and make commerce as cheap and free as possible. For these reasons, we ought to have that information. When I move that the committee rise for the present, I do not wish to stop the Bill entirely, but only to put it off until this information is available. We cannot do our duty in the consideration of this Bill until we have this information, and the government ought to see to it that it is afforded us.

Motion (Mr. Sproule) negatived—yeas 25; nays 58.

Mr. J. D. REID. It would not take the president of this company five minutes to tell what has been expended up to this time.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Would he accept the figures submitted by this company in such a matter? I would not accept their figures until they had been verified.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am sorry the hon. member (Mr. A. A. Wright) has so little confidence in this company.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I do not think that any man of business experience or common sense would accept the figures of another party in such a matter without the opportunity to criticise them.

Mr. J. D. REID. When the hon. gentleman has so little confidence in the company I wonder all the more that he is so willing to allow this Bill to pass without any information. I think we should have the figures showing what the expenditure of the company has been and also what their annual expenditure is. The government are surveying this great waterway at heavy expense. I feel that this company should be recouped for anything they have really expended on this great work, but I do not think that the government should allow the expenditure to be increased while the government itself is on the work. Another thing is that the minister in charge of this work, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) is not present to give us the information we require. If this Bill is not sufficiently important for the hon. gentleman to attend to, I do not see how it can be regarded as so important that it must be

rushed through to-night. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) is taking a pretty active part in it, and I think he should be looking after the interests of the St. Lawrence on which he lives.

Mr. GRAHAM. But my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) is never satisfied with the way that is done.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am satisfied with the St. Lawrence channel so far as the work has been done. But I want it made a 20-foot channel, including the deepening of the Welland canal, so that steamers can come down to Kingston and Prescott. I think that such a channel will suffice for many years to carry the grain of the west. I think the Minister of Railways and Canals should allow this to stand until his colleague the Minister of Public Works is present.

Mr. LANCASTER. I, for one, am not prepared to vote for this Bill in view of what I have heard. The gentleman in whose name the Bill stands gives us no information about the expenses, for which, it is admitted on all hands, this company would have a moral, if not a legal, claim to be recouped by the government if the work is done by the country instead of being left to the corporation. I confess that I begin to grow suspicious that there is something wrong. This company asks us for a favour, an indulgence. I have been in the Railway Committee for seven years and have seen these renewals made periodically. This company is to be given an opportunity to mark time until the government decides upon a policy, and then it will have as big a bill as possible against the country. I want to be perfectly fair to this corporation. If the expenses were not increasing, it would do no harm to grant this company a renewal of its charter, but when there is no means of knowing what the claim of the company may be two years from now, we are asked to then pay, I grow suspicious, as I have said, that the bill may be a good deal larger than the country will think it ought to be. I am like my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. A. A. Wright) in desiring a verified bill, but I am unlike him in that, if I cannot get a verified bill, I would at least rather have one to which we can hold this company for the future. I am not with the minister in what he says about wanting all the information before stating the policy of the government on this matter.

Surley the same rule ought to apply to us in dealing with this private charter, and we should have information before we decide that it shall be the policy of the House to renew this charter. No. hon. gentleman who is anxious for the passage of this Bill, not even the hon. member of Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) who urges it so strongly, holds out any encouragement that this company will carry out the work if the charter is renewed. They do not believe that the people incorporated by the Bill have any real intention or ought even to be allowed to carry on the work. Yet they say the Bill should go through as a matter of course. We have to remember that some day we will probably have to pay these people a large amount of money expended in connection with this work and we ought surely not to be asked to grant a renewal without any information as to what this amount of expense is likely to be. I do not admit that a company which obtains renewals of its charter on condition of doing a certain thing at a certain time, and fails to do it, has any legal claim upon the people of this country. But it is suggested that a clause is to be put in the Bill which is not in any copy of the Bill which was before the committee or which is in the hands of any hon. member here to-night.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend does not mean to mislead the House, but he understands that the Bill went through the Railway Committee on the distinct understanding that it should be made subject to the clause safeguarding the rights of the government which was inserted in the Bill of last year. That clause was to be inserted by the clerk of the committee. This is the clause which was inserted last year:

His Majesty, his heirs and successors, may at any time assume the possession of, and the property in, the said canals and works, and of and in all the rights, privileges and advantages of the company on giving to the company one week's notice of intention to do so; and thereupon all property in the said canals, works, rights, privileges and advantages shall become, and thenceforward shall be, vested in His Majesty, his heirs and successors; and by way of compensation His Majesty shall pay to the company the value of the work actually done by the company up to the time of the giving of such notice in surveying, and in the making of plans and otherwise upon the ground, together with the value of all tangible property of the company, of which possession may be so taken, such values to be fixed by three valuators, or the majority of them, one valuator to be chosen by His Majesty, another by the company, and the third by the two so chosen.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not understand what the minister means by saying that I do not wish to mislead the committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. He said that the House was being asked to vote that amendment to this Bill without that having been seen by the committee.

Mr. LANCASTER. They have heard it now for the first time since the minister rose. It is all very well for the minister to read it but it is not in the Bill as placed before the members. I do not think the minister was right in suggesting that I was misleading the House intentionally or unin-

tentionally. I was absolutely correct in my statement and the minister proved that by reading the section he proposes to have inserted in the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is wrong, the Railway Commission of which my hon. friend is a member did that. The Bill passed that committee with the understanding that a clause was to be added by the clerk of the committee making that clause from the Act of last year effective as regards the renewal and the chairman of this committee has a copy of the Bill before him with the clause in it.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is in the Bill before the chairman but not in that upon the desks of members. It was not in the charter when the promoters brought it before the committee and they attempted to get it through without having it in.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. That was in 1906.

Mr. LANCASTER. Suppose it was, I am speaking of this session. It was there without the clause.

Mr. GRAHAM. We put it in in the committee.

Mr. LANCASTER. It was ordered to be put in and it is before the chairman, but no hon. member in the Railway Committee saw it unless by referring to an existing statute. You have to do this to see what the minister was having the clerk of the committee insert. At the time that the Railway Committee dealt with the Bill there was no such provision in it. That is what makes me say that I have no sympathy with these people in asking for this indulgence now. They are taking all they can get from the country and they are taking it without any condition whatever unless it is forced upon them. Although the committee has shown them the necessity of having such a clause to protect the people and although they have agreed to put it in they will not give us any information as to how many dollars and cents that contract may involve. I do not know that there is much use of my going on with any extensive remarks because the hour for private Bills has about elapsed although I have a good deal more to say about it when the occasion arises.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) takes exception to the Bill because an expropriation clause is not included in it. The Bill provides for that.

Mr. LANCASTER. It did not before the Railway Committee.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, it does; you have not read the Bill through. There was no necessity whatever for this subsequent clause, but the government, in order to make assurance doubly sure, provided for it in the amendment which has been handed in. Provision is made that all the safeguards of the former Bill shall apply to this particular Bill. The Bill provides that the company:

> Subject to the provisions of this Act, may in connection with such construction and operation, exercise all the powers granted to the said company by its Act of incorporation, chapter 103 of the statutes of 1894, and amendments thereof; and if such construction is not so commenced and such expenditure is not so made, or if the said canals are not finished and put in operation, on or before the said respective dates, the powers granted to the said company by parliament shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the canals and works of the said company as then remain uncompleted.

Mr. LANCASTER. Where does that bring in that clause about expenses?

Mr. HAGGART. It brings in all the Acts upon which the expropriation power is founded. There is no necessity at all for that clause, but, in order to remove all doubts, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) thought it would be better that that particular expropriation clause should be put into this Bill. The hon. gentleman asks about bringing down the amount of the expenditure. How could any company do that? They are limited, under the expropriation clause, to certain claims against the government. It is only the actual work done, the machinery that is on the work, tangible property, that can be made the basis of any claim. They have no prospective profits. They have no expenditure for incorporation or for like purposes. The company are limited under the expropriation clause such as no other company was limited that applied for a charter.

Mr. LANCASTER. All the more reason for giving the figures.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman asks for figures. There may be very little expenditure in actual construction.

Mr. LANCASTER. Let them say so.

Mr. HAGGART. The gentlemen who are promoting this charter are the foremost men in construction companies in the world. One of the parties who is interested in this construction company is Mr. Perks, a member of parliament in England, who believes fully that the undertaking will be a benefit to the country. We may all differ from that; we may think that this is a work that the government ought to undertake. What has this to do with the extension of the charter of this company? Nothing whatever. The parties who are applying for this Bill say they have complied with every condition, and if they are not going on with the work now and if the conditions embodied in the last Bill have not been fulfilled it is through no fault of theirs, but for other reasons. They say that they have made surveys of the ground and that, ac-

cording to their charter, they have furnished plans and specifications of this particular work, which have been in the hands of the government for a year. The government are making surveys. The government have not determined what their policy is in reference to this particular work. Are these people to be refused an extension of a charter when they have performed every condition? This is getting a little monotonous. Parties who have fought their Bills before the committee to which, for the convenience of this House, they are referred, and where they should get all their information—if they are not there they ought to be—come before this House and, in the Committee of the Whole, ask for that information. I never heard of it before. It is something novel to us. Why the objection to this Bill? Is it on account of this particular company, or is it that they are afraid that they will build the canal? Is it that a great many of these gentlemen do not want the Georgian Bay canal to be built at all? As stated the other evening, we in this section of the country want the canal built. If it cannot be built by the government, we are anxious to grasp at any opportunity of having it built by a company or any one else. Hon. gentlemen object that it is not the province of a company to build canals in this country. That was the objection the other evening. Every canal that is built in Great Britain is built by a company. Who built the Manchester ship canal, who built the whole of the canals that are at present in Great Britain and a great many of them on the continent? Who built the Suez canal? It was built by a corporation, and although I may doubt perhaps in this particular instance if a corporation ought to have an opportunity of collecting tolls upon this canal, and although it may be said that it more properly is a work which the government should undertake, I would at the same time point out that the powers of expropriation that the government have enabling them to take the work into their possession show that they are as fully protected as if they had made the expenditure themselves, I cannot see any possible objection to this Bill.

LAND GRANTS TO SOUTH AFRICAN VOLUNTEERS.

The hour for private Bills having expired, House resumed in committee on the proposed resolution of Mr. Oliver providing for land grants to South African volunteers.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to prolong unduly discussion on this resolution in which I fully concur as far as it goes, but I wish to offer a few observations to the committee in regard to the extent of it. We have had no valid reason given by the government why this recognition should not be extended to all Canadians who took part in the South African war. These lands belong to the Dominion and our contention is that there should be no discrimination whatever, and that all the South African veterans should stand on the same footing and receive the same reward from the Dominion. One supporter of the government alleged that the reason this resolution had taken its restricted form was because in a former session a private member had moved that the volunteers who reside in the Northwest should have recognition. Surely if a private member saw fit to bring the claim of the volunteers in his particular locality to the attention of the government, the government is not bound by such a restriction, and the moment it undertook to reward these volunteers it should extend the reward to all indiscriminately. Nothing can be more true than the remark of my hon. friend (Mr. Barker), that in future years it will be considered as a reflection upon all the other volunteers of Canada that they have not been included in this legislation. Another supporter of the government advanced the contention that we are administering the lands of the provinces of the Northwest as trustees for the provinces where these lands are situated. I have never heard that view put forward before. On the contrary, when Alberta and Saskatchewan were organized as provinces it was maintained by the government that we should keep these lands exclusively under our control, and when we acquired them we granted a very large indemnity to the provinces and that indemnity is paid yearly by all the citizens of Canada without distinction. The argument of the Minister of Militia, that the western provinces still exercise a kind of sovereignty over these lands and that the government had been guided in the preparation of this resolution by the wish expressed by these provinces, has no foundation in fact. If the resolution is not made wider in its scope, it will create a well founded feeling of dissatisfaction throughout the country. There is a cognate question which calls for some consideration before this matter is disposed of, and I would like to be enlightened upon it. The claims of our veterans have been before the House many a time and the strange thing is that on this as on other questions the government does not seem to have any fixed policy at any particular time. In 1903 Mr. Walter Scott, then a member of the House, asked whether the government would recognize the claims of the South African volunteers who were residents of the Northwest Territories, and the Minister of Militia answering on behalf of the government, stated distinctly (Hansard, 1903, page 820) that it was not the intention of the government to ask parliament to vote any recognition of the services of these volunteers. In 1906 we had a very interesting discussion in this House in reference to a petition made to this government by the veterans of 1866

and 1870, and upon a motion which I then presented. Let me say that I do not understand why we should reward the South African volunteers and totally ignore the veterans of the forces that were engaged in 1866, and 1870, and in the rebellion of 1885 in the defence of the country. I do not think it is possible for us to make a better distribution of the lands in the Northwest then to grant special favour in the settlement of these lands to all our veterans. They are our own people ; as a very general rule they are qualified to settle those lands, and their claims should be acknowledged without any discrimination whatever. In 1906, as I have said, I moved that the services of the veterans of 1866 and 1870 should be recognized and that they should be given an opportunity to settle in the west. The Minister of Militia admitted the claim was well founded but he asked me to withdraw my motion promising to give it consideration. The member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) thought it was a most reasonable proposition, declared he sympathized with it, and that undoubtedly if the motion were withdrawn consideration would be given to it. The Prime Minister concurred in the suggestion and he, too, promised to give it consideration, but he urged that the policy of the government was that the Northwest lands should be given to settlers only and on condition that they should settle there, and so the government did not see its way clear, as it would not depart from that rule, to recognize the claim of the men for whom I was pleading. The right hon. gentleman said, that although the motion came late and although the petition of the veterans of 1866 and 1870 had only been brought to the consideration of the government since 1896, yet times had changed and the conditions of the lands in the Northwest were different. I quote the right hon. gentleman's words from page 636, 'Hansard' of 1906 :—

Time moves and evidently the ideas we have in 1905 are not the same as they were in 1866 or 1870. The government of the day thought they were discharging their full duty to the veterans and the volunteers to those who had risked their lives, by simply providing for the widow and the orphans of him who was no more and providing as well a pension to him who had been disabled. But, we have moved since that time and now we are told that we should recognize in some substantial manner the services of these men. As I have said, the government will be prepared to consider any resolution of that kind. But, if it be insisted that the veterans should receive land simply to speculate in it, that is a thing that requires further consideration from the government before we agree to it.

At that time it was established by the statement of the Minister of Militia that there were about 5,000 veterans of 1866 and 1870. There is no doubt that times have moved even since 1906, and there has been a great deal of speculation in Northwest lands. There has been a great deal of alienation of lands to companies who have obtained them under peculiar circumstances and realized immense profits from them. There is no doubt also that our policy in regard to the settlement of those lands has been largely influenced by immigration agents, booking agents associated together, and transportation companies having large interests at stake. There are two things that we see to-day: companies who succeed in obtaining very extensive grants of land and realizing large profits on the re-sale of those lands, and immigrants from foreign countries who are brought out here under special conditions of favour and succeed in obtaining the best of those lands under the most favourable conditions that our own fellow citizens do not seem to be able to obtain. Under these circumstances, though approving of this resolution, I say we cannot do better, if we adopt the principle of rewarding our veterans, than to adopt the policy of making no distinction whatever. Do not let us give them lands to speculate with, but let us give them all indiscriminately the same chance of obtaining under specially favourable conditions those lands in the Northwest which other people seem to be able to obtain from this government under conditions of special favour. I do not think it would be fair in any sense to confine the resolution to the volunteers resident at that time in those three provinces. I do not think it would be fair to adopt the suggestion made by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) to confine our recognition of merit to those provinces in which no recognition has been made by the provinces themselves. That would be unjust. We should extend the condition of favour to all our volunteers, without any distinction, and I feel satisfied that those of 1866, those of 1870 and those of 1885 who have expended their strength and their courage, not, it is true, in defending the empire in another dependency, but putting forth all their efforts at a time of great peril and under conditions of great difficulty in the defence of their own land, should all be put on the same footing.

Mr. GALLIHER. Speaking for myself, I would like to see all the Canadians who took part in the South African campaign granted recognition. The point is how that can be brought about. Certain of those soldiers have already received recognition from some of the provinces. The province of British Columbia and the province of Ontario, which control their lands, have to my mind taken the proper course in granting recognition in the shape of land grants to the soldiers who were residents in those provinces and enlisted from them. I think the same course should be followed by every province in Canada which has control of its own lands. In the province of Quebec

and the province of New Brunswick, at all events, there are large tracts of land that will be opened up by the construction of the new Transcontinental Railway, and those two provinces are in a position to treat the soldiers who were residents of those provinces in the same manner as the soldiers in the province of Ontario and British Columbia have been treated. Then, let us come to the question at issue in this resolution, which proposes to deal with lands owned by the Dominion government in the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. In those provinces, as we all know, there are three clases of lands—school lands, Indian lands and lands owned absolutely by the Dominion government. In regard to the first two classes the government occupies only a fiduciary relation; the other lands, over which the Dominion government has absolute control, are not only the property of the citizens who may reside in the district where the lands are situated, but are the property of all the people of Canada. To that extent such provinces as can be shown to have no land at their disposal have an equal right to share with the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. I believe there are Crown lands in the province of Nova Scotia, but I do not know whether there are sufficient for this purpose or not; that is a matter on which the government can satisfy themselves. I am satisfied, however, that there are absolutely no lands at the disposal of the government of Prince Edward Island, and, therefore, it strikes me as a fair proposition that the soldiers who enlisted from Prince Edward Island should be dealt with in exactly the same manner in regard to Dominion lands as the soldiers from provinces which had lands to dispose of. I take that position because the soldiers from Prince Edward Island are not recruited by that province, but by the Dominion of Canada. The resolutions presented to this government from the Northwest provinces indicate that if it were within the power of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan to grant those lands, as had been done by the provinces of British Columbia and Ontario, they would do so, but not being in a position to do so themselves, they asked this government to set aside certain lands under certain conditions for the volunteers who were residents of and enlisted from those provinces. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has referred to another class, the veterans of 1866. I would refer still to another, in whose behalf I have already spoken on one or two occasions very briefly in this House. I refer to the men who were the original pioneer foreign service men in the service of the British government. I mean the body of men specially selected from Canada in 1884 as being particularly qualified for a special kind of work, that of conveying the troops up the river Nile to the relief of General Gordon at Khartoum.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. GALLIHER. I never had the opportunity of bringing this matter up so directly before because there was no occasion in which the government proposed to give land to Canadian volunteers as a reward for Imperial service.

Mr. BERGERON. It was not a war.

Mr. GALLIHER. The men who went up that river and did that special work were as fine a body of men as ever left the shores of Canada and they took their lives in their hands.

Mr. BERGERON. That is true, and the hon. gentleman is a good sample of these men.

Mr. GALLIHER. I am not speaking for myself though I was one of them. Many of those men lost their lives in that undertaking, many have died since, but there are scattered throughout this country many of them to whom a grant of this kind would be a great deal of assistance; and on their behalf I would ask the same consideration as we are giving to the men who served the empire at a latter day. Because that occurred twenty or thirty years ago is no reason why the claims of these men are not as just to-day as the claims of any others who fought in the Imperial service. I do not wish to add any more to this debate but simply to reiterate that I believe the provinces which have lands at their disposal should take the same course as has been taken by British Columbia and Ontario. As regards the provinces which have not public lands, let the government take that fact into consideration and treat them in the same way as they propose to treat the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Mr. HERRON. Before this resolution is disposed of, I wish to obtain a little information. I am very much at sea regarding the meaning of one or two clauses in this resolution. To begin with, I am not going to quarrel with my other friends on the other side of the House regarding how far the benefits of this resolution should extend. If the government should be satisfied to grant land to the South African volunteers throughout the Dominion, no one would greet that decision more heartily than I. I do not think that we could bring any men from any part of the empire to the Northwest who would make better settlers than those who took up arms to defend the empire in South Africa. But if this grant should be extended to men from other provinces, some slight difference should be made in the conditions. The hon. member from East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) this evening said that a substitute could perform the resident duties for the appli-

cant for these free homesteads. In the first two lines of the second clause of the resolution, namely :

That every such grant shall be subject to the conditions that the grantee, or his duly qualified substitute, shall select and enter for the said two quarter-sections in the Dominion lands office for the land district in which they are situated.

These are quite clear to me. I suppose they mean that a substitute may make entry for the applicant in the Land Office as was the case in days gone by. But the first part of clause 3, I do not understand. It says :

That any person entitled, under the foregoing provisions, to select and enter for, either by himself or by his substitute, land as a homestead, may, in lieu thereof——

The words 'entitled to' are what I do not quite understand. Under the provisions of this Bill, if a man has already availed himself of the privilege of homesteading, can he take 320 acres of land, 160 acres as a second free homestead and another 160 as a pre-emption or free grant ? If in the first case, he is allowed to take 320 acres provided he has already had a homestead, I am satisfied with the Bill. But if he is not allowed to do that, what condition applies to the other quarter-section? Will he have to reside on it or could a substitute perform the duties for him, or will the duties have to be performed ? I would like to impress on the minister and the House the great importance that that will be to the members of the volunteer force from the Northwest. The House is well aware that most of these men volunteered from the settled portion of the country, where the land was practically at that time pretty well taken up, and where the men were either engaged in farming or in stock raising or other business in the country. When the men returned from South Africa the land was practically all taken up in the country where they resided. If these men have to comply with all these conditions as regards residence for six months in the year for three years, for one or even two quarter-sections of land, I do not think that many of them will be able to avail themselves of the privileges contained in this resolution.

These men are engaged in some line of business in settled parts of the country, where they could not get two quarter-sections adjoining—that is unless they are allowed to take a second homestead. Not one man in twenty would be willing to leave his present place of business to go to a new part of the country and take up a quarter-section of land. Even if the terms of the grant allowed them to have the duties performed by somebody else, it would probably cost them as much as the land is worth to engage somebody else to do those duties. Another point which I mentioned two years ago when the Bill was introduced and accepted by the House was that the land or scrip should be issued to the nearest of kin to those who were killed in South Africa or who have since died. I mentioned two cases when the Bill was before the House. One was that of a young man who was killed in South Africa. Since then, his father has died, leaving the boy's mother a widow. Another South African volunteer in the same town was killed in the war, leaving only a sister. These relations, of course, could not comply with the conditions required for the ordinary homestead patent. Another case that I have in mind is that of a man who received injuries or who contracted illness during the South African campaign, and who has been in the hospital almost constantly since he returned, and is now in a hospital in Vancouver, B.C. Special provisions should be made for a case of that kind. I know another instance which should be included within the scope of this measure. A young man who was born in the Northwest was in the employ of one of the banks. He was transferred from the Northwest Territories to Ontario a few months before the war broke out. He volunteered in Ontario, went to South Africa, and remained there during the war. He then returned to the Northwest and resumed work in the employ of the same institution as before. Though this young man did not actually enlist in the Northwest, I think the benefits of this measure should be extended to him. I hope that liberality will be shown in matters of this kind.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). I should be very much pleased if the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should see his way clear to withdraw his resolution. The discussion we have had shows that the consensus of opinion is that this is a very sectional, one-sided proposal. Volunteers went from all parts of Canada to risk their lives in defence of the empire, but the government will divide these men into two classes, according to the section of country in which they live. Surely this is not the teaching of the Prime Minister. I remember reading with great pride that, when in England, he told the people there how he was uniting all sections of Canadians making this people into one great nation. But what is he doing under this resolution ? He is setting section against section ; he is declaring that, if a volunteer lives in one section, his services should be rewarded, but the volunteer who lives in another section should be ignored and his services disregarded. The Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) tells us that this resolution is introduced because the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) made a speech last year. The great government, forsooth which is supposed to have a mind of its own, must

come forward with such a resolution as this because a member opposed to them has made a speech. I have heard an argument from the Prime Minister also which, if he sat on this side of the House, he would be the first to condemn. If the government of Manitoba, or Alberta, or Saskatchewan came here and asked this Dominion to give its volunteers some land, what would be the reply? The reply would be: True you have no land, but we gave you a quid pro quo for your land; we satisfied you completely; you cannot expect to have both your lands and the money which was given as compensation for withholding those lands; if you have not the lands you have the money, and, if you wish to reward your volunteers, you have the means of doing it. In any case, these lands are lands for which every province in Canada assisted to pay. I have heard how generous Ontario and British Columbia were to their volunteers. They might well be generous for they had been given large slices of this land for nothing. And now the province of Quebec wants more, the province of Ontario wants more, the province of Manitoba wants more. And you propose under this resolution that if a man lives in Prince Edward Island he shall have no share of this land for which his province helped to pay, but land shall be given to men who happen to live in another section of the country. I can imagine the leader of the government speaking on such a resolution as this if he were on this side of the House and the resolution had been proposed by his opponents. I could not say it in the way he would say it, but I can imagine his speech. I can imagine the cheers that would be raised by those surrounding him on this side when he would ask the leader of the government sitting where he now sits: What are you doing? You say you are trying to unite the people of this country, but this Bill is going to divide them; you are going to draw lines which will divide east from west and throw the apple of discord between the different provinces; you are going to say that the man in little Prince Edward Island is to be treated differently from the man in Manitoba. He would say: I will stand up for the minority, I will not see a small province or any part of this Dominion trampled under foot.

I say to the leader of the government in all seriousness withdraw this resolution; do not throw an apple of discord among the provinces. Those men, the bravest men in this country, risked their lives and do not draw a dividing line between the men coming from Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island or Manitoba.

I could understand one thing if you would say it. You might say: We have lots of land in the west though the grafter got large shares which we desire to see settled by patriotic people. If we want patriotic people, those of our own country who served in the wars are patriotic men. But what does this resolution say? It does not propose to give them the land, but to give them scrip. If you are going to act in the interest of this country, give them that land if they will settle on it, and do not allow the advantage to go to the man who buys the scrip and makes money out of it.

The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) was kind enough to say: Oh, well, the people of Prince Edward Island can pay their volunteers in money. The hon. gentleman has been very kindly dealt with by this government, I believe, as far as I can learn, he would like the government to be generous to himself, but I do not know about his own generosity.

I could not imagine, if I had not heard this discussion from both sides of the House, that such arguments would be used as have been used to prop up such a one-sided proposal as this Bill contains. I am not here to discuss what was done last year and the year before. Some hon. gentlemen say there was a vote on this matter, but no. I do not remember the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) making that speech; I did not hear it, and if he did make it, I do not wish to be responsible for the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes), and I am sure that this government is not going to take their cue from him. The Minister of Militia says that he heard the hon. member for Victoria. I believe they are very good friends, but I did not think that the minister had such influence that he would induce his leader, the Prime Minister to go with him and adopt the view of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes), making it the policy of the government. Such arguments, in my opinion, are on a par with the other one, that because Manitoba and these other provinces wanted something therefore the government must give it to them, simply because they asked it. Have they always been that generous to Manitoba? Have they always given to Manitoba what that province wanted? The people of Manitoba have for years asked to have their boundaries extended so that from being a mere postage stamp on the map it would be a province of a size commensurate with that of the western provinces. But this government turned a deaf ear. In this case Manitoba wanted something else, and they could not resist the appeal; they could not tell them what any government with any kind of judgment would tell them: If you have not lands to give these men as Ontario and British Columbia have done, under the settlement which we made with you you have money, and you can give them some of that. If the government wished to be patriotic, let them now come forward with a resolution which will do equal justice to all sections of the country. I

have faith enough and confidence enough in the Prime Minister to believe he will withdraw the resolution and introduce one more patriotic, equitable and fairer to all the provinces of Canada.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) and the member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross) placed a great deal of dependence on the fact that they had a mandate from the territorial assembly in the shape of a resolution passed by that body declaring that the lands should be disposed of to the residents of those two provinces who had served in South Africa. Both of these hon. gentlemen made that a special reason why this government should follow the course they are now following in the resolution before the House. Those hon. gentlemen are not always so anxious and eager to follow the mandates of the people. As the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. A. Martin) has rightly pointed out, this government for many long years has turned a deaf ear to the mandate of the province of Manitoba. That province has asked to have certain lands added to its territory. This was a universal demand unanimously passed by the legislature on many occasions, but still this government has not responded to that demand. The resolution passed by the territorial assembly asked that the lands should be given to the people resident in those provinces. But was there not also prior to this time another mandate to which this government turned a deaf ear years ago ? Is it not a fact that when the Autonomy Bills were up for discussion and before that the people of the territories formally asked that all the lands be handed over to the provincial governments to be controlled by them in the interests of the provinces and of the settlers? Did the government act on that mandate? Did they not reject it, notwithstanding the fact that when the Bill was before the House resolution after resolution was presented from boards of trade all through the province to the same effect? Indignation meetings were held in the two provinces, and very strong expressions of opinion were made. The government were not anxious then to obey the mandate which was unanimous on the part of the people of those territories. One hon. gentleman stated that these lands are undoubtedly owned by the Dominion. No one will question that. It was, however, questioned by the hon. member for Strathcona, who took the exception that these lands were being administered by this government as trustees for the people of the two provinces of the west. He is one of the hon. gentlemen who, in conjunction with his colleagues in the late provincial election, impressed on the people that the arrangement entered into by this government that they were to pay a dollar and a half on an estimated number of acres in each province in lieu of lands, by way of compensation, was a much better bargain for the people of those provinces than to have the land in their own possession. And still to-day he would, in addition to that, desire not only that they should have the money, but that the lands should be administered here with a certain amount of provincial jurisdiction. That hon. gentleman, I also think, made use of the argument that when once these lands are alienated from the Crown they pass under the jurisdiction of these provinces. For what purposes do they pass? For taxation purposes alone, and is it going to make any difference after these lands are handed over as to the powers of the provinces in so far as taxation is concerned? Will not these lands be subject to taxation immediately they pass and are alienated from the Crown, no matter where the person resides, whether in Saskatchewan, in Alberta, in Quebec, or in any of the eastern provinces? The jurisdiction of the provincial government only exists in so far as taxation is concerned.

It has been claimed that because the provinces of Ontario and British Columbia have also given some special consideration by way of land grants it would be an unjust discrimination to these other provinces if we acted upon the same principle. Carry that argument to its logical conclusion and where will it lead? In the province of Ontario, for instance, the provincial government have given a certain number of acres of land to the veterans who went to South Africa. But special considerations have also been given by municipalities and various small towns. For instance, some of the hon. gentlemen on the other side to-day stated that. I think that the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. D. Ross) stated that certain municipalities have granted certain considerations to these veterans. Would that have been an excuse why the Ontario government, for instance, should refuse to grant land to the veterans of that province, that because, within the borders of the province, in certain towns and municipalities certain considerations of a special character had been given and because all the towns and municipalities did not do the same thing therefore they should withhold this consideration from all? Neither would it be just for this Dominion government to withhold their land simply because a province had been generous enough to give this land grant. If there is any fault to be found with the province of Quebec the residents of that province have to settle with the provincial government. Let them apply there if they desire to be on an equality in that regard. But this is not a sectional question. The brave and patriotic men from Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta who went to South Africa to contend for England's honour went as Canadians, as Canadians they

should be dealt with and they should be dealt with by the government with reference to the whole country.

I think that the government are taking entirely too sectional a view of this matter. I think the people of the west would be the last to take exception to having these lands handed out to the veterans no matter from what part of Canada they might hail. The fact of 320 acres of land being handed out to a resident of another province of the Dominion, to a man of the stamp who has served his country in South Africa, will be the means of encouraging these young men who are now resident in the eastern provinces to come and locate on these lands, because, under the present homestead laws, all they can get as a land grant is 160 acres, whereas under this Bill they can get 320 acres by performing settlement duties. I think that, viewed from that standpoint, although a sectional standpoint it probably is, the people of the west would be desirous of seeing a number of our own young men offered some inducement to take up this land and make their homes in the west.

The opposition are not opposing this resolution, but they are not standing on the strict literal interpretation of the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) last year. I do not think that he or any other gentleman on this side of the House, when that resolution passed, thought that it was going to tie us down to a strict literal interpretation, but that we might expect that a Bill would be submitted which would include not only those of our fellow Canadians who were resident in these western provinces, but also those who were resident in the provinces which owned their lands notwithstanding that they might have given a land grant to the veterans such as they have in the provinces of Ontario and British Columbia. If those provinces have acted in advance of this government they have done so while this government have dilly dallied with the question year in and year out, and have turned a deaf ear to the pleadings of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. It is much better that our fellow Canadians in other portions of the Dominion should have land grants than that the public domain should be parcelled out to Saskatchewan land companies and Robbins irrigation companies.

There is another question in reference to this matter. If provision is made that veterans may accept scrip for $160 in lieu of doing their settlement duties, the likelihood is that those who should be advantaged by receiving it for their services in South Africa will not get very much out of it. The scrip will pass into the hands of scrip speculators who will reap the greatest benefit, men who are in a position to hold the land until it becomes more valuable, whereas these gentlemen who, by reason of being unable to perform their settlement duties, will dispose of their land, will no doubt do so for a small consideration. On the contrary this would not take place if the government would adopt this suggestion. The government propose that those veterans who perform their settlement duties shall be entitled to receive 320 acres of land. The alternative I have to suggest is that instead of giving scrip, give 160 acres of land free without any settlement duties at all. That would be very much better than to allow the beneficiaries to sell their scrip and allow speculators to reap the benefit. I would be in favour of this resolution if it were extended as I suggest. I only object to the resolution at all in so far as it is too curtailed, and I feel confident that those who reside in the west would be the last to object to Canadians from other portions of the Dominion enjoying the same privileges that are to be enjoyed by the residents of these provinces.

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer my support to the resolution which is now before the committee and to express my approval of the government's course in so far as it goes, but at the same time to enter my protest that the government is not extending its benefits to the South African veterans who are to be found in every part of Canada. It was stated here this afternoon that the provinces of Ontario and British Columbia have been more generous than the other provinces to the volunteers. May I be permitted to point out that the government in the province of Ontario were not particularly generous to the volunteers. It is true that they did give to them a grant of 160 acres of land, but in giving them that grant they reserved the pine timber upon the land. A large number of the volunteers who accepted this 160 acres of land from the province of Ontario have sold it for $50. Therefore, I do not think that that should be any reason why the government, when they are setting apart a portion of the public domain for the volunteers, should not include all who are entitled to this regard whether they are in the province of Ontario or in any other province. I was a little surprised at the argument which was used this afternoon with respect to the motion of my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes). The resolution presented to the House on December 10, 1906, reads as follows :—

That in the opinion of this House, grants of Dominion lands should be set apart for those who took part in the South African war of 1899-1902, residing in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

It will be seen by this resolution that the hon. gentleman was rather more generous than the government. I am sure my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton

is always prepared to support a grant of land to those volunteers who reside in different parts of Canada. The government, on the suggestion of the Minister of Militia, restricted it to those who enlisted from the provinces in the west, and therefore if the resolution does not go further the responsibility rests with the Minister of Militia.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is nothing said in the resolution about residents in other parts of Canada. The resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) as first introduced included those who might have gone into the Northwest after the war, but it did not refer to those residing anywhere else than in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. BLAIN. The point is that the limitation in the resolution was on the suggestion of the minister himself.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, but as between those who were actually in the Northwest when they enlisted and those who had gone to the Northwest afterwards but were living there at the time the resolution was moved. That was the only distinction.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand the suggestion for the amendment came from the Minister of Militia.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The limitation was to the three provinces named.

Mr. BLAIN. The resolution introduced by my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) was broader than that afterwards adopted by the House on the suggestion of the minister.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There was practically no difference.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The resolution as introduced would have included any one who subsequent to enlistment moved into the west.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Exactly.

Mr. BLAIN. Then the restriction in the resolution was introduced at the suggestion of the Minister of Militia. The resolution introduced was broader.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The resolution would have excluded any who might have left the Northwest in the meantime and gone elsewhere. It is not fair, to say the resolution was any broader or any narrower; it simply defined what was meant.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, I leave the facts to speak for themselves and I will not discuss that matter further. This is the first time the government has presented a tangible resolution to aid the veterans for the consideration of the House and I am in favour of it but I think it should go further. A discussion took place in 1906 and some suggestions were made on this matter, and it is strange to hear the supporters of the government assert that the opposition is responsible for the restriction in that resolution because there were only four members of the opposition who took part in the discussion, namely, Colonel Hughes, Mr. Lake, Mr. M. S. McCarthy and Mr. Lefurgey, of Prince Edward Island, the last-named gentleman suggested that the resolution should be broad enough to include every volunteer in Canada.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. How many took part on the government side?

Mr. BLAIN. Very few. The Minister of Militia spoke, the Prime Minister said a few words, and the member for East Assiniboia, and it is very strange that gentlemen opposite should suggest that the responsibility for the restricted resolution passed at that time rests with the members on this side.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It rests with the House.

Mr. BLAIN. At all events this is the first time the government has brought the question fairly before the House, and as I have said I am fully in accord with it so far as it goes and I advocate that it should go very much further and include all our South African veterans. I do not think there should be any discrimination made. I do not believe that the veterans who get these land grants should be asked to settle there; I think that if the parliament of Canada gives this small recognition to those who fought the battles of Canada and the empire, the men should be free to settle on the land or not as they please; they should have the right to dispose of the land if they wish, and put the proceeds in their pockets. I believe the people of Canada would uphold the government in adopting a policy of this kind. I do not think the government of Canada is doing itself justice when it suggests that only a sectional part of the South African veterans should receive recognition. I believe that every South African veteran, no matter from what province of Canada he comes, should have the same liberal fair-play at the hands of the Dominion government.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) when he said that this government is not doing itself justice in introducing this very partial measure. Not only is the government not doing itself justice, but it is not doing justice to the members of this House, to the people of the country, or to the veterans to whom Canada ought to be grateful. I am in thorough accord with the resolution. I think it is long delayed and tardy justice and only partial justice at that, because it only includes a portion of those brave men who in my opinion are entitled to fair consideration from Canada. Surely, this is

above all a national question. For many and obvious reasons our country has not yet been forced to the necessity of a pension system and we trust we will never be involved in war to the extent that will make a pension system necessary in this country. But we have taken other means to reward those who have fought for their King and their country, and we now propose to give to some of our veterans a grant of land. Surely, where a number of soldiers have served in the same war we cannot say that because one man comes from a certain district and another man comes from another district that the service of one man is to be recognized by the government and the service of the other man is not. Is that not especially the case where the length of service is the same ; where the service is equally arduous, and where the results have been equally glorious to our country. I cannot see why there should be any discrimination between the provinces in this matter. I believe that this question should not be viewed or argued from any provincial standard ; it is national in its essence and the fact that it is national is the best feature of it.

It has been said to-day in this debate that because Ontario and British Columbia have rewarded their troops with gifts or partial gifts, they have been sufficiently rewarded, and that this national parliament should not give them anything further. You might as well say that because one soldier had a rich father who rewarded him for his services when he came home, he should not be rewarded, while the man who had a poor parent should be rewarded, as to say that because one province, out of its bounty and pure generosity has made a gift to the soldiers coming from that province, they should not be rewarded by the national parliament. I happen to know that the Ontario veterans were rewarded very partially. They were given what are called grants of land. In reality, they were grants of 160 acres of wild lands, less the timber upon it. The government selected certain townships which were not fit for settlement, and permitted the veterans to make their selections from these areas. The result has been that a very large number of these veterans have sold their right to their scrip for $50 and in some cases less. Surely that is a very partial reward. I merely mention that to show that the province of Ontario has not gone to the full extent of rewarding the veterans of that province, who fought for their King and country. The reward proposed to be given to the veterans of the west, under the resolutions now before the House, are very much more liberal. I am not at all saying that they are too liberal. I think they are reasonably fair. But a grant of 320 acres of land open for settlement in the west, even with the requirement of settlement duties upon it, is a very handsome reward compared with a grant of 160 acres of wild land in the province of Ontario, which the veteran has been in the habit of selling for $50. It seems to me that the government could do nothing wiser than to give to all the veterans who fought for their country the same opportunity of taking up homesteads in the west. This discussion has not brought out the number of veterans entitled to participate in these grants, or the number there would be if the government allowed them all to participate. My own idea is that the total number is in the neighbourhood of 5,000, of whom nearly one-half came from the west. The Minister of Militia will know. They included the Strathcona Horse, the Mounted Rifles and the Second Contingent. So that I think nearly one-half of the total number of veterans came from the west.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, if you include British Columbia.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. So that you are to-day rewarding practically one-half of these veterans ; and surely it would not be an extravagant thing, but a fair and wise thing, to include them all. This would practically double the area of land that would be given, and there are ample lands in the west to include all the troops. Many of these young men who went to serve their country in South Africa left occupations in which they were permanently employed ; many of them became unhinged and unfitted for regular business ; many have not recovered their situations ; many have not had permanent employment since ; the life of a soldier in South Africa for a couple of years seems to have given many of them a roving disposition ; and it seems to me that nothing would be more desirabe than to afford all these young men an opportunity to take up homesteads in the west. Consider the past history of this country. The best men who settled in this country of old were the United Empire Loyalists, English, Irish and Scotch, who came here in 1776 and 1812, and preserved this country as a British country—fought for it and were rewarded by their King with grants of land. And who among all the people of this country made better settlers, built it up, and really formed the backbone of it, than these loyalists of old ?

Mr. TALBOT. There are others, far ahead of them too.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. The hon. gentleman is inaudible, for what reason I do not know. If he will keep himself in order, there will perhaps be a better chance of hearing what he says. I say the United Empire Loyalists were given grants of land, and that would be a good precedent for us to follow, by giving to all the veterans who fought in the late war an opportunity to take up land in the west. While agreeing with the principle of this resolu-

tion I disagree with its scope, it does not go far enough. Some fault has been found with the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) because of the character of this resolution. That hon. member has again and again in this House for five or six years past endeavoured to persuade the government to consider the claims of all the veterans of Canada to some reward. Failing in that, he succeeded in getting the government to present this resolution. From the manner in which it has been received, I think the government will see that the feeling of this House and this country is in favour of extending the same measure of justice to all the veterans of the country. I hope that the government, realizing how much in accord all the members of this House are on that subject, will at an early day see their way to extend the scope of the resolution so as to include in its benefits all those who fought in the late war, whether they came from the east or the west, and whether or not they were partially rewarded by the provinces in which they lived.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure that our friends on the other side are to be congratulated on the generosity with which they have expressed themselves in regard to the recognition of the services of the volunteers in South Africa. They are to be congratulated on the number of excellent speeches in that line that have been made to-day—might I suggest, perhaps rather with a view of influencing the opinions of the voters than for the purpose of influencing the issue of land grant. Might I suggest also that their speeches have been made about a year too late to have that desirable effect. Our friends have suggested that the government has not assumed its proper share of responsibility in regard to the proposition before the House. I would like to say that the government is prepared to absolutely assume the fullest responsibility, but it is not more possible for a member of parliament to relieve himself of his responsibility than for the government. And when this matter was up before the House for discussion last session, our friends, who now find fault with the action of the government, had then the opportunity to express themselves on the subject and did not, and they must be held to their record as not having at the proper time and in the proper place given expression to those generous views of which they have been so lavish to-day. The government was not impelled to take the action it did because of the resolution submitted to the House last session, although that of course is a factor to be seriously considered. Any resolution passed unanimously by this House must have some recognition and some effect in shaping the policy of the government, but it is no secret to the House that this matter is one which has been up for consideration, in one form or another, for a number of years. Pressure has been brought to bear on the government from various sides on behalf of the volunteers, but for reasons which have already been stated, it was not thought desirable to deal with the question until the present, and it is now being dealt with, not only in accord with the resolution of the House last year, but also in accord with the resolutions of the Legislative Assemblies of the two western provinces more immediately concerned. As to what further resolutions may be passed, that is a matter which may be fairly considered. They are not excluded from consideration because of the passage of this resolution and may be taken up in the proper place and at the proper time, and if taken up I trust they will receive the fair measure of consideration which this has received. It has been said by some of our friends opposite that this is either a Dominion or a provincial matter. I would like to say that it is both. The services rendered were rendered to the empire rather than to the Dominion, but they were, I am free to say, to the Dominion rather than to the provinces. But the question of a special grant of land in recognition of these services naturally and necessarily pertains to that authority which owns and controls the land. That ownership and control rests in certain provinces in the provincial government and in others in the Dominion government, and the Dominion government is dealing with this question to-day, not as the government of the Dominion, but as the holder of lands in certain provinces, and is dealing with this question, therefore, as it has been dealt with by some of the other provinces which are the holders of their own provincial lands, and as the legislatures of the new provinces in the west have expressed themselves as desirous it should be dealt with. We are not dealing with the question of the distribution of land generally for services in South Africa, but with the question simply from the standpoint of these particular provinces in which this government owns and controls the land, and are dealing with it from a provincial rather than a Dominion point of view.

It will be somewhat surprising to some of our friends in the west when they read the report of this debate and find that the gentlemen who have during the past several years loudly and strongly proclaimed the absolute rights of these western provinces to the ownership and control of their own lands declare here that these lands are absolutely the property of the Dominion, paid for by the Dominion, and to be used for any purpose this government may choose. This doctrine will grate rather harshly on the ears of a good many of the friends of the opposition in that western country. They will be rather surprised when they find what a right about face our hon. friends opposite have so suddenly taken..

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the hon. gentleman not distinguish between a question of doctrine and a question of law? It is not a question of doctrine at all, but the minister's own law for which he obtained his portfolio.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Does the minister deny that these lands are the property of the Dominion?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly not.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. What then does he mean?

Mr. OLIVER. I mean that my hon. friends opposite have campaigned up and down the Northwest declaring that these lands were not the property of the Dominion.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I never heard any one making the statement that these lands were not the property of the Dominion. On the contrary it was held by every one that they were. I mean since the Autonomy Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know just exactly how my hon. friend wants to draw the line between the campaign his friends made in the west before or after a certain date. I am aware, however, that I saw my hon. friend who represents Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) taking part in a political campaign in the west, only some three or four months ago, and one of his strong points was that the people of the west had been robbed of their lands.

Mr. LAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. That is to say that the control which this government exercises over those lands was unjustly acquired and unjustly exercised.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. That is not the statement we have heard to-day so frequently from hon. gentlemen opposite, and I repeat that I am afraid that the position so strongly taken and so repeatedly announced by our friends opposite will jar harshly on the ears of their friends in the west when they read the reports of this debate.

I do not presume at the moment to define just what the relations are between this government and the people of the Northwest in respect to the lands of the Northwest. But I do take issue with the position I have heard stated to-day that the lands of the Northwest were paid for by the terms of the Autonomy Bill. They were not paid for, or pretended to be paid for, by those terms. The Autonomy Bills provide that there shall be certain money paid by this government to those new provinces in lieu of lands for the expenses of government. That is in lieu of the revenue which might be derived from lands, which money should go towards the expenses of government in these provinces. That is quite a different matter from paying the price of the land, and it is in regard to the value of the land that the discussion has gone on to-day. For it is the value of the land, or the actual price of the land, that goes to the volunteer and not the mere taxable value, which was the transaction between this government and the government of the provinces. It is a doctrine that will not be received by our friends in the west when they are told that the subsidy which is agreed to be paid by this government to their governments is a price in payment of their land. That is not an understanding in accordance with the facts and will not be received.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not a price in lieu of their lands because they did not receive those lands from which they might get an income ?

Mr. OLIVER. It was in view of the revenue which might be derived from the taxation or other disposition of the land, but not in lieu of the value of the land.

Mr. SPROULE. Did not the resolution declare that it was in consideration of the fact that these provinces did not get their land and could not realize revenue from their land, that they were given certain subsidies in lieu of it ?

Mr. OLIVER. In lieu of the revenue to be derived, but not in lieu of the value of the land.

Now, that point being settled, I wish to deal with another feature of the case. The question of the value of the lands of the west is one that is of interest, no doubt, to every resident of the Dominion ; but I think every one will admit that it is of paramount interest to the people of the west themselves. The method, the distribution and the prospects of settlement, and the system of settlement, are matters of paramount importance to the people there, and particularly the question whether there should enter into the handling of the lands the element of speculation. And, as an element of speculation certainly must enter into any transaction such as has been placed before the House to-night—any transaction in the way of land grants or scrip for lands—it is natural that the people of the west should look with some degree of care upon any proposition involving the alienation of any considerable portion of Northwest lands on any condition instead of actual settlement.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you provide for settlement in this case?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. So, when the people of the west, through their legislative assembly declare themselves in favour of the granting of scrip for lands to a certain class and a certain number of people, that binds them to that principle only so far as they

ask it to be applied. and does not bind them to the principle of granting scrip or lands to everybody whom any person might think should be entitled to receive land. Therefore, while I say nothing whatever on the claims which have been put forward here on behalf of those not included in the resolutions before the House, I desire to say that there is a radical difference between the resolution of the Northwest assembly in this regard and the propositions or suggestions that have been made from the other side of the House, and that will have to be considered or, I think, in reason ought properly to be considered, entirely separately from those we have placed before the House.

Mr. BERGERON. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) be kind enough to tell the House how many in the three provinces will get the benefit of this resolution ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is only an estimate, of course but I believe it is placed at between 1,500 and 2,000. While there is every desire to deal with every possible liberality with those who have made sacrifices in the interests of our country and of the empire, it is necessary, of course, always to consider the difficulties of dealing with the situation and the possibilites that are involved in that dealing. As I said a few minutes ago it is impossible to give special concessions to any person or class of persons without introducing an element of speculation, and, as everybody knows, that element is not a desirable element in so far as it can be avoided. Therefore, in approaching this question, and in undertaking to deal with, as we think, a fair measure of liberality, with a certain proportion of the volunteers who went to South Africa, we thought it well to go cautiously and to put ourselves in a position that we could not with fairness be criticised as opening the door more widely to speculation than was absolutely necessary to meet the case. If it be so that the mind of parliament goes further and would justify the government in going further, and ignoring the possibilities of speculation in this regard, that is a matter for further consideration at some other time, but it does not interfere with the position of the present resolution, or the discussion of it.

I wish to refer for a moment to the question mentioned by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) to the effect, as I understood, that the province of Manitoba had not received justice at the hands of this government in regard to its lands. I have not the exact words of my hon. friend, but I think I understood the point he sought to make. The House should know that, at the present time, the province of Manitoba, as represented by its government, has under consideration a proposal to extend the boundaries of that province, and is declaring through its members on the floor of parliament that, unless a cash subsidy is given to the province on the same basis as was given to Saskatchewan and Alberta,—as my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) has said in lieu of the lands—it would be a vile imposition upon the province and a most unjust discrimination against it. In regard to the terms of the resolution, I would like to say that the resolution only contains the salient features of the measure, but that the details will be contained in the Bill, and I think my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) who has asked certain questions, will find those questions fully answered in the Bill if and when it is brought down.

Mr. LAKE. Can the substitute do anything more than select and enter for ? Must the actual applicant himself perform the duties ?

Mr OLIVER. We have had in mind the previous land grants in recognition of military service in the west. The first of these was in respect of the expeditions in 1870 and 1871 in the Red River Rebellion and the next in the case of the rebellion of 1885. In the first case the scrip was for 160 acres; it was transferable and no settlement duties were involved. In 1885 it was thought desirable that advantages should not be given without settlement accompanying these grants. It was provided in 1885 that the person entitled by his services should receive a homestead of 320 acres instead of a grant of 100 acres. The preemption law was then in force so that the practical result was that the person entitled to scrip received a free pre-emption. He had also the privilege of assigning his right to this homestead of 320 acres so that any person who wished to do settlement duties in order to acquire a homestead and preemption could acquire that right by buying from the volunteers and fulfilling these duties.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister propose that now ?

Mr. OLIVER. We are going on the principle that grants of land should not be made unaccompanied by settlement and cultivation. We adhere to the principle adopted in 1885, by giving a homestead of 320 acres, requiring the same settlement conditions as in the case of a homestead of 160 acres and allowing the right of assignment so that the volunteer may dispose of his right to another person who, by settlement on the land and fulfilment of the requirements, can acquire a patent to 320 acres.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the minister not introducing another Bill giving a homestead of 320 acres ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He did last year.

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He had one quarter-section and could acquire another.

Mr. OLIVER. By paying for it.

Mr. LAKE. The grantee can assign his right to any one whether he has had a homestead or not, absolutely free of the regulations in regard to the first and second homestead.

Mr. OLIVER. That is the intention as the Bill is drafted and in that it differs from the Act of 1885, which did not permit that privilege. In that case the person who already had a homestead only had the right of pre-emption in addition. In this case we do not take cognizance of the previous standing of the assignee. He buys a right and if he fulfils the requirements he gets that right without any question as to other rights he may have under other circumstances.

Mr. GALLIHER. How many assignments can be made under that? If the volunteer assigns to Jones and Jones assigns to Brown, then if Brown performs the duty can he acquire the homestead or can there be only the one assignment direct to the man who proposes to do the duty.

Mr. OLIVER. I would have to get a legal opinion, but my impression would be, and I think the intention is, that the volunteer can assign to whoever he pleases and that person can assign to another, passing on the right to assign; but once the last assignee has made his entry for the land he cannot assign and will have to fulfil the duties.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is what you call a substitute in the regulations?

Mr. GALLIHER. That would open the door to speculation.

Mr. OLIVER. We cannot disassociate this from speculation; when you give a privilege it involves speculation.

Mr. GALLIHER. You could curtail speculation by allowing only one assignment.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not say that we will not be guided by opinions given in the committee. We desire to deal with these volunteers with the utmost liberality, consistent with absolute settlement aud cultivation. We do not wish to prevent the volunteer getting out of his land its fullest value. For that reason we give him the full right of assignment and I think it would be just as well to give the free right of assignment until the actual entry has been made.

Mr. LAKE. Will this grant go to every volunteer or his legal assigns? For instance, if the volunteer had died in the meantime?

Mr. OLIVER. While there is no provision to that effect in the resolution, that could be dealt with and such a clause inserted in committee if it is agreed to by the House.

It may be of interest to the committee that there were 1,558 issues of land grants in the case of the Red River rebellion, and in the case of the Northwest rebellion 1,068 land warrants and 5,125 money scrip notes of $80 each. In the case of the rebellion of 1885, the volunteer was allowed to exchange his right to the land for a scrip note of $80 which he could use in a payment for Dominion lands. We have followed that provision but we have changed the amount to $160.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the minister think that land scrip to the amount of $160 is a fair proposition?

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I have been following the precedent of the previous arrangement, and I thought that $80 was certainly too small. I thought it would be fair, at any rate, to double it, and I think there is a good deal to be said against increasing the amount of the scrip to any great degree. What we want is settlement on the land, and if we give a reasonable value for the exchange between land and scrip, I think we are doing fairly well.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We can discuss that when the Bill comes down.

Mr. HERRON. Would it be possible to insert an option in the Bill. If a volunteer did not wish to take 320 acres under the homesteading conditions, could it not be arranged that he might be permitted to select a quarter section and get the patent for it in a few months? There are men who would prefer that to receiving 320 acres with settlement duties.

Mr. OLIVER. That is a matter that can be discussed in committee on the Bill. There is no doubt that the matter was considered fully in 1885, and, for the reasons which are apparent, it was decided then that it was not advisable to follow the precedent of the scrip land of 1870 and make a grant of 160 acres clear of all duties. If, in 1885, it was not thought advisable to follow the example of the scrip of 1870 giving a free grant, I think it would be looked upon with very much less favour to-day. I think the demand to-day is more strongly for actual settlement in making any land grant than it was even in 1885. We have, at any rate, followed the precedent of 1885 in making this provision and in drafting the Bill.

Mr. HERRON. I disagree with the minister's statement that the sentiment in the west is in favour of settlement. Of course, it is in favour of the general settlement of the country, but in reference to the volunteers I do not think it is. I think the sentiment of the country has been or would be in favour of giving a free grant to a man who has served in South Africa. The bulk of the

men who have served in South Africa and who are alive are residents in that country to-day. These men have served about three years for their king and country, and I think that should be ample service in lieu of a residence of six months each year for three years on a homestead, and I believe that if any man wishes to have the option of taking 160 acres he should be allowed to do so without being hampered by any conditions whatever. I am quite sure that this would meet with the approval of the people of the Northwest, and I think it would be a reasonable provision to make in the Bill.

Mr. TURRIFF. I think that the volunteer who gets a warrant enabling him to locate 320 acres of land, with the right of assignment, would be able to sell that to fully as good advantage as he would be able to sell a quarter section of land if he had the patent for it. There are a large number of men in the older settled parts of the west who have not the right to second homestead and who would be very glad to buy an assignment that would enable them, by doing the homestead duties for three years, to secure 320 acres. A man who has a homestead is not debarred in any way from purchasing the assignment of any of these volunteer's rights and locating an additional 320 acres. The volunteer is going to have fully as much advantage under this arrangement as if the suggestion of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) were adopted and he were given a free patent to a quarter section.

Mr. LAKE. Excepting that if he had a patent of his quarter section he would always have security if he made a sale, whereas he would have no security beyond the real cash he got if he made a sale under this, because he would have no hold upon the land. There is another point in reference to the desirability of making a full grant of 160 acres, and that is that it will simplify the matter for the widows of those volunteers who have unfortunately died, in a great many instances, as a result of the privations which they suffered during the campaign, and also in cases such as that which was mentioned by my hon. friend from Alberta, in which a man, who was permanently disabled during the campaign, has been obliged to remain in the hospital ever since. It would be a very great relief to him if he had a free grant of land. Under the present conditions it will mean that a large number of these options will be on the market at the same time. They have to be exercised within three years, or within less than three years from the present time, in order to make them effective, and it will be a pretty difficult matter for a good many people who are not on the spot to dispose of them in this way. I had a letter only a day or two ago from a gentleman who is a member of the provincial police in British Columbia wanting to know what was going on. I do not think he can leave his duties to go hunting for land or to find purchasers of his rights. I think it would be a great benefit to all these grantees if they could have the option of taking full title to 160 acres of land.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say a few words in regard to some of the observations made by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). He said that further resolutions could be taken up at the proper time and place. Does it not occur to him that there could be no more proper time than the time when we are considering the resolution for granting land to a portion of the volunteers to consider a resolution for granting to the balance of them a similar consideration? It seems to me that there can be no more proper time than that to consider it. The hon. gentleman said that the opposition must be considered responsible for this resolution, because they assented to it as well as the supporters of the government, although they may not have expressed themselves in favour of extending it to all, it must be assumed that they were in favour of extending it to all those who have been resident in that country. I want to say that that was neither my intention nor desire. My feeling was this: It had been several times brought to the attention of the government and they had always refused, upon one pretext or another, to consider it. Therefore, I believe that most of the members of the opposition thought that it would not be accepted or considered by the government. Therefore they refrained from wasting the time of the House talking upon a question which they believed would not be considered. But the government accepted it. The minister said as well: We had a memorial from the Northwest, and that memorial only requested that this right should be granted to residents of that country; it did not request that it should be applied to all. He said the government did this because the others were likely to be granted some compensation by their respective provinces. The natural selfishness of human nature prompted them to make a request to this government, believing it was the only power which could grant them compensation, but had the question been submitted to the people of the province, whether they were willing that the same rights should be extended to all volunteers outside Manitoba and the Territories as well as those that resided there, I venture to say very few would have objected to extending the grant to every volunteer who served in South Africa.

Mr. WARD. The Minister of the Interior said it was almost impossible to eliminate the principle of speculation from transactions of this kind, but if the Dominion government were to follow the example of the government of Ontario under like circumstances, that element would be eliminated. Past experience has shown that fully

one-half of those who received warrants for land take up the scrip instead, and if this government were to do as the Ontario government did and issue no scrip at all, it would be in the interest of those who receive the grant. I may tell the Minister of the Interior that the Ontario government in connection with the 160 acres of land granted by it, has provided that during the last two years any one who is entitled to that land can surrender his right to the land and accept from the government $50. Why not give to these South African veterans the sole right of any advantage the government intends to give them, as can be done by adopting the Ontario system. If a veteran is in need and wants to dispose of his scrip he will take almost anything he can get for it, and the speculator in the end really gets one-half of the scrip. But if the Ontario system were followed the veterans would get the sole benefit and the speculator would get nothing. The government is surely not so poor that they cannot pay in money instead of giving scrip. It really amounts to the same thing in the end because the government has to honour that scrip as so much cash in payment for land. I would ask the Minister of the Interior to consider this suggestion so that no matter whether the South African veteran takes the land and asigns it or takes the payment, he will get the whole benefit of whatever the government is giving and thus the placing of one-half of it in the hands of speculators will be avoided. I concur in what has been said by hon. members on this side of the House ; I approve of the resolutions so far as they go, but I would like to see their scope extended so as to include every Canadian who served in South Africa.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to say that while the Bill would be on the lines of the resolution it would be materially different from the resolution.

Mr. OLIVER. The resolution contains the salient features of the Bill. There is nothing in the Bill as drafted that is not covered by the resolution, but the details are elaborated in the Bill. I have stated that the amendment suggested was by an oversight not included in the Bill, and as it goes further than the resolution it will have to be considered separately in the committee on the Bill.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister has suggested that he might probably increase the sum of $160 in scrip mentioned in the resolution, but I do not think the Bill can deviate from the resolution in that respect.

Mr. OLIVER. If it be the view of the House the change could be made but it would have to be done by another resolution.

Mr. SPROULE. What does the minister understand by the statement in the resolution that the grant shall be exempt from all fees and charges exacted in the case of an ordinary homestead entry ? Is it the small $10 fee or does it apply to taxation ?

Mr. OLIVER. Of course the question of taxation would stand in the same position only fee contemplated here is the ordinary entry fee.

Resolution reported and agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 109) respecting grants of Dominion Lands to certain Volunteers for Military Service in South Afica.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read first time.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 26, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of Exploratory Surveys of the Peace River country.—Hon. Frank Oliver.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 107) respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

Bill (No. 108) respecting the Windsor, Chatham and London Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke.

QUESTIONS.

CLAIM OF JAMES MAHER.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens)) asked :

1. Has a claim been made on behalf or, or by James Maher for payment of damages on account of land expropriated in connection with the construction of the Montague branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway?

2. If so, why was this claim not paid or sent to the Exchequer Court at its recent sitting in Charlottetown?

3. Has James Maher's claim for damages for laying water pipes across his property adjoining the Montague branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway been paid?

4. If not, why not, and why has not this claim been sent to the Exchequer Court, with other claims, at its recent sitting in Charlottetown?

5. What steps does the government propose taking to have those claims paid?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. No land has been expropriated from James Maher; but the right of laying water pipes through his land was expropriated for which he agreed to take $70, but has since claimed $150.

2. The investigation into the claim of James Maher was not completed in time

to permit its reference to the Exchequer Court to be heard in October last. Unless a settlement can be effected an information will be filed in that court for the purpose of determining the compensation.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 2.

5. Willing to pay $70.

LUMBER IN NORTHWEST PROVINCES.

Mr. LAKE asked:

How much lumber upon which royalty was payable to the government has been manufactured during the years 1906 and 1907, respectively, in the province of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1906: 131,980,587 feet. B.M.; 572,150 shingles; 19,458,190 laths.

1907 (incomplete): 133,663,249 feet B.M.; 60,000 shingles; 20,099,261 laths, and 385,533 mining props. All of the returns have not been received for 1907, so that the quantities for that year are incomplete.

NORTHWEST LAND SALES.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Who was the purchaser of the northwest quarter-section 28, township 9, range 5, west of the second meridian, the price paid per acre, the purchaser's address and occupation, and the name, occupation and address of the present owner?

2. Who was the purchaser of the southwest quarter-section 20, township 10, range 6, west of second meridian, the price paid per acre, the purchaser's address and occupation, and the name, occupation and address of the present owner?

3. Who was the purchaser of northwest quarter-section 9, township 54, range 27, west of fourth meridian, the price per acre paid, the purchaser's address and occupation, and the name, address and occupation of the present owner?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. The N.W. ¼ of section 28, township 9, range 5, W. of 2nd M., was sold to R. B. Beaumont, of Toronto, at the rate of $1.25 per acre, and was patented to Mr. A. C. Bedford-Jones, of Toronto, barrister-at-law, The name of present owner not known to Department of Indian Affairs. Sale, 20th November, 1901, by tender.

2. The S.W. ¼ of section 20, township 10, range 6, W. of 2nd M. was sold to E. C. Mackenzie, of Toronto, at the rate of 50 cents per acre, and letters patent issued to A. C. Bedford-Jones, of Toronto, barrister-at-law. The department is not aware of the name of the present owner. Sale 20th November, 1901, by tender.

3. The N.W. ¼ of section 9, township 54, range 27, of 4th M., was sold to Frederick William Grant, of Midland, Ont., barrister-at-law, at the rate of $5 per acre, and still stands in the books of the Department of Indian Affairs in his name. Sale 5th December, 1906, by auction.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Who purchased the northwest quarter of section 3, township 46, range 20, west of second meridian, the price paid per acre, the purchaser's address and occupation, and the name, address and occupation of the present owner?

2. Who was the purchaser of northeast quarter of section 13, township 46, west of second meridian, the price per acre paid, the purchaser's address and occupation, and the name, address and occupation of the present owner?

3. Who was the purchaser of the northwest quarter of section 7, township 41, range 17, west of second meridian, the price paid per acre, the purchaser's address and occupation, and the name, address and occupation of the present owner?

4. Who was the purchaser of the northeast quarter of section 18, township 20, range 15, west of second meridian, the price paid per acre, the purchaser's address and occupation, and the name, address and occupation of the present owner?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. The N.W. ¼ of section 3, township 46, range 20, W. of 2nd M., was sold to James E. P. Prendergast, J. H. Lamont, P. D. Tyerman and Thomas O. Davis, of Prince Albert, and A. W. Fraser, Ottawa, barrister, at the rate of $2.55 per acre, and the land now stands in the books of the Department of Indian Affairs in the name of A. J. McPherson, financial agent, Strathford, Ont. Sale May 12, 1903, by tender.

2. The N.E. ¼ of section 13, township 46, range 20, W. of 2nd M., was sold to A. J. Menary, of Toronto, at the rate of $2.30 per acre, and now stands on the books of the Department of Indian Affairs in the name of M. G. Siddall of Winnipeg, real estate agent, J. R. Lamy, of Amherst, N.S., gentleman, Byron C. Borden, of Sackville, N.B., D. D., Charles W. Fawcett, of Sackville, N. B., gentleman, Alonzo Smith, of Pugwash, N.S., gentleman, and Charles G. Black of Amherst, gentleman. Sale May 12, 1903, by tender.

3. Not sold.

4. The N.E. ¼ of section 18, township 20, range 15, W. of 2nd M., was sold to the Hon. A. E. Forget, of Regina, Sask., at the rate of $10.75 per acre, and still stands in the books of the department in his name. Sale October 17, 1906, by auction.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Who was the purchaser of the northwest quarter of section 27, township 46a, range 25, west of second meridian, the price paid per acre, the address and occupation of the purchaser, and the name, address and occupation of the present owner?

2. Who was the purchaser of the northwest quarter of section 27, township 46, range 26,

west of second meridian, the purchaser's address and occupation, and the name, address and occupation of the present owner?

3. Who was the purchaser of the southwest quarter of section 6, township 47a, range 25, west of second meridian, the price paid per acre, the purchaser's address and occupation, and the name, address and occupation of the present owner?

4. Who was the purchaser of the southeast quarter of section 28, township 46a, range 26, west of second meridian, the purchaser's address and occupation, and the name, address and occupation of the present owner?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The N.W. ¼ of section 27, township 46a, range 25, W. of 2nd M., was sold to Mr. J. W. Smith, of Toronto, at 50 cents per acre, and letters patent issued to A. J. Stade, of the town of Devil's Lake, North Dakota, U.S.A., merchant. No knowledge of present owner's name. Sale 4th January, 1902, by tender.

2. Purchased by Mary McFarlane, Prince Albert, married woman, who assigned to Roderick Ross Macfarlane, of Cumberland House, Sask., chief factor, Hudson's Bay Company. It is not known who is the present owner. Sale July 16, 1882, each under regulations then in force; price $2 an acre.

3. The S. W. ¼ of section 6, township 47a, range 25, W. of 2nd M., was sold to Thomas O. Davis, of Prince Albert, merchant, at the rate of $2 per acre, and he still stands as owner in the books of the Department of Indian Affairs. Sale, December 19, 1901, by tender.

4. The S.E. ¼ of section 28, township 46a, range 26, W. of 2nd M., was sold to John Henderson Lamont, of Prince Albert, advocate, and has been patented to him. Name of present owner not known to department. Sale December 19, 1901, by tender.

LIGHTHOUSES, NICOLET AND FORT ST. FRANÇOIS.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Bergeron—asked :

1. What is the total amount spent to date upon the lighthouse erected at the entrance of the Nicolet river and at Fort St. François in the province of Quebec?

2. Were the said works executed by contract or by day work?

3. If by contract, what was the name of the contractor, the amount of the contract, and the amount of the contract in each case?

4. Were tenders called for through the newspapers? If so, what newspapers?

5. Was there a superintendent? If so, what was the name, the amount paid him per day, and the total amount he received?

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

1. Nicolet range, $27,438.08 ; Port Francis range, $29,881.99.

2. Work executed by day's work, steel towers for the back ranges in both instances were obtained from the Goold, Shapley and Muir Company, Brantford, for $668.50, under the terms of their general contract for steel towers, but were erected by the department.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. Answered by No. 2.

5. No special superintendent for these works. There is a resident engineer for this district, Mr. Oscar Arcand, who receives a salary of $125 per month, and a superintendent of works, Mr. Charles Basinet, who receives a salary of $100 per month.

NICOLET POST OFFICE.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Was the post office at the town of Nicolet, P.Q., built by contract or by day work?

2. Were tenders called for publicly for the said work? If so, what newspapers published the call for tenders?

3. Was the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer for the entire work, or were different contracts awarded for stone work, wood work, painting, heating and plumbing? If so, what was the amount in each case, the name of the contractor and the amount paid to each?

4. What was the amount of extras on each contract claimed or paid?

5. Who was the inspector named to superintend the execution of the said works on the said post office, the amount of his salary or wages, and the total amount paid to him?

6. Who was the caretaker named for the said building, what was the salary fixed for his remuneration, and what was the date of his nomination?

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

1. By contract.

2. (a) Yes ; (b) Following newspapers published call for tenders for construction of public building :

'Le Progrès,' Nicolet ; 'Le Soleil,' Quebec ; 'Telegraph,' Quebec ; 'La Semaine Commerciale,' Quebec ; 'La Presse,' Montreal ; 'La Patrie,' Montreal ; 'Herald,' Montreal ; 'Le Canada,' Montreal ; 'Witness,' Montreal ; 'Sunday World,' Montreal; 'Le Bulletin,' Montreal ; 'Argus,' Montreal; 'L'Industriel,' Shawenegan Falls ; 'L'Union des Cantons de l'Est,' Arthabaskaville ; 'Le Courrier,' Drummondville ; 'La Revue d'Acton,' Acton Vale ; 'La Tribune,' St. Hyacinthe ; 'L'Union,' St. Hyacinthe ; 'Le Courrier,' Sorel ; 'La Gazette,' Berthier ; 'L'Etoile du Nord,' Joliette ; 'Le Progrès de l'Est,' Sherbrooke ; 'Times,' Richmond ; 'L'Album Universel,' Montreal.

For heating apparatus :

'Le Progrès,' Nicolet ; 'Le Soleil,' Quebec ; 'Telegraph,' Quebec ; 'L'Union des Cantons de l'Est,' Arthabaskaville ; 'La Patrie,' Montreal ; 'La Presse,' Montreal ; 'Le Canada,' Montreal ; 'Herald,' Montreal; 'Witness,' Montreal ; 'Le Bulletin,' Montreal ; 'Shareholder,' Montreal ; 'Le Progrès du Golfe,' Rimouski.

3. (a) Stone work, wood work, painting and plumbing included in original contract ; lowest tender accepted.

(b) Amount of contract, $14,500.
(c) Joseph Bourque.
(d) Amount paid, $14,500.
(a) Heating, a separate contract; lowest tender accepted.
(b) Amount of contract, $980.
(c) George Morrisette.
(d) Final estimate being prepared for payment.
4. Additional work for clock, $980; $380 paid on account pending settlement. Extras claimed on heating, $39; under consideration.
5. Clerk of works, P. Rivard; salary, $3 per day; amount paid him, $1,689.
6. U. Papillon; salary, $520 per year; appointed November 8, 1907.

INDIAN LANDS, NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C.

Mr. J. D. REID—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Are there any Indian lands adjoining the city of New Westminster, B.C.?
2. If so, what is the name of the reserve?
3. Have any lands of such reserve been disposed of?
4. If so, how many acres, and to whom?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1 and 2. The New Westminster reserve, comprising three blocks of land within the limits of the city of New Westminster, containing 22·48 acres; Poplar Island reserve, on the north arm of the Fraser river, opposite New Westminster, containing 27·1 acres; and reserve No. 8, on the left bank of the Fraser river, opposite New Westminster, containing 4·68 acres.
3 and 4. No.

TIMBER BERTH, EAST SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. To whom and when was timber berth No. 42, in Eastern Saskatchewan granted, and on what terms?
2. Who are the present owners?
3. Have the conditions on which the berth was granted been so far complied with?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. (a) Messrs. W. J. Ferguson, John McQuarrie and Samuel Grigg, (b) 20th March, 1882, (c) those contained in the regulations in force at the time, which provided, among other things, for the payment of rental at the rate of $5 per square mile, the payment of royalty on timber cut, the making of a survey, &c.
2. Messrs. Samuel Grigg and D. S. Perrin.
3. Yes.

IMMIGRANTS LANDED.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Bergeron—asked:

1. What number of immigrants landed in Canada during the three months ending June 30, 1907?
2. What number of immigrants were refused admission during the said period, and what number were deported?

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. 105,512 immigrants landed in Canada via ocean ports during the three months ending 30th June, 1907.

During the same three months 21,859 arrived from the United States.

2. Out of those arriving via ocean ports 211 were refused admission, and 164 were deported.

Of those arriving from the United States 3 were refused admission. One was deported.

DREDGING AT NICOLET, &C.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. What are the total amounts spent from December 1, 1904, to February 1, 1908, on dredging works: (a) at or near the entrance of the Nicolet river; (b) at Port St. François; (c) at River Godfroi; (d) at the wharfs of St. Angèle, Bécancourt, Gentilly, and of St. Pierres-les-Becquets?
2. Was the dredging done after tenders had been called for publicly through the newspapers? If so, what newspapers?
3. Was the said work executed by the lowest tenderer?
4. What was the name of the dredging contractor in each case, and the amount received by each contractor for the work done?

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I would ask my hon. friend to ask this in the form of a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

JUDGE FORBES.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

1. Has the attention of the Department of Justice been called to matters affecting the professional status and character of Frederick Fraser Forbes, Esq., a district judge in the Province of Saskatchewan, reported in the territorial reports, volume 2, at pages 410, 423 and 447?
2. If so, what action has the department taken, or what action does the department propose to take in reference to this matter?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. Only by the question asked in the House on 3rd February instant.
2. No action has been taken in the matter. The legal reports referred to show that the debt in question had at that time been paid. This was more than eleven years ago and no further action would seem necessary now.

INTERNATIONAL TUNNELS—CUSTOMS DUTIES.

Mr. McLAREN asked:

1. Is the material used in the construction of the Canadian end of the international

tunnel at Windsor, Ontario, being admitted into Canada free of duty ?

2. Was there any change in the customs laws and regulations to allow such material to enter into Canada free of duty ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. The material used in the construction of the Canadian end of the International tunnel at Windsor, Ontario, is being admitted free of duty, under item 596 of the Customs Tariff, 1907.

2. Item 596 of the Customs Tariff, 1907, is a new provision. Remission of duty on materials used in Canada for international bridges and tunnels was formerly by order in council, under the Audit Act.

COOPER & WHITE.

Mr. LANCASTER asked :

1. What does the firm of Cooper & White, or any other lessees, pay the government for the tract of land of about 400 acres near the town of Welland, which was purchased to do away with the Quaker bridge over the Welland canal ?

2. How long has the lease or leases yet to run, and when were they respectively made ?

3. Is all rent paid to the present time ? If not, what is the amount in arrears, and by whom owing ?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. A tract of land of 200 acres was leased to the Riverside Stock Farm Company, represented by R. Cooper and A. F. White, at a rental of $200 a year, payable in advance on the 1st of February.

2. The lease is during pleasure and was made on the 10th March, 1905. The term beginning February 1, 1905.

3. Rent is paid up to 31st January, 1908.

ROSS RIFLES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

How many Ross rifles have been reported unfit for use through the various district officers commanding ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia) :

No Ross rifles have been reported either as 'unfit for use' or unserviceable, except the one to which an accident occurred, as the result of being tampered with, at Eastman, Que.

594 rifles from the various military districts have been reported by the Inspector of Small Arms as requiring repairs and as being 'easily repairable.'

TIMBER ON CYPRESS HILLS.

Mr. J. D. REID—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the attention of the Minister of the Interior been called to the fact that the timber on the Cypress Hills in Alberta and Saskatchewan, is being dissipated by saw-mill prospecters and others ?

2. Is it the intention of the department to preserve the timber for the use of the settlers ?

3. If so, how is it proposed to be done so that the settlers can look forward to a permanent supply of fuel and building timber ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Representations have been made to the Department of the Interior that the timber on the Cypress Hills is being rapidly used up.

2. Yes.

3. A forest reserve has been established covering the south half of township 8, range 3, west of the 4th meridian, and it is proposed to have a careful examination of the remainder of the Cypress Hills made by the Forestry Branch during the present year to determine what further steps are necessary.

MILITARY CAMP IN EASTERN TOWNSHIP.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. In what month during the present year will the military camp be held in the eastern townships ?

2. Will it be held in the same month as the other camps throughout Canada ?

3. What are the proposed arrangements with respect to the holding of camps ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence) :

1, 2 & 3. The arrangements for the holding of camps in the Eastern Townships and the various military districts are under consideration.

OTTAWA POST OFFICE.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT asked :

1. Has the roof and repair work of the Ottawa Post Office been completed ?

2. What has been the cost to date ?

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

1. Yes.

2. $208,000.

MR. WILLIAM H. HOPPINS.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT asked :

Is Mr. Hoppins, of Parry Sound, in the employ of the government ? If so, in what capacity and what salary ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). One William H. Hoppins is employed as an acting customs officer at Parry Sound, with salary at the rate of $700 a year.

MR. E. A. WALLBERG—STEEL CONCRETE COMPANY.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What contracts for work or service were awarded by the government during the calen-

dar year 1906, through the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or any other department, to E. A. Wallberg, of Montreal ?

2. When were the same respectively awarded and what is the nature of the several works?

3. What was the original contract price in each case ?

4. How much money in each case has been paid to the contractors ?

5. Were tenders called for in each case ? If so, who were the other tenderers ?

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

1. No contracts were awarded by the Department of Marine and Fisheries to Mr. E. A. Wallberg, of Montreal, but the following contracts were entered into with the Steel Concrete Company, of which Mr. Wallberg is president : (a) To build reinforced concrete lighthouse towers at Matane, Cape Magdalen and Métis, in the province of Quebec. (b) To construct a reinforced lighthouse tower at Little Hope island, N.S.

2. (a) Awarded on the 1st day of September, 1906. The work at Matane to consist of a reinforced concrete tower complete, 10 feet 2½ inches in diameter and 50 feet high, for $3,600 ; at Cape Magdalen a similar tower 40 feet high for $3,300, and at Little Métis a similar tower 60 feet high for $3,900. (b) Awarded on the 27th day of September, 1906, a reinforced concrete tower 10 feet 6 inches in diameter and 75 feet high, for $4,950, to which a supplementary agreement was added in the spring of 1907 providing for the strengthening of the tower to carry a heavier and larger lantern and apparatus than was originally contemplated. The supplementary agreement provided for the doubling of the reinforcing and the continuation of the buttresses to the top of the tower, with a heavy strengthening at the upper extremity, and also provided for a satisfactory junction of the new work with the old, the payment to be $2,300, making a total of $7,250.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. The contractors in each case have been paid the above mentioned amounts, as called for by their tenders.

5. Tenders were not called for the work at Little Hope. In the other cases tenders were invited publicly, but the Steel Concrete Company was the only tenderer.

Mr. STAPLES—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has E. A. Wallberg any contracts with the Marine and Fisheries Department ?

2. If so, how many, and for what ?

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

1. Yes.

2. One. A contract for increasing the height of the lighthouse tower at Heath Point, Anticosti, using reinforced concrete for the work and sheathing, the extension in wood, the contract price for same being $6,095.

Mr. BOYCE.

STEAMER 'SPEEDY.'

Mr. BENNETT asked :

What has been the total expenditure of the steamer 'Speedy,' of the Public Works Department, from March 30, 1907, to date, for repairs, maintenance, wages and all charges in connection with the said steamer?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). $17,233.20.

PETITION OF JAMES GUNNIP.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

1. Has the Minister of Railways received a petition from James Gunnip, an aged man and ex-employee of the Prince Edward Island railway, who had received injuries while in the employment of the government, which necessitated his retirement, praying for an allowance ?

2. If so, what does the government intend doing in the matter ?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes ; a letter was received from James Gunnip asking that an allowance be made him on account of injuries received while in the employ of the railway.

2. The Act will not admit of any allowance in the case.

WHARF AT GARTHBY, QUEBEC.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Is the government building a wharf at Garthby, Quebec ?

2. Has the department sent a man by the name of Midraud to examine the wharf at Garthby ? If so, on what date ?

3. Has the said Midraud been at Ayers Cliff, North Hatley, or any other points in the county of Stanstead since January 23, 1908, on government business ? If so, for what purpose ?

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

1. Yes.

2 & 3. No one by the name of Midraud is employed by Department of Public Works.

NEW DEPARTMENTAL BUILDINGS—SERVICES OF MR. JOSEPH RIOPELLE.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. What amounts have been paid to Joseph Riopelle in respect of services performed relative to the purchase of properties on Sussex Street or Mackenzie Avenue, for departmental buildings ?

2. If any amounts paid, what was the basis of such payments, by commission or otherwise ?

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

1. Total payments to date, $4,767.

2. By commission.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked :

1. What are the names of all the immigration agents to whom commissions are paid by

this government on the different classes of immigrants covered by the order in council of February 19, 1907?

2. In what country does each such immigration agent reside?

3. What is the amount of commission paid to each agent from February 19, 1907, to February 1, 1908?

4. How many immigrants have been sent into Canada by each such agent?

5. Does each agent report to the government as to the number sent in by him, or does the government report to the agent, as in the case of the North Atlantic Trading company?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1 & 2. In France—
Messrs. Currie & Co., Paris.
Messrs. Pitt & Scott, Paris.
Messrs. Hernu, Peron & Co., Paris.
(Each of the above offices controls ten or more sub-offices.)
In Belgium—
P. Canon, Antwerp.
H. Debenham, Antwerp.
Messrs. Raydt & Bryunseels, Antwerp.
Fedor Barns, Antwerp.
General Agent of the C.P.R., Antwerp.
M. G. Frendberg, Antwerp.
G. Schyns, Antwerp.
In Norway—
Albert Raffel, Christiania.
Oluf Ruud, Drontheim.
Charles Bennett, Christiania.
R. Solem, Trondhjem.
Olaf Rasch, Christiania.
A. Litland, Strandgaden.
In Sweden—
C. J. Edenholm, Gothenburg.
L. Anderson, Malmo.
C. A. Lundberg, Gothenburg.
Sam. Larsson, Gothenburg.
In Denmark—
A. Turkelsen, Copenhagen.
J. Rath, Copenhagen.
Joachim Prahl, Copenhagen.
In Holland—
H. Hartevelt, Rotterdam.
John Otten & Toon, Rotterdam.
Devries & Co., Amsterdam.
Hoyman & Schuurman, Amsterdam.
A. Swanenburg, Amsterdam.
Anglo-Continentales Reise-Bureau, Rotterdam.
In Russia—
A. S. Williams (Northern Steamship Co.), St. Petersburg.

3. From 19th February, 1907, to 1st January, 1908:

L. Andersson, Sweden	£ 17
Chas. Bennett, Norway	69
Fedore Berns, Belgium	43 10
R. Cannon, Belgium	49 15
J. M. Currie & Co., France	49 5
C. J. Edenholm, Sweden	81 10
M. G. Frendberg, Belgium	3 5
Hernu, Peron & Co., France	114 101
Hoyman & Schuurman, Holland	36 101
S. Larsson, Sweden	11
A. Litland, Norway	$ 4 10
C. A. Lundberg, Sweden	55 5
Pitt & Scott, France	16 10
J. Prahl, Denmark	19
A. Raffel, Norway	40 15
O. Rasch, Norway	6 15
J. Rath, Denmark	37 5
Messrs. Raydt & Bryunseels, Belgium	4
O. Ruud, Norway	94 15
R. Solen	129 10
A. Terkelsen	49 15
	£933 5

4. The government has no complete record of the number of immigrants sent to Canada by each agent.

5. The agents report the names of those on whom bonus or commission is claimed.

GLENCOE, ONT.—NEW POST OFFICE.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to build a new post office building in the town of Glencoe, Ontario?

2. If so, has the contract been let, who received the contract, and what is the estimated cost?

3. Has a site been purchased? If so, from whom, and what was the purchase price?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. A petition praying for the erection of a public building at Glencoe was received at the Post Office Department and transferred to the Department of Public Works on the 15th April, 1907.

2. No. Plans have not as yet been prepared.

3. (a) Yes. (b) P. D. Keith. (c) $1,250.

CANNED GOODS INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. J. D. REID asked:

Are sections 26 and 27 of the Act respecting the inspection of meats and canned foods being enforced by the department? If not, why not?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Evidently the question would not apply to section 26 and 27 of the Act, but it would apply to section 26 and 27 of the regulations. These sections of the regulations are being enforced in so far as regards the products of establishments designated by order in council as those in which inspection is to be maintained under the Act.

INLAND REVENUE SEIZURES.

Mr. BARR asked:

1. Who made the seizures under the Inland Revenue Department in the fiscal years 1906 and 1907, in Cornwall, London, Ottawa, St. Catharines, Toronto, Joliette and Montreal, and what did the seizures consist of?

2. What was the name of the party or parties from whom the material was seized?

3. What was the amount realized by the sale of such seized material?
4. How was this seized material disposed of, and was it by public auction or by private sale?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). The answer to this question will take a full week to make out. I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Barr) to let it stand as a notice of motion for return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for return.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES IN COUNTY OF QUEBEC.

Mr. ROBITAILLE asked :

1. What moneys have been expended by the government for a local advantage in the county of Quebec, for the last eighteen years?
2. For what special purpose have these amounts been appropriated?

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for return.

IMMIGRATION—INFORMATION FORMS RETURNED FROM WEST KENT.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

Out of the number of information forms sent to West Kent to farmers whom the department supposed had received immigrants through the agents appointed, how many farmers have returned forms or informed the government they never received any of the immigrants through the government agents?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Copies of all replies received from farmers in West Kent are contained in return No. 109.

CANNED PEAS—IMPORTATIONS FROM FRANCE.

Mr. MARSHALL asked :

How many pounds of canned peas were imported from France into the Dominion in the fiscal year ending 1907, and what was the value of the same?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I regret that I shall not be able to furnish the hon. gentleman (Mr. Marshall) with this information. In order to learn separately the imports of these articles, which are included with others in the returns, we should have to collect the information from the several ports, and could not collect the facts during the present session I fear.

ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. During the year ending October 31, 1907, was target practice suspended with the Ross rifle by the Royal Northwest Mounted Police?
2. If so, by whose orders, and for what reasons?
3. Have the Ross rifles with which the R.N.W.M.P. were armed been called into stores?
4. If so, for what reason?
5. With how many and of what varieties of rifles or carabines is the force now armed?
6. Is it the intention of the government to arm this force with the Ross rifle?
7. If so, when will the issue be made and of what mark or description will the rifle be?
8. Have there been any complaints in reports of the R.N.W.M.P. of the inferiority of pistol ammunition?
9. If so, by whom was this ammunition manufactured?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Minister of Militia) :

1. Yes.
2. They have been recalled into store to be exchanged.
3. Yes.
4. To be exchanged for an improved pattern.
5. 804 Winchester carbines, 220 Lee Enfield, 204 Lee-Metford.
6. Yes.
7. Undecided.
8 and 9. Yes, but only with respect to the 'capping' of one trial shipment manufactured by Eley Bros., England.

MR. H. J. MOBERLEY.

Mr. LAKE asked :

What payments have been made to H. J. Moberley, of Prince Albert, in connection with the census or other services, from January 1, 1905, to the present time, by the Departments of Agriculture or the Interior, giving amounts, dates of payment, and services for which made?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Mr. H. J. Moberley was engaged by Mr. James Flett, one of the enumerators of the census of 1900, as guide. He received from Mr. Flett, July 28, 1906, $59.75, and from the department, in closing his account on his being recalled from the work, $34.25, June 11, 1907.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). So far as the Department of the Interior is concerned the answer is, No.

BAIT FREEZER AT NORTH SYDNEY.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

1. Did the government assist in the construction of a bait freezer or cold storage building at North Sydney?
2. If so, to what extent, and to whom was the money paid?
3. Who was in charge of the erection of said building?
4. Has the government any lien on the land or building?
5. What did the building cost?
6. On whose land is the building erected?
7. Is all the material and labour paid for?

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

1. Yes.
2. $2,000. To the North Cape Breton Fishermen's Bait Association.
3. Peter Macfarlane, the officer in charge of the establishment of fishermen's bait freezers.
4. No.
5. $4,142.39.
6. On land arranged for by the association.
7. Yes, so far as this department is concerned. The association is responsible for individual accounts.

DOKIS INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked :

1. Have the Indians surrendered or agreed to surrender their title to the Dokese or Dokis Indian reserve?
2. If so, for what consideration, at what date, and under what arrangement?
3. Who negotiated the surrender on behalf of the government?
4. Did any person or persons acting on behalf of private individuals or corporations assist in negotiating the surrender?
5. Has the government made any inquiry into the circumstances in this connection?
6. What is the area of the reserve?
7. What quantity of timber and of what character is supposed to be on this reserve?
8. Has the government made any survey or estimate of the value of timber thereon? If not, does it propose doing so?
9. Is it the intention of the government to dispose of this reserve? If so, in what manner and under what conditions?
10. In what way is it intended to safeguard the public interest in the timber on this reserve?
11. What is the estimated value of the reserve and of the timber thereon?
12. Where is this reserve situated?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The Indians have not surrendered their title to the reserve. They have signed a surrender of the pine timber thereon, but the surrender has not yet been accepted by the government.
2. The Indians to receive ten per cent of proceeds of sale, payable after sale effected.
3. The local Indian agent.
4. No.
5. No.
6. 30,000 acres.
7. The government has no recent information as to this.
8. The government has made no recent survey or estimate of timber, but before sale will do so.
9. The government intends to dispose of surrendered timber by public competition.
10. The government's obligation is to safeguard the interests of the Indians, and will do so by endeavouring to obtain the largest return possible from the sale of the timber.
11. The government has made no recent valuation of either the reserve or the timber.
12. The reserve is situated on the French river, near Lake Nipissing, in the province of Ontario.

Mr. BENNETT. In what form will the competition be, by auction or tender ?

Mr. OLIVER. Assuming the surrender is accepted, the sale will be by auction.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all inquiries, applications, leases, contracts, agreements, assignments, correspondence and papers of every description, in connection with or referring to the granting of coal mining privileges in section 11, township 8, range 4, west of the fifth meridian.—Mr. Ames.

For a copy of all correspondence, leases or other papers in connection with the leasing or proposed leasing of Kananaski falls, on the Bow river.

A copy of all correspondence and other papers in connection with the selling or otherwise disposing of 1,000 acres or any lands to the Calgary Power and Transmission Company, Limited.

A statement showing an estimate of about the number of acres and territory owned by the Stony Indian reserve, held in trust for the Indians, the said statement showing the quantity of each side of Bow river.—Mr. J. D. Reid.

For a return showing what sums of money were paid during the fiscal year 1905-6 and 1906-7 by any department of the government to the Steel Concrete Company, Limited; for what purpose such payments were made; what orders for work or material to be done or supplied by that company are now being filled, and the aggregate amount payable for same.—Mr. Boyce.

For a copy of all applications to homestead or purchase, reports, agreements of lease or sale, correspondence exchanged between the Department of the Interior and any person whatsoever, and papers of every description dealing with or treating of the sale or lease of surface, mining, timber or any other rights in respect of the northwest quarter of section 8, township 53, range 4, west of the fifth meridian.—Mr. Ames.

For a return showing what lands, if any, have been reserved for grazing purposes or for acquisition by means of irrigation within the tract described as follows: townships 12 to 19, inclusive, in ranges 15 to 21, west of the fourth meridian; and when such lands were so reserved, and for how long it is the purpose of the government to continue such reservation.—Mr. Lennox.

For a return showing, in respect of each of the undermentioned blocks disposed of as coal lands by the government, viz.: sections 2, 4, 9, 15, 17 and 28, of township 7, range 3, west of the fifth meridian, when and by whom the first application was made for right to acquire; when and to whom the original grant of mining rights was made; what transfers of rights have been recorded, when such transfers were

dated, and when registered with the department; who the present owner or occupant is, as known to the department; and the name and address of each company or person above referred to.—Mr. Ames.

For a return showing, in respect of each of the undermentioned blocks disposed of as coal lands by the government, viz.: section 13, of township 9, range 4, west of the fifth meridian; section 16, township 10, range 3, west of the fifth meridian; section 15, township 11, range 4, west of the fifth meridian; section 20, township 12, range 4, west of the fifth meridian; section 5, township 13, range 4, west of the fifth meridian; section 21, township 19, range 7, west of the fifth meridian, when and by whom the first application was made for right to acquire; when and to whom the original grant of mining rights was made; what transfers of rights have been recorded, the date of transfer, and date of registration of same; who the present owner or occupant is, as known to the department; and the name and address of each company or person above referred to.—Mr. Ames.

For a copy of all applications, leases, assignments, correspondence and papers of every description in connection with or referring to the granting or sale of the mining rights in sections 17, 20, 21, 28, 29, 32 and 33, of township 8, range 4, west of the fifth meridian.—Mr. Perley.

For a return showing the number of seizures under the Inland Revenue Department in the years 1906 and 1907; the name of the party or parties making the seizure; the description and quantity of material seized; the name of the parties from whom the material was seized; how the seized material was disposed of, whether by public auction or by private sale, and what the amount realized thereon was.—Mr. Barr.

For a return showing a list of timber berths awarded between June 1, 1904, and July 15, 1896, with the number of tenders in each case, the amounts of each tender, the name of the successful tenderer, the area of each berth, the dates of notice and opening of the tenders in each case.—Mr. Crawford.

GRANTS OF TIMBER LIMITS IN PEACE RIVER REGION.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES moved :

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports, recommendations, tenders or communications of any kind in relation to the granting of sixteen townships and certain timber limits in the Peace river region, as referred to in a motion of the 15th January ultimo, reference 102.

He said : I would like to add 'orders in council' before the word 'letters' in the second line, and change the words 'Order of the House' to the word 'address.'

Mr. OLIVER. I think that all the papers in connection with this case, or at least all until some date of the last session, have already been placed before the House. I think it would be in order for my hon. friend to amend by saying, 'those not already brought down.'

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I accept the suggestion.

Motion as amended agreed to.

MONEY AND SCRIP RECEIVED FROM LAND SALES.

On the order :

For a return showing how much money and scrip the government has received on account of the lands, mines, minerals and timber, in each of the provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, during the following periods: from July 1, 1896, to June 30, 1905, and from July 1, 1905, to December 31, 1907.—Mr. Lake.

Mr. LAKE. When this question was asked the other day, the Minister of the Interior desired that it should be put in a different form, and I have put it in a different form which I think will give no trouble at all to the department. I ask that a distinction be made in the different provinces, so that each land office will be simply returning its own accounts.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to say that the Battleford agency extends into Alberta, and by asking for a return of all agencies, in that case it will not give the division between the provinces.

Mr. LAKE. I understand that, but I want it by agencies.

Motion as amended agreed to.

SALE OF DOMINION LANDS IN WESTERN PROVINCES.

Mr. LAKE moved :

For a return showing the approximate total area of Dominion lands disposed of by the government in each of the provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan between the 1st July, 1896, and the 30th June, 1905, distinguishing between lands for agricultural purposes, grazing, irrigation, timber and coal; and also from the 1st July, 1905, to the 31st December, 1907.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to point out to the mover that the information called for will require a great deal of time to compile. I merely wish to point that out. Although it is a very easy question to ask, it is a very difficult question to answer, but if my hon. friend, knowing that, still desires the information, of course I will try to get it for him.

Mr. LAKE. I am willing to make this by agencies also.

Mr. OLIVER. That would not make any difference.

Mr. LAKE. Let it stand, and I will see about it.

Motion amended and agreed to.

EXPENDITURES AT MONTREAL, QUE., ETC.

Mr. ROBITAILLE moved :

For a return showing how much money has been spent in the port of Montreal for the past fifty years, (a) for wharfs ; (b) for dredging in port; (c) for transportation facilities by grain elevators, railway tracking, &c.; (d) for dredging between Montreal and Quebec; and also, showing how much money has been spent in the port of Quebec for the last fifty years.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Robitaille) whether he thinks it is desirable to have this motion carried. It involves a large amount of labour.

Mr. FIELDING. It goes back fifty years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Long before confederation. Perhaps my hon. friend would amend his motion so as to limit the time to recent years, at all events within confederation.

Mr. HENDERSON. Say the last ten years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The last ten years or the last fifteen years.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. If I could get the estimates as voted it might not take very much time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will see that his motion goes back to a considerable time before confederation.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. Make it since confederation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If it is limited to that we can get it.

Motion as amended agreed to.

EXAMINATION OF ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS.

Mr. AMES. Before the motions are taken up may I be permitted to ask a question for the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to answer? I wish to know whether the Minister of the Interior has issued instructions to the department in effect that none of the documents which may be asked for by the Public Accounts Committee shall be produced for the examination of members except while the Public Accounts Committee are in session?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

ALCOHOL FOR INDUSTRIAL USES.

Mr. D. W. BOLE (Winnipeg) moved :

That, whereas the regulation requiring two years' storage of alcohol after distillation, tends to create a monopoly in that article and increase the price, without increasing its usefulness in the manufacture of medical and pharmaceutical preparations, perfumes, chemicals, dyes, and scientific research; and that the potable article costs in the Canadian market over twenty-five times more than the primary cost of production, and therefore tends to restrict development in the lines mentioned, and prohibits its use as an economical agent in the wider field of industrial activity, in the opinion of this House the government should appoint a commission to inquire into and report upon a method by which alcohol can be generally used in legitimate scientific and industrial operations, without increasing the danger of its use as a potable spirit.

He said : Mr. Speaker, I desire to engage the attention of the House this afternoon for about ten minutes on the question of cheap alcohol for medicinal, pharmaceutical and manufacturing purposes. In bringing this subject forward for discussion I appreciate the fact that I am up against a prejudice in the minds of a great many people against alcohol, people who think that alcohol is the active, evil spirit of all intoxicants and that having no other use, it should be relegated to the safest place possible. I am well aware, as well as the rest of the members of this House, that alcohol is a dangerous article if abused. At the same time it must be remembered that pure alcohol, properly used, is one of the most useful agents in the hands of man. It is at once dangerous and useful. It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to advocate the wider use of alcohol as a beverage. It is not my intention to discuss the question of alcoholic beverages such as whisky, brandy, gin, but I intend to confine my remarks solely to pure alcohol such as is used, and might be used to a much larger extent in pharmaceutical and chemical enterprises, and generally in greater industrial development. There are two declarations in the resolution which I have moved which I understand have been attacked since the resolution was placed on the Order Paper by some outside interests. The first is the declaration set out here that two years storage tends to create a monopoly. I think the statement is true that the storage of a manufactured article for two years would tend to create a monopoly because it could be manufactured only by people who are strong enough to carry it for two years previous to marketing it. The other declaration is that the price of alcohol in Canada to-day is twenty-five times greater than the cost of production. When I tell you that alcohol can be purchased in Germany at 22 cents a gallon, that it can be purchased in Cuba at 25 cents a gallon—I regret that I have not the documents to prove that it can be purchased at this price in Germany, but I have a statement from a reputable house in Cuba quoting this article at 25 cents a gallon—and when I tell you that the wholesale price at the distillery in Canada is $4.43 a gallon, or $4.75 a gallon retail, you will see that my statement is correct when I say that the price in the market is

twenty-five times greater than the cost of production. Assuming that the article can be purchased in Germany for 22 cents and that the distillers will have a profit of 4 cents a gallon, 18 cents may be put down as the cost of production of this article in Germany.

In respect to the position of alcohol in Canada, I would like to state to the House that the price in bond in 1880, twenty-eight years ago, was 59 cents a gallon. In discussing this question of alcohol I am not, of course, talking about proof gallons but about alcohol as we understand it in commerce, namely, 65 over proof, or about 90 per cent pure alcohol; and when I speak of a gallon I, of course, refer to an imperial gallon. The price in bond in 1880, was 59 cents a gallon at the distillery before the duty was paid. The excise duty at the same time was $1.28 per gallon, making the price wholesale at the distillery, duty paid, in 1880, twenty-eight years ago, $1.87 per gallon. The price to-day in bond is $1.39 as against 59 cents twenty-eight years ago; the excise charge to-day is $3.14 a gallon, making the price at the distillery wholesale, $4.43. The customs tariff at the present time in Canada is about $4 per gallon on alcohol 90 per cent strength, or more correctly speaking, $3.99, or a protection to the distillers in Canada of 85 cents a gallon more than the excise charge.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman stated that in 1880 the price was $1.87 a gallon and the price quite recently $4.43; can the hon. gentleman state the prices in the intervening years so that we may see when the advances were made?

Mr. BOLE. I have that information. There has been a general increase from 1880 up to the present time in jumps of 10 cents, 15 cents, 25 cents. Of course the increase in the excise charges could only be made by an Act of Parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. When the hon. gentleman quotes the price of alcohol in Germany does he refer to the same kind and quality of alcohol as we use in Canada?

Mr. BOLE. No. The alcohol generally used in Germany is distilled from potatoes, but there is the same duty on potato alcohol coming into Canada as on grain alcohol. I am free to admit the grain alcohol is the better article, but for all manufacturing purposes the potato and the molasses alcohol is quite as good. There is no difference as far as I am aware, in the quality of these articles for manufacturing purposes. As I have said, the customs tariff, which is about $4 per gallon, gives the distillers of this country a protection of 85 cents a gallon beyond the excise charge. Now, we are allowed in this country to manufacture in bond, that is, we can manufacture from duty paid alcohol and by producing evidence of exportation there is a rebate allowed. But for home consumption the duty must be paid on alcohol and of course any that is manufactured for home consumption is manufactured from duty paid spirits. In England the price in bond is 43 cents a gallon for the same kind of alcohol, I understand, as is manufactured in Canada at the present time—43 cents in England as against $1.39 in Canada. The excise charge is 21 shillings a gallon for 90 per cent pure alcohol and the customs charge is 9 pence per gallon more, or a protection to the English distillers of 18 cents a gallon as against 85 cents in Canada. In England the manufacturers are also allowed to manufacture in bond as we are in Canada, namely, from duty paid spirit and upon proof of exportation a rebate is allowed. I wish to point out that for a number of years in England there was a strong agitation in favour of free alcohol for manufacturing purposes. The government woke up to the fact that it was absolutely necessary some regulations of this kind should be made, and legislation was passed to encourage the home manufacturer, but the whole question was relegated to the officers of the department to make the regulations and the officials created a code of regulations so stringent that it was practically impossible for the manufacturers to proceed with the manufacture in England and they were obliged to go to Germany. The result is that the English officials have driven out of England some of the very brightest minds in scientific chemical research. For a great many years England led in the development and manufacture of aniline dyes and coal tar products and things of that kind, but I am safe in saying that now hardly any of these are manufactured in England; they are all manufactured in Germany. The price in bond in Germany is 25 cents a gallon. The excise charge is 70 marks per 100 litres or about 70 cents per imperial gallon. For burning and mechanical purposes the excise charge is 6 marks per 100 litres or about 6 cents per gallon, and for scientific purposes in the universities and scientific research generally there is no charge at all, except a very small premium, the amount of which I have not been able to learn, but which I understand is a nominal figure. In consequence of this great freedom in the use of alcohol in Germany no less than 82,000,000 gallons were used last year for manufacturing purposes, 95,000,000 gallons of denatured alcohol were used for power and 67,000,000 gallons or about 9 pints per head of the population were used for drinking purposes. You will see therefore that it is possible to give wider range to the use of alcohol without increasing its danger as a potable or drinkable spirit. The result of this freedom in Germany has seen the development of a tremendous business as the figures which

I have given will show. In fact, the Germans control the markets of the world with respect to dyes, small chemicals, coal tar products and many heavy chemicals. Then as to the denatured article, 95,000,000 gallons being used in Germany shows the great usefulness of this article outside the question of pharmaceutical purposes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what do I want by this resolution. I want:

1. The abolition of the two years' storage regulation as far as it applies to the manufacture of pharmaceutical products.

2. Alcohol free from excise duty for manufacturing purposes and for the purposes I have named.

3. The reduction of the customs tariff to 25 cents per gallon for manufacturing purposes only, and,

4. A commission or committee to inquire into and report upon the methods by which this can be done without increasing the danger of its use as a potable spirit.

I will consider for a few minutes these various subjects in the order in which I have named them. The storage system is I claim absolutely unnecessary as far as the uses of alcohol for the purposes I have indicated are concerned. It is absolutely unnecessary to store alcohol for manufacturing purposes. It is very true, and no doubt the minister will point it out, that manufacturers at the present time have the privilege of using non-potable spirits direct from the still if they so desire. But it must be under government supervision. The result is that large manufacturers can avail themselves of this privilege by getting alcohol direct from the still at a reduced cost, but not reduced so far as the customs and excise charges are concerned—only at a reduced cost as far as the price of the article in bond is concerned. But only large manufacturers can avail themselves of that privilege. The druggists, 3,000 of whom live in Canada and have shops open every day, and the hospitals in all parts of the country are deprived of this privilege. The result is that they are obliged to pay for this article in barrels, in carload lots at the distillery, $1.43 when it can be bought in other countries at from 25 to 30 cents a gallon.

Mr. SPROULE. How it it kept this length of time?

Mr. BOLE. It is now stored, I believe, in copper tanks. I will not at present discuss the propriety of storing. My own opinion is that it does not do the alcohol any good. There may be some reason for storing it in wood, by which there is a chance for the absorption of the oil; but for the purposes of manufacturing pharmacists, it is of no use to store this article. But the fact that it is stored for all purposes tends to increase the price and to restrict operations in the way I have stated. Of course, the department will raise the objection that the removal of this storage arrangement will have a tendency to cheapen alcohol and therefore increase the danger of drinking habits among the people. I appreciate that danger. At the same time I think you can trust the druggists of this country not to abuse the privilege; but if any do, punish them just as you would those who manufacture alcohol in an illicit way.

With respect to making alcohol for manufacturng purposes free of excise taxes. I understand that it is the policy of both political parties to make the raw material of all manufactures as free of taxes as possible. Alcohol is the only raw material I know of that is taxed at the present time in Canada. It is only used as a raw material; and when I state that the British pharmacopœia contains over 3,000 articles that are recommended by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Great Britain, and that of these 2,000 have alcohol, either used in their manufacture or as a component part of the finished product, its usefulness can be understood. Take, for instance, such an article as chloroform. Nobody will deny the usefulness of this article. It has been stated that chloroform is the greatest boon medical science has given to humanity; but at the present time it is impossible to manufacture chloroform in Canada, although we have the facilities for doing so, the capital, the enterprise, and the brains. We are obliged to import it from foreign countries. There are other articles in the same position, such as ether and spirits of nitre. The medical gentlemen in the House will appreciate the usefulness of all these things; yet they cannot be manufactured in Canada to compete with the foreign article. Spirits of nitre cannot be manufactured in Canada for less than fifty-five or sixty cents a pound, but it can be bought in Germany for from fifteen to seventeen cents a pound. I am safe in saying that if we had in Canada free alcohol for manufacturing purposes, we would increase our trade in five years by at least $5,000,000; because we would manufacture not only for our own country, but for the West Indies, South America, and South Africa; in fact, we could compete with the German manufacturers all over the world.

I know that the objection will be raised to all this that it would somewhat decrease the revenue. The revenue which the government derives at the present time from alcohol used for the purposes I have mentioned amounts to about $120,000 a year; but I venture the statement that if alcohol for these purposes were made free the wealth of this country would be increased by ten times that amount in five years.

Mr. FIELDING. Do you mean free as to both excise and customs duties?

Mr. BOLE. Free as to excise and a reduction as to customs. If alcohol for these

purposes were made free, and denatured if the government thought fit, I believe that within five years the people all over this country would be using pure alcohol for industrial purposes instead of benzine or gasoline. Last year there were imported 3,294,759 gallons of benzine for use in motor cars, elevators and small engines. The customs duty should be reduced to twenty-five cents a gallon, that would be equivalent to 100 per cent of protection, which I think ought to be sufficient for the distillers of this country. Very few of our manufacturers enjoy so large a protection as that.

I have no doubt that the objection will be raised that it is impracticable to import alcohol purely for manufacturing purposes, as it is likely to lose its identity and go into general consumption as a drinkable article; but I think the government has already furnished examples of the practicability of admitting an article used for certain purposes at a lower rate of duty than when used for other purposes. For instance, printing presses for newspapers are allowed to be imported free of duty, while, if imported for job printing purposes, they are charged ten per cent.

With respect to the fourth suggestion I make, namely, that a commission be appointed for the purpose of inquiring and reporting to the government by what means the object of the resolution can be carried out, I would be quite willing to relegate the whole subject to the department, but that I am a little afraid that the department, who are accustomed to consider only the requirements of the revenue, and have no experience in industrial development, would report only with respect to the effects of the change on the revenue. This was the experience in England, when the parliament there passed legislation which gave to the manufacturers all the privileges they asked for; but when the matter was referred to the department for regulation, the regulations were such that it was impossible for manufacturers all the privileges they asked measure, and the result was that they went holus bolus to Germany. If the suggestions I make are carried into effect, I think it will be reasonable to expect a tremendous increase in trade along the various lines that I have mentioned, and I do not see why the people who use medicines, the hospitals and many other interests are not entitled to have this matter inquired into.

There are a great many small chemicals imported at present from Germany that do not contain alcohol but require a large amount of alcohol in their production. The result is that in Germany the people who employ alcohol for this purpose can afford to lose it. But we have to pay an excise of $4.15 per gallon and $1.39 for the alcohol itself in bond, it is impossible for us to do that and the result is we are obliged to pay tribute to the Germans in so far as these articles are concerned. If the government adopt the proposed policy, and I think the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) made some suggestions in his last budget speech with respect to the development of denatured alcohol—if that policy and the suggestions I make be carried out, we will all appreciate the great benefit that will result to the farmers from the use of a larger quantity of grain for the production of alcohol. I have already taken up more time than I intended, but to a considerable portion of our people this is a very important subject. With 3,000 druggists scattered over the land, it is a most important subject, because it is impossible for a druggist to buy alcohol at present and manufacture in the way he is trained to do. He is obliged by law to learn how to do it but is prevented by the price of the alcohol. These men all over the country could use a very large quantity of pure alcohol. The subject is therefore a very important one, and I hope the government will see the necessity of giving it consideration.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) has spoken, not of denatured alcohol, but of the various uses to which pure alcohol may be put and in respect of which he thinks a duty should not be imposed and no excise revenue collected. During last session I spoke on the subject of denatured alcohol and its use for many of the purposes for which the hon. gentleman advocates the use of pure alcohol under favoured conditions. For these purposes the denatured alcohol may be as well and as profitably used. I have followed with some interest the legislation and regulations of the United States Congress since I spoke on this question last session. The first legislation in the United States respecting denatured alcohol was an Act passed in June, 1906, and which came into force the 1st January, 1907. Another Act was passed by the American Congress giving greater liberty of action in the manufacture of alcohol. That Act was passed in March, 1907. Under it the door was more widely opened for the manufacture of alcohol for denaturing purposes. Many of the restrictions imposed upon the larger distilleries were, by the consent of the commissioner of internal revenue and the seretary of the treasury, removed in respect of distilleries producing alcohol on a smaller scale and for denaturing purposes only. A distillery producing not more than 100 gallons per day is free from many or most of the restrictions which apply to the larger distilleries. A distillery having a capacity of not more than 50 gallons per day is called a first-class distillery, and a distillery having a capacity of more than 50 gallons, but not more than 100 gallons per day, is called a second-class distillery. The only distinction between the first and second class is

this. In the case of the first class, it is provided that no revenue officer need be stationed in the distillery unless under special circumstances, which make it appear necessary to the collector of the district to have him there. The distilleries of the second class are to have stationed in them one revenue officer unless the collector of the district reports that, for special reasons one is not required. These distilleries, having a capacity of not more than 100 gallons per day and which use the product for denaturing purposes only, have to provide bonds in order to protect the revenue against any loss through any infringement of the laws. Not only does the latest legislation of the United States permit these small distilleries to distil alcohol free from the restrictions imposed on the larger, but it also provides for what are termed central denaturing warehouses for the use of which any one may purchase alcohol from any regular licensed distillery for the purpose of denaturing. That is, he need not manufacture the alcohol but he may purchase it, and he too must give bonds to protect the revenue against any loss by fraud.

I would like to point out the manner of denaturing alcohol as practised in the United States. I believe that our Inland Revenue Department has until a comparatively recent date, used a large portion of wood alcohol for the purpose of denaturing what is called ethyl produced in this country from grain. In the United States completely denatured alcohol is produced according to either one of the following formulæ. First to 100 parts in volume of ethyl alcohol, of not less than 180 degrees strength they use ten parts by volume of approved methyl alcohol, commonly called wood alcohol and one-half of one part by volume of approved benzine. The second formula is this. To every 100 parts in volume of ethyl alcohol of a strength not less than 180 degrees, they add two parts by volume of approved methyl alcohol and one-half of one part by volume of improved pyridine bases, this being a product of distilled coal tar. In France the general denaturing process followed consists in adding to 90 per cent alcohol 10 per cent of wood spirit (methyl alcohol), which contains 25 per cent or acetone and 2·5 per cent of various impurities. In Germany the general denaturing agent authorized consists of one part pyridine (obtained by distillation from coal tar) and four parts wood alcohol, to which may be added to each quart approximately 1·7 ounces of lavender oil or rosemary oil. In other words, the German denatured alcohol contains 2 per cent of alcohol and 0·5 per cent of pyridine, with optionally 0·125 per cent of lavender or rosemary oil

I would like to call attention for the moment to the large use of denatured alcohol in France and Germany and the particular purposes for which it is there used. In France, in the year 1905, there was used of denatured alcohol the following quantities for the following purposes :

	Gallons.
Heating and lighting..	8,326,084
Varnishes..	305,222
Polishes, &c..	46,415
Plastic materials..	562,497
Manufacture of hats..	6,023
Dying and colours..	14,635
Rennet..	3,910
Collodion..	11,016
Chloroform..	4,914
Choral..	10,091
Canning materials..	14,978
Chemical and pharmaceutical products..	178,843
Scientific uses..	31,515
Ethers, fulminates, explosives. ..	2,961,900
Total..	12,478,043

The following are the figures showing the consumption in Germany :

Year ending September 30—	Denatured.	Partially denatured.
1900..	20,665,887	8,975,281
1901..	18,616,826	9,137,482
1902..	23,780,319	9,529,405
1903..	25,998,819	10,195,535
1904..	25,889,056	10,353,615

Thus we see that in the year 1904, the last one for which I have the figures, the quantity of alcohol used in Germany, wholly or partially denatured, was over 36,000,000 gallons. I notice that in France, where the use of denatured alcohol is very large, the government pays a bounty of 5 cents per gallon on that produced there. In France, the source of production mainly is the sugar beet, while in Germany it is the potato.

As to the progress in the use of denatured alcohol in the United States, let me quote from a United States government bulletin published in 1906.

Mr. DANIEL. Could the hon. gentleman tell us the prices in Germany and France ?

Mr. MILLER. The prices vary from season to season according to the crop of beets or potatoes from which the material is produced. The following is from the United States government bulletin of which I spoke :

With the vast agricultural resources of this country, there will be no difficulty in increasing the consumption of industrial alcohol in the United States to equal or exceed that of Germany.

I call your particular attention to the last paragraph, which says :

This increase, however, must come slowly, and probably after many disappointments both of an agricultural and a technical character.

So that, while I claim that the question of denatured alcohol is one to which our government may properly give a great deal

of attention, I do not think the facts warrnat us in supposing that the use of denatured alcohol is going to accomplish any sudden revolution in mechanical devices or in any other way. It will be rather a steady growth as the machinery in which the industrial or denatured alcohol is used is from time to time improved and the cost of alcohol is reduced from year to year as we become more accustomed to its production and learn to make it in the cheapest way.

Now, I would like to take up the time of the House for a few minutes in reading from certain conclusions arrived at by the United States Inland Revenue Department as given in a bulletin published by the United States government and dated February 16, 1907. These conclusions are the result of the experience of the United States department subsequent to the legislation of 1906 :

Storage of alcohol and its use in engines is much less dangerous than that of gasolene, as well as being decidedly more pleasant.

The exhaust from an alcohol engine is less likely to be offensive than the exhaust from a gasolene or kerosene engine, although there will be some odour, due to lubricating oil and imperfect combustion, if the engine is not skilfully operated.

It requires no more skill to operate an alcohol engine than one intended for gasolene or kerosene.

There is no reason to suppose that the cost of repairs and lubrication will be any greater for an alcohol engine than for one built for gasolene or kerosene.

There seems to be no tendency for the interior of an alcohol engine to become sooty, as in the case with gasolene and kerosene.

The fact that the exhaust from the alcohol engine is not as hot as that from gasolene and kerosene engines seems to indicate that there will be less danger from fire, less offensive in a room traversed by the exhaust pipe, and less possibility of burning the lubricating oil. This latter point is also borne out by the fact that the exhaust shows less smokiness.

In localities where there is a supply of cheap raw material for the manufacture of denatured alcohol, and which are at the same time remote from the source of supply of gasolene, alcohol may immediately compete with gasolene as a fuel for engines.

It strikes me, in reading that clause, that, in our own western provinces, especially Alberta where there is no large production of kerosene, and where the climate and soil are admirably suitable for the raising of the sugar beet, they may produce alcohol for light, fuel and motor purposes to great advantage and with great economy.

If, as time goes on, kerosene and its distillates become scarcer and dearer by reason of exhaustion of natural deposits, the alcohol engine will become a stronger and stronger competitor, with a possibility that in time it may entirely supplant the kerosene and gasolene engines.

By reason of its greater safety and its adaptability to the work, alcohol should immediately supplant gasolene for use in boats.

By reason of cleanliness in handling the fuel, increased safety in fuel storage, and less offensiveness in the exhaust, alcohol engines will, in part, displace gasolene engines for automobile work, but only when cost of fuel for operation is a subordinate consideration. In this field it is impossible to conveniently increase the compression because of starting difficulties, so that the efficiency cannot be improved as conveniently as in other types of engines.

In most localities, it is unlikely that alcohol power will be cheaper or as cheap as gasolene power for some time to come.

Our government, at the present time, has a monopoly of the production of denatured alcohol. No one save the government is permitted to denature alcohol or to use alcohol free from excise duty for that purpose, and that is, perhaps, wisely so. I am glad that our Inland Revenue Department is using today the same quantity of wood alcohol as is being used in France and the United States for denaturing purposes ; that is, they have reduced the amount to ten per cent. I say I am glad of this because the smaller the proportion of wood alcohol used for denaturing, the lower the cost of the denatured product. The Inland Revenue Department is now paying a very large price for the wood alcohol it uses for denaturing purposes, owing to the fact that it entered into a contract for the supply of wood alcohol at a time when the price of that article was very high both in the United States and Canada. As a result of changes and of new legislation in the United States, the price of wood alcohol has become very much reduced on the other side, and, in sympathy or, it may be of necessity, this has reduced the price on the Canadian side.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) know the figures ?

Mr. MILLER. Our department is paying $1.29 per gallon, which was the ordinary price when the contract was made. The price of wood alcohol now is about 50 cents. The present contract will expire next month, and we shall be free to purchase wood alcohol at the cheapest price at which it can be sold. I think it would be well for our Inland Revenue Department not to go rashly as to licensing persons to engage in the manufacture of denatured alcohol. It is better that we should be content to await the figures and experiences of the United States and be guided to some extent by what is accomplished in that country, where they take such a deep interest in the question.

There is only one thing that I would ask of the Inland Revenue Department, and that is that the denaturing place should not be confined to the city of Ottawa. While denatured alcohol cannot now be used perhaps profitably as a motive power, or for fuel, or for lighting purposes, throughout the greater part of Canada, I believe that

denatured alcohol can, at the prices at which it can now be produced, be used with great advantage and profit in many of the manufacturing industries, and so to that extent we will reap the benefits that have been pointed out by the hon. member for Winnipeg. If a varnish manufacturer, or a hat manufacturer, or a manufacturer in many other lines in which alcohol is used, operating say in Toronto or in Montreal, desires to use the denatured product, he will have to pay a larger price for it if the denaturing takes place in Ottawa only, because the government must pay the freight carriage from the distillery where it is produced to the denaturing establishment at Ottawa, and the manufacturer using denatured alcohol must pay the freight from Ottawa to the point where he uses it. I would like to see the Inland Revenue Department establish a denaturing warehouse, say in the city of Toronto, as an experiment. They will be able to buy their alcohol in Toronto and do the denaturing there, and sell the denatured product at a considerably lower figure than they would be able to sell it in Toronto if it were denatured only in this city. I would like also that the Inland Revenue Department should, as soon as they are released from their present contract as to wood alcohol, and whenever their contract expires in March, and as soon as they are able to manufacture denatured alcohol at the lower prices which will then be possible, I would like to see them send out circular letters to the manufacturers advising them of the price at which they will be able to supply the article, making the price as low as it can be made without loss to the department. If they will make the price as low as it can be made, and if they will do their denaturing in various centres, beginning at Toronto or one of the other cities as an experiment, I believe denatured alcohol will be immediately used by the manufacturers in many manufacturing processes, not only with great economy, but because it will provide material of a quality better for their purposes than the wood alcohol they now use. For instance, in the manufacture of varnish, denatured alcohol will produce a much better article than that made with wood alcohol. Such varnish flows much more freely, and in every respect it is better and gives a better lustre. I trust the matter will receive the earnest attention of the department.

Mr. L. ROBITAILLE (Quebec County). The hon. gentleman has pointed out a similarity between the use of denatured alcohol and grain alcohol. No doubt there is a great similarity from the fact that denatured alcohol is a product of grain alcohol to the extent of 90 per cent of the mixture, and of methylated spirits,which is wood alcohol, to the extent of 10 per cent. These two mixtures of 90 per cent and 10 per cent make what we call the denatured alcohol. I may mention that in France they have a method of denaturing which is found very effective. The great difficulty in denaturing alcohol has been this, that no denaturning agent has been found that could not be eliminated by redistillation, or any other method of separating the denatured alcohol, and thereby enabling it to be sold without control by the excise law. In France there was a prize offered to all the scientific world of Europe for the most efficient denaturing agent, and I understand that at different intervals the French government change the denaturing agent so as to prevent individuals from copying the formula.

I am in full sympathy with the motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole). I may say that I belong to a family which is interested in the alcohol business. For my part I see no reason why the two years storage should be exacted. There is no economical reason why the government should oblige manufacturers to keep spirits two years in storage. The only reason I can discover at present is that such an arrangement was found politically advantageous during the Conservative regime, it was found advantageous to the whisky trust, and the regulation was made to reward certain services of a monetary character which were given to the Conservative election fund at different times. I have been told that certain gentlemen of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec used to make trips to Toronto every four years to the Messrs Gooderham and get substantial gifts of half a million or so to carry the province for Sir John A. Macdonald.

Mr. BRISTOL. What does the hon. gentleman mean ?

Mr. ROBITAILLE. Well, I understand that Mr. Blackstock, one of your leaders in Conservative circles, and probably one of the whisky trust, during the Conservative regime, would have been glad to see them back in power.

Mr. BRISTOL. Mr. Blackstock was not interested in the whisky trust.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. But I understand that he is a brother of Mr. Blackstock, who was secretary of the trust.

Mr BRISTOL. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that George Tait Blackstock had anything to do with the whisky trust ?

Mr. ROBITAILLE. I am saying that he was a brother of one that died and he was married to a Miss Gooderham. At all events, the Customs Department of the Canadian government to-day makes a great difference between foreign spirits and Canadian spirits, the reason being that Canadian spirits have to be kept two years in bond, while the foreign spirits are sold as they are sent over to Canada. That is a great handicap on the Canadian trade, which has

a huge capital invested. There is a difference also in the cost of manufacturing European and Canadian spirits. The raw material of European manufacture is beet sugar or beet root, grapes, the residue of grapes, and potatoes ; whilst in Canada they have to take good rye which costs $1.25 a bushel. or corn at $1 a bushel, and our good friends of the Customs Department exact 7½ cents duty on corn. These things must be taken into consideration by the committee who will study this question ; they must also consider the figures given by the German manufacturer as showing the difference in the cost of production.

The difference between the excise in 1880 and the excise at present, which is $1.90, has increased the selling price of grain alcohol. Grain alcohol is sold to chemists at something over $4 per gallon and to the wholesale trade at $3.50, and deducting $2.10 or $1.90—it depends on whether it has reference to the proof gallon or not—you will find that 100 per cent protection exists to-day without reducing the selling price. It might be well to legislate with respect to the spirit which goes into pharmaceutical preparations. To-day, on account of the enhanced value of grain alcohol, methylated spirits have taken its place in the manufacture of different goods in which ethyl alcohol might be more advantageously used from a hygienic standpoint. Methylated spirits is used in the manufacture of goods such as bay rum, witch hazel, corn cure, tincture of iodine and some essences and extracts. Several extracts, such as vanilla, are made from methylated spirits, and from a pharmaceutical and hygienic standpoint I do not think the use of methylated spirits is desirable. Many chemical changes take place in the destructive distillation of wood, and if I might be permitted to offer a suggestion, it would be that the law be so amended as to provide for granting licenses to manufacturers to purchase ethyl alcohol without any excise duty, or at a reduced excise duty, for use in the production of pharmaceutical supplies intended for human consumption. I would suggest that you prohibit the purchase of methylated spirits in the drug stores in order that there may be no chance of substituting methylated spirits for ethyl alcohol or that one may not be used for the other. I would also suggest that denatured alcohol might be purchased under license by varnish and paint shops. I am in full sympathy with the motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg. Although I am not myself directly interested in this business, some of my family are, and we find that the unjust legislation which is now on the statute-book prevents more capital from engaging in this line of business. It also prohibits the utilization of alcohol for industrial purposes, lighting and motive power, rather than gasolene. The manufacture of alcohol in Canada to-day utilizes the product of the farmer, whilst gasolene is an imported article. The adoption of the proposal in the resolution, from that standpoint, would assist and develop the Canadian industry and would help the farmers to dispose of their products in industries which could utilize them if the excise duty and customs tariff are not antagonistic to them as they are at the present moment.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). Mr. Speaker, the resolution as proposed by my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) practically asks for duty free alcohol to be used in the manufacture of medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations, perfumes, tinctures, essences and articles of that class. It seems to me that there are two branches of the one subject, or rather that the discussion has proceeded with regard to the question of denatured alcohol, which is one question, while the subject introduced by my hon. friend from Winnipeg of duty free alcohol —that is pure ethyl alcohol for medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations—is an entirely distinct question. The difficulties surrounding the proposition of my hon. friend, a proposition which has been made to the department very many times, I am informed, during the last thirty or forty years, are very great indeed. The department thus far has thought that the difficulties were so great as to be practically insurmountable. It has been thought to be impossible to permit the use of pure ethyl grain alcohol in the manufacture of pharmaceutical preparations without endangering the revenue. The direct loss of revenue and the expense of the supervision of establishments licensed to use duty free spirits would no doubt be considerable, but that would not give us much concern if the resulting advantages would be anything as great as my hon. friend argues that they would be. The real objection is that after the pharmaceutical preparations are manufactured and sent out all over Canada they would be no longer under supervision, and the alcohol in these preparations could, by redistillation, or by some chemical process, be made drinkable again and the revenue would suffer to that extent. I might give the House a little history of what has been done in the past and what efforts have been made to utilize free alcohol for this purpose. I want the House to distinctly understand that I am dealing with the question separate and distinct from the question of methylated spirits or denatured alcohol. Denatured alcohol is alcohol which is made so obnoxious that it is not drinkable. It could not be used in the majority of preparations or in pharmaceutical manufacturing establishments, and particularly in chemical compounds and medicines. Between 1868 and 1879 by order in council permission could be procured for the manufacture in bond of all the articles that our

chemical manufacturers put up, such as extracts, essences, perfumed spirits, ethers, chloroform, collodion, tinctures, cordials, bitters, syrups, compounds of brandies, gin, proprietary preparations, patent medicines, resinoids, chemicals, pharmaceutical preparations, powders, vinegar, varnish, etc. Permission could be obtained during these years for the manufacture of all these articles by the payment of eighty cents per gallon on the alcohol used. This list comprises nearly all the articles to which reference has been made by my hon. friend. I take it that it includes all these articles, and these are the articles that he now asks shall be manufactured with duty free alcohol. It was during these years that the greatest frauds were perpetrated upon the Inland Revenue Department, and in one instance a licensed concern, through the assistance of a dishonest official, defrauded the revenue of the country of a very large sum. In 1879 another order was passed permitting the manufacture of practically the same articles, but provision was made that tinctures, extracts, essences and all articles from which the alcohol could be extracted in a potable state, should be subject to the excise duty on the alcohol contained therein. In 1891, the following articles were allowed to be manufactured under a bonded manufacturer's license, the previous orders in council being of course repealed. Manufacturers were permitted to manufacture a long list of articles, such as vinegar, fulminate, soap and any other article of commerce in the process of manufacturing which the alcohol is destroyed and from the resultant products of which it cannot be recovered. That is practically the law in Canada to-day. Any manufacturer can obtain from the department permission to manufacture any article in the process of manufacturing of which the alcohol is destroyed and from the resultant product of which it cannot be recovered. In 1892, the manufacturing in bond of perfumed spirits was authorized, the alcohol used being subject to a duty of 75 cents per proof gallon. That is the law to-day. In 1894, an order in council provided for the manufacture from duty paid spirits of goods for export and for the refunding of the duty paid on the alcohol used when proof of exportation was furnished. That is the law to-day. Now, for the information of the House I might quote exactly what the law is. Section 252 of the Inland Revenue Act reads :

> Spirits used in any bonded manufactory in the production of such chemical compositions as are determined by the Governor in Council, for every gallon of the strength of proof by such hydrometer 15 cents per gallon.

Under that authority the regulation of the department says :

> Subject to the provisions of the Inland Revenue Act, to these regulations, and to such further regulations as may hereafter be made by competent authority, licenses may be granted to manufacture in bond the articles herein enumerated, namely, vinegar, fulminate, soap, and any other articles of commerce in the process of manufacture of which the alcohol is destroyed, and from the result of the products it cannot be recovered.

That is the policy of the department, and if any manufacturer can show us that in the process of manufacture the alcohol disappears or is changed into another substance —as I believe is the case with vinegar—and is not recoverable, that manufacturer can secure all the alcohol necessary at fifteen cents a gallon. But the department does not license any manufacturing establishment to use alcohol when that alcohol can be recovered and made potable again. There are in Canada to-day under the present regulations, using free alcohol, some eighteen vinegar establishments, three fulminate of mercury establishments in the manufacture of which the alcohol is non-recoverable——

Mr. GANONG. Can United States alcohol be brought in bond free for that purpose ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No. No alcohol can be used free for this purpose. Canadian alcohol cannot be used free for this purpose.

Mr. GANONG. I understood the minister to say it was free for that purpose.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No. Alcohol is used in the production of transparent soap and the manufacturers get a reduced rate of duty of seventy-five cents per gallon instead of $1.90. Perfumed spirit manufacturers pay seventy-five cents a gallon and there are eight such establishments in Canada.

Mr. BOLE. That is a proof gallon.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, I think it is. Now the manufacturers of pharmaceutical preparations for export get a rebate of the duty they pay on alcohol and there is one large establishment in Ontario which practically pays no duty, all their manufactures being exported. There are certain products of alcohol such as chloroform, ethers, and other like articles in the production of which the alcohol is practically destroyed or so far changed chemically that to reproduce it the cost involved would rob the venture of a great portion of its profits. There are others in which the component drugs are so costly that it would not pay to tamper with them in this way, and the Canadian manufacturer can get the alcohol for these articles by paying fifteen cents a gallon. But in the bulk of tinctures and essences the alcohol can be recovered at a cost which would bring about a repetition of the frauds which existed some years ago.

Mr. BOLE. Do I understand the minister to say that you can manufacture in Canada chloroform from spirits at an excise duty of fifteen cents a gallon.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am so advised.

Mr. BOLE. That is contrary to the information I received from the department.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My notes are prepared by the deputy minister and I am advised that the products of alcohol, chloroforms and ethers and so forth, in which the alcohol is destroyed or so far changed as to be non-recoverable, may be manufactured in Canada by paying fifteen cents a gallon. I am quite sure the policy of the department will be that wherever it can be demonstrated that the article to be produced destroys the alcohol in such a way that it cannot be recovered again for drinkable purposes, the alcohol will be allowed to be used on payment of fifteen cents a gallon. I have made some inquiries about what is done in other countries and I am in a position to say that there is no country which permits the employment of other than duty paid alcohol in the manufacture of pharmaceutical preparations where the alcohol remains as a spirit after the manufacture and may be recovered. There are several countries, in Europe and particularly Germany which permits the use of duty free alcohol in the manufacture of pharmaceutical articles in which the alcohol is either so changed chemically as to destroy it or from which the alcohol is removed before the product is put on the market, but not otherwise. In all other cases they charge whatever their excise duty may be on the alcohol consumed. My hon. friend from Winnipeg in moving the resolution referred to Germany, and the quotation which I will cite is not cited for the purpose of refuting any statement he made but rather with a view of giving information to the House, because we know that whenever the question of free ethyl or denatured alcohol is under discussion the example of Germany is always quoted. In 1905, the imperial parliament appointed a commission to inquire into the existing facilities for the use without payment of duty of spirits, in arts and manufactures, and to advise further measures to be adopted without prejudice to the safety of the revenue derived from spirits and with due regard to the interests of the producer of spirits in the United Kingdom. This was an exceedingly influential commission; it was composed of some of the leading manufacturing chemists and others in England who were well informed on the subject. They made a most elaborate investigation which is printed in a blue-book and among their recommendations they say:

> That in the manufacture of fine chemicals and pharmaceutical products, spirits specially denatured should be allowed only where the manufacture is kept entirely separate from the manufacture of tinctures and other prepartitions in which spirit remains as such in the finished product.

In England to-day free alcohol is not permitted for the manufacture of the medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations referred to by the mover of the resolution, and the situation in Germany is practically the same as in England. My hon. friend made a comparison between England and Germany, arguing that in consequence of the greater liberality of the German law than the English law with regard to the use of alcohol, many of the best and brightest minds in England have been driven to Germany, where manufactures have increased at a very rapid rate as a result of free alcohol. Let me quote from this same commission's report, which they make after having examined every prominent manufacture in Germany. They say this:

> After having the advantage of discussing this aspect of the general question with many persons well qualified to express an opinion, we have little doubt that the pre-eminence of Germany, in these particular branches of applied chemistry, is due to the same causes which have contributed to her success in the so-called coal tar colour industry. Alcohol in that industry has played at most a very subordinate part in its development, and although it is true that it plays a relatively much more important part in the manufacture of 'fine' chemicals and of pharmaceutical products, the extraordinary development in Germany, which has occurred during the last fifteen or twenty years, in the discovery and utilization in medicine of synthetic organic substances, is primarily due to the influence of the school of chemistry to the ardour and success with which organic chemistry in its highest developments is cultivated, and to the skill, energy and resourcefulness with which it is sought to turn the results of investigation to immediate practical account.

In Germany to-day duty is paid on the alcohol used in the manufacture of most of these fine chemicals. I have before me a report to the effect that the celebrated firm of Merck, I believe one of the largest and most celebrated in the world, consumes some 2,000,000 gallons of duty-paid alcohol in the manufacture of their special preparations. The United States also does not permit the use of duty-paid alcohol for medicinal preparations. I do not think it permits the use of duty-free ethyl alcohol for any purpose whatever. The United States Congress did last year pass a law for the removal of the duty from alcohol used for mechanical and industrial purposes, but not for the purposes my hon. friend has in view in moving this resolution. The view of the Department of Inland Revenue is that in so far as we can aid or encourage the use of alcohol in the manufacture of articles or products from which the alcohol cannot be again taken and used as a potable substance, the department is willing to assist; but it does not think, as my hon. friend suggested, that all the druggists in Canada, some 3,000 in number, should have access to alcohol on which the duty has not been paid, for the purpose of manufacturing

their pharmaceutical preparations. We would soon cease, it seems to me, to collect very much revenue from alcohol if it were dealt with in that way. If my hon. friend would eliminate the last few lines from the resolution, we would have no objection to it; but we do not think any commission to inquire into and report upon a method by which alcohol can be generally used in legitimate scientific and industrial operations, without increasing the danger of its use as a potable spirit, or the danger to the revenue, is necessary. We do not think there is any person better qualified to judge what injures the revenue than the officers of the Inland Revenue Department, who are there especially charged with the duty of guarding the revenue. A commission might inquire into the purposes for which alcohol could be used and how it could be used; but to suggest a way by which alcohol could be permitted to be used without abuse is something which we think can be better managed by the department itself. If my hon. friend does not object to eliminating the words, 'appoint a commission to,' and leave the instruction to the government to inquire into and report, I think the resolution would be quite acceptable.

Mr. G. H. PERLEY (Argenteuil). Mr. Speaker, this is one of the cases in which I am very glad to be able to side with the minister. It seems to me that the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) has proposed a rather extraordinary resolution regarding alcohol to be used for medicinal preparations and patent medicines.

Mr. BOLE. I wish to state emphatically that I never mentioned patent medicines. If the hon. gentleman reads my resolution, he will see that it refers to pharmaceutical preparations only.

Mr. PERLEY. Do not medicinal preparations cover patent medicines?

Mr. BOLE. I have not mentioned patent medicines. They are separate and distinct from pharmaceutical preparations, and are so regarded in the trade. I do not think the resolution should be read as including patent medicines.

Mr. PERLEY. I am only an amateur in the drug business, but according to my reading the term medicinal preparations would cover patent medicines, and I certainly think it would be an extraordinary thing for the government to allow alcohol to be used free of duty for any such purpose. We all know that there are many medicinal preparations—not to offend my hon. friend from Winnipeg by using the term patent medicines—that contain so much alcohol that they are used by many people in place of those refreshments which some of us take when the House is in session too late at night. If the hon. member for Winnipeg could bring pressure on the government to get this resolution passed, I wonder if the prices of any of these medicines would be reduced; because some of us who are amateurs in the drug business think that their price has very little to do with their cost. I must congratulate the minister for resisting the demand of his followers in this instance. The question of denatured alcohol for the arts and industries of this country—as the minister has properly stated, for such purposes that the alcohol is practically destroyed when used, that is, that it cannot be put back into its original state as a spirit except at extreme cost—is of such great importance to this country that I am sorry to see it perhaps prejudiced by being mixed up with other things in this resolution, which asks for free alcohol for purposes for which it should not be allowed to be used free. While on this subject, I would like to ask the Minister of Inland Revenue if he would be good enough to give us a little information as to what has happened in regard to denatured alcohol since we discussed the matter last session, when I believe it was stated that the government got from 65 to 80 cents a gallon for the different kinds of denatured alcohol?

I think it was stated then that the price was perhaps a little higher than it might otherwise have been, if the government had not had a contract in force which was to last some little time. In the United States it is stated that with corn at 30 cents a bushel, grain alcohol could be produced for 15 cents a gallon, which seems to us a pretty low price, and I have no doubt lower than that at which it could be produced in Canada. At the same time there was a lot of evidence to show that denatured alcohol could be produced in this country from inferior articles for the price of some 40 or 50 cents a gallon. By inferior articles, I mean the refuse of the farm, for instance. In the Customs Act which we passed last year, the government took power to admit free of duty alcohol for the purpose of making it into denatured alcohol. The explanation then given was that if the distilleries of this country saw fit to charge the government too great a price for their alcohol, the government could bring it in from other countries free of duty, but only for the purpose of making it into denatured alcohol. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) said it was being sold in Cuba at 25 cents a gallon. In other words, if the government saw fit, they could bring alcohol from Cuba at 25 cents a gallon for the purpose of making it into denatured alcohol and thus force our distillers to sell it to them at that price or go without the business. It is of the utmost importance, especially to our farmers, that some arrangement should be made by which they may get denatured alcohol at the lowest price possible. Not

only should the government make arrangements to allow this alcohol to be brought in as low as possible and denatured here, but they also ought to arrange to have it denatured in other places than Ottawa. My hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) has spoken about that already, and it is not necessary that I should speak of it at any length. We all know the government could provide denatured alcohol in Toronto very much more cheaply than to ship it from Ottawa. It is so essential that we should make inquiry regarding denatured alcohol, that I would like to ask the minister to give some little explanation as to what has happened since last session and what steps the government have taken to carry out the wishes of the House and provide the people with as cheap denautred alcohol as possible.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before the minister takes up that point, I would like to say a word with reference to the use of alcohol for industrial purposes. It seems to me that there is something more to be found out as to the possibility of obtaining alcohol cheaper, when it is absolutely ascertained that it is going to be used for medicinal purposes solely, without any danger of its being used for any other purposes. And with regard to the industrial side, I had some correspondence with the Department of Inland Revenue last year. We have in Montreal some very important manufacturers of furniture and some establishments where old furniture is remodelled, repolished and preserved in that way. Two or three of those establishments are very important. I have been informed that it is impossible to polish furniture properly without the use of alcohol. It is impossible to polish it properly with denatured alcohol. You must use pure alcohol, and it is impossible to use the pure alcohol and put a suitable polish on the furniture, at the prices at which alcohol is sold. The possibility of allowing the use of pure alcohol at reasonable prices for industrial purposes is a fit subject for inquiry at present. I do not remember exactly what was the result of the correspondence I then had, on behalf of one of these important manufacturers, with the department, but it was impossible to comply with the conditions, and the manufacturer had to give up the prospect of obtaining pure alcohol for industrial purposes. He had to give it up on account of the great price which, under the present system, is put upon that article. Where it is possible to make sure that the pure article only will be used for other purposes than drinking, some machinery ought to be provided by which the use of alcohol could be obtained at less ruinous prices than at present.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My hon. friend is not quite correct in his conclusion regarding myself.

Mr. PERLEY.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is only with the consent of the House that the hon. gentleman can speak.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I understood my hon. friends opposite asked me to say something on this question. My information is that, in the polishing of furniture, almost exclusively wood alcohol is used. Until a year ago there was no other alcohol used in the United States except the wood alcohol for the purpose of polishing furniture. If it can be used for that purpose, surely our methylated spirits, one of the acids being 90 per cent ethyl and 10 per cent wood alcohol, can be used for that purpose. Methylated spirits, manufactured by the Inland Revenue Department, is almost altogether used by furniture manufacturers throughout Canada.

Mr. MONK. The stains come back invariably.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Even if it were possible to permit pure ethyl alcohol to be used for that purpose, I cannot conceive of any government inspection or supervision which would safeguard the revenue. The greatest frauds imaginable would be perpetrated on the revenue. Very little change has taken place with respect to the production of methylated spirits by the department since a year ago. As then explained, the cost of wood alcohol to the department, under contract, was $1.29 per gallon, and that contract expires March 1, next. The cost of the grain alcohol at present is 25 cents per proof gallon. The cost to the department for that class of alcohol, methylated spirits, is about 41 cents per gallon.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the Imperial gallon?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes. We make three classes of methylated spirits or denatured alcohol, and one grade is openly sold on the market without restriction. Ninety per cent grain and 10 per cent wood alcohol is sold to manufacturers who enter into a bond that they will use it for special purposes.

Mr. SPROULE. What does that cost them ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. From 60 cents and upwards. That is pretty nearly cost price. It is quite true that the cost of methylating or mixing is unduly high. We do not do enough for the force we have, we bring the wood alcohol and the grain alcohol to Ottawa, paying the freight on it, and I think that probably it costs 10 cents to 15 cents per gallon to bring it here and mix it, which is a high charge. No change was made in the practice of the department, because very little could be effected until after March 1, when the price we pay for wood alcohol, now $1.29, will drop, probably to 50 cents or 60 cents. In the United

States, the price is 40 cents per wine gallon. It seems to me that it will be possible to put on the market denatured alcohol at a saving of a good deal of the expense now incurred in mixing. By using more economical methods, and, by turning out ten times the quantity, it will probably be possible, in a few months, to put it on the market at a price in the neighbourhood of 50 cents. But I cannot understand how, paying 41 cents for grain alcohol, we can sell it for much less than 50 cents per gallon, unless we sell it at less than cost.

Mr. PERLEY. I understand the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) to say that alcohol could be bought at 25 cents per gallon.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Per proof gallon. It depends on the strength. We use 65 over proof at 41 cents per gallon. When we buy proof spirits at 25 cents per gallon from the distillers, we are buying it very cheap. We do not buy first-class alcohol, but a grade of alcohol which remains in the distilleries after certain operations and the distillers do not think it better to put it through another distillation, but would rather sell it to us at 25 cents a gallon.

Mr. BOLE. Could the government bring in alcohol free of duty for this purpose?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes. But we do not want to take that step for some time to come. We want to use the wood alcohol produced in Canada. In reducing the price of methylated spirits, hon. gentlemen will see we come into competition with the wood alcohol manufacturers of Canada. The more we force down the price of methylated spirits, the lower they have to sell wood alcohol which does not command so high a price as methylated spirits. So, we are between two fires. The public want cheap methylated spirits and the wood alcohol manufacturers do not want us to put it on the market cheaper than at the present time.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What progress is being made towards giving to the farmers and industrial classes of Canada a cheap grade of alcohol for use in driving their machinery?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I thought my explanation was along that line. I was pointing out that, with alcohol bought from the distillers at 41 cents a gallon, in my opinion, the denatured alcohol cannot be made to compete with gasolene or petroleum for fuel purposes. It will be remembered that the United States, a year ago, introduced a law with regard to denatured alcohol. They never had denatured alcohol or methylated spirits in the United States until a year ago. But they are trying to emulate Germany in this matter in providing a cheap alcohol for farm and industrial purposes. After a year's trial, it has not worked out as successfully as they anticipated, though I am not saying it will not work out successfully.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Can the minister give reasons why we cannot manufacture this cheap grade of alcohol in Canada as they manufacture it in Germany?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. In the first place, the farmers of Canada will not grow potatoes as cheaply as do the farmers of Saxony and other German states. Then, petroleum is heavily taxed in Germany, in order to protect the alcohol. The German government subsidizes industrial or farm distilleries to the extent of 7 cents or 8 cents a gallon on the product. So, in Germany, alcohol is produced at a relatively cheap rate. But the conditions are different in Canada. Would the farmers of the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Armstrong's) county, for instance, grow potatoes at 8 cents or 10 cents a bushel to sell to an industrial distillery?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Is there a particular variety of potato best adapted to this purpose?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes. The lower the grade of the potato, I believe, the larger the product per acre and the higher the percentage of alcohol. Referring to industrial or farm distilleries, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States, in his report for the fiscal year, ended June 30, 1907—a very recent report, it will be seen—says:

> No large number of these industrial distilleries seems probable under existing conditions. While these distilleries are now permitted to use any material whatever in the production of industrial alcohol, the alcohol so far manufactured has been produced mainly from corn; and until a cheaper distilling material is found and its practical use demonstrated, it may be doubted whether this class of alcohol can successfully compete with gasolene or kerosene in this country.

I do not think we can produce alcohol in Canada at as cheap a rate as in the United States. The cheapest alcohol in the United States is from corn, and I think that most of the alcohol produced in Canada is from corn imported from the United States. These are the reasons why, for my part, I doubt that, even growing potatoes or any other material for the production of cheap alcohol, it would be possible to produce denatured alcohol at a price to compete with gasolene or petroleum at present.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). In regard to this resolution, I have received a good many letters from people who are in the proprietary medicine business, and those who use alcohol in different ways for manufacturing purposes, and these people appear to be very much in favour of the resolution brought forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole). I am satisfied that if something could be done to re-

duce the cost of alcohol for manufacturing purposes, while it might have the effect for a time of reducing the revenue, which for all purposes appears to be more than ample just now, it will result in great benefit to the country by giving employment to more lobour. Of the letters I have received I have picked out a couple which I will read. One of them is from Lyman Bros. & Company, Limited, who I understand are wholesale druggists, and are also manufacturers of certain kinds of proprietary articles. They say :

We take the privilege of calling your attention to a great injustice to the drug trade, and in fact all manufacturers who use alcohol, namely, that a necessity like alcohol should be so highly taxed, whereas it is supposed to be the policy of both political parties to encourage manufacturers by putting raw material on the free list, or on a very low basis of taxation.

We understand that one of the reasons given for the high cost is the fact that the regulation requires two years' storage of alcohol after distillation. This, of course, tends to create a monopoly as well as increase the price without increasing its use in the manufacture of medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations, perfumes, chemicals, dyes and in scientific research.

The potable article costs in the Canadian market over twenty-five times more than the primary cost of production, and, therefore, tends to restrict development in the lines mentioned, prohibits its use as an economical agent in the wider fields of industrial activity. Further, we are very much handicapped in Canada at the present time for the reason spirit can be bought at very much cheaper price in other countries, thereby giving them a decided advantage in manufacturing.

We would be glad if you would look into the matter, and we think it would be wise for the government to appoint a commission to inquire into and report upon a method by which this source of detriment to Canadian manufacturers can be remedied.

Mr. BOLE. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman. These are not patent medicine proprietors, they are wholesale druggists, they do not manufacture patent medicines. There is a tendency in the minds of many people to associate wholesale druggists with patent medicine manufacturers, which is an entirely erronous idea.

Mr. KEMP. I do not know that I designated these gentlemen as patent medicine manufacturers, I did not intend to. In their letter head they claim to be manufacturers of chloroform, sulphuric ether, and several other chemical articles.

Mr. BOLE. These are pharmaceutical.

Mr. KEMP. The other letter which I have is from the Toronto Pharmacal Company, Limited.

There is a matter of very considerable interest to ourselves as well as to the drug trade generally that has already or will in the very near future be brought to the attention of the House by Mr. Bole, wholesale druggist, of Winnipeg, and that is the question of the exorbitant prices we are obliged to pay for alcohol for use in the arts. The manufacturers are obliged to keep this article in stock for three years in order to comply with the regulation. We consider this absolutely unnecessary when the alcohol is used for manufacturing purposes and this fact adds practically fifty per cent to the actual cost of the spirit, without, of course, considering the question of government duty. A denatured alcohol is manufactured and sold in the United States at thirty-nine cents per gallon which illustrates the fact that a spirit can be manufactured and sold, if there were no duty to pay and it had not to be kept for three years, at from forty to fifty cents per gallon, imperial measure, with a very good profit. Of course the government duty is placed high enough so as to prevent any spirit being imported.

We readily recognize many of the difficulties that would appear in a discussion of this nature but feel sure that this question of allowing spirit to be used immediately after it is made would make a very material difference to manufacturers such as ourselves and we cannot understand for a moment why there should be the slightest objection raised to an arrangement being made whereby this would be made possible. We will esteem it a favour if, when this matter comes up for discussion, you will give it your earnest thought and use your influence in seconding this very just claim which the manufacturers are making.

I do not intend to say anything further on this subject, because I feel that all the points have been well covered by hon. gentlemen who have spoken previously.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It seems to me that the resolution aims at two purposes. One to reduce the cost of alcohol by doing away with the restrictions which make it necessary to keep it two years in storage before it is used. That will reduce the monopoly, if there is a monopoly, and to that extent I presume it is a monopoly. But I would be afraid that if you reduce the cost you would increase the chances of a much larger consumption for drinking purposes. If you made it cheaper, people would be likely to drink more of it ; therefore I do not think that temperance men will be pleased with this proposal from their standpoint. On the other hand, it is proposed to reduce the cost when it enters into medical preparations. It seems to me that could be easily accomplished by the government providing that alcohol used for those purposes might be alcohol which was distilled yesterday and could be used to-day. I do not see why it should be kept so long for that purpose. I agree largely with the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole). I cannot understand what great improvement is made in alcohol by keeping it two years, unless it is kept in something else than copper tanks, because if you keep it in copper tanks they prevent evaporation. The evaporation of the fusel oil through wooden barrels is supposed to make the whisky better,

and that is the reason why the law was changed which required it to be kept five years. Originally the time was five years, and I think it is five years still before it can be used. But it had to be kept in wooden vessels, not in copper vessels. If you keep it in copper or glass vessels, they do away with evaporation, and therefore cannot improve it to any great extent. In those vessels certainly the fusel oil could not be taken out of it. I always thought that the amendment to the law, whether it was or was not calculated to benefit those who were then in the trade, had the result. I never could see the wisdom of it, because I did not think it desirable that alcohol or liquors should be improved very much by age, because if they were improved very much, people would be likely to drink more of them. I think the worse you made them, the better it would be for those who are in the habit of drinking them, unless you desired to make them so bad that they would kill off the drinkers. The other feature of the resolution is the appointment of a commission to make an inquiry. Well, the government say, We can inquire ourselves. I suppose the inquiry could be made as well by the government as by a commission. But even after the inquiry, it seems to me it would be a difficult task for the government to make such regulations as would enable those who require alcohol for the purposes mentioned, to get it at a much lower cost than it is procurable to-day. At least they could get that alcohol at whatever reduction could be made by using the newly made article instead of that a few years old. But they could go further still; they could reduce the Inland Revenue tax upon alcohol if they desired to those who required it for that purpose. It seems to me that it would not be a very difficult matter to make that arrangement. I agree with those who claim that it is desirable for these legitimate purposes that alcohol should be as cheap as possible. It is not to be used for beverage purposes. It is for the purpose of making medicinal preparations and for use in the arts. The minister said that when he allowed the use of alcohol to manufacturers, for instance, furniture manufacturers, they abused the trust very much and converted it to other uses. If I understand correctly what they require it for, it is for the purpose of making varnish.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My hon. friend misunderstood me. When I said there were frauds on the revenue twenty or thirty years ago when grain alcohol was used in these pharmaceutical preparations I did not know exactly what the manufacturer was making who perpetrated the fraud to which I referred. I am rather inclined to think it was methylated spirits which was then made by outsiders.

Mr. SPROULE. It did not apply to the use of alcohol in the arts?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I misunderstood the hon. gentleman and I withdraw what I said. I think the whole thing could be easily accomplished by the government if they made an effort to do so. Give it to the trade at a reduced price while at the same time keeping up the price to those who would be likely to use it for beverage purposes.

Mr. BOLE. In respect to the observations made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the withdrawal of the regulations requiring storage for two years would decrease the cost of alcohol and would therefore make it more susceptible to consumption for beverage purposes, I have to state that I do not think that the people would commence to drink alcohol even if the regulations were abandoned for the reason that if that regulation were abandoned, and assuming that in consequence of the abandonment alcohol is reduced in bond to, say, 75 cents, from $1.39 a gallon, you will have to add to that $3.14 a gallon excise tax, so that the people will not pay $4 a gallon for alcohol when they can buy whiskey for $2 a gallon. Therefore I think that the objection does not stand. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) asked me if I had the particulars in respect to the price of alcohol from 1890 down to the present. I wish to state that I have the price in bond and the price duty paid for every year. The list is a long one and I do not care to weary the House with it at this time. Perhaps I might take every four or five years. The prices are as follows:

Year.	In bond per gallon.	Duty paid per gallon.
1880	$0.59	$1.89
1885	1.00	2.65
1889	0.91	3.06
1892	1.13	3.62
1895	1.15	3.53
1897	1.13	4.27

I am not quoting proof gallons as the minister has been all afternoon. A proof gallon of alcohol contains 57 per cent of pure alcohol. The article known in commerce contains about 90 per cent of pure alcohol.

Mr. SPROULE. Proof spirits is about half and half?

Mr. BOLE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. What strength is the hon. member quoting?

Mr. BOLE. 65 per cent o.p. which is about 90 per cent pure alcohol. For this, as I stated, the price is $1.39 in bond and $4.15 excise duty. The hon. member for South

Grey (Mr. Miller) quoted some figures from Germany which appeared to be out of joint with the figures I quoted. I think he quoted figures for the years 1900. There has been a tremendous development in the alcohol business in Germany since then. I have a report which states that there was an increase of 104,000,000 litres of alcohol used for burning purposes over the year before. The last figures I have are for 1906-7. An increase of 104,000,000 litres is an increase of about 20,000,000 gallons. So, I think that the figure I stated is correct. The minister has stated that difficulties existed in respect to making alcohol cheaper for the purposes which I have designated this afternoon and he points out that if goods are manufactured from alcohol they will be taken out, redistilled and the alcohol recovered and used for beverage purposes. I acknowledge that there is that danger but it does not follow that because people are liable to perpetrate frauds of that kind industrial development should not go on. It does not follow that I should not carry money in my pocket because there is a danger of some one on the street knocking me down and taking the money from me. There is bound to be sin committed as long as human nature is human nature and I think this parliament should rise to the occasion and mete out punishment sufficient to deter people from doing that kind of thing and allow industries in Canada the same chance that they have in other countries that I have named this afternoon. I think it is unfair to assume that because people will commit fraud we should not have the privilege of making those things which are manufactured in such large quantities in other countries and imported into this country.

Mr. SPROULE. Now, they carry on illicit distilleries.

Mr. BOLE. Yes. It is just as unfair to say that nobody should grow corn or rye because some one is going to take a bag of rye or corn into the woods and distil whiskey from it. You can punish the man who abuses the privilege he gets when he asks for alcohol for pharmaceutical preparations and distils alcohol from it. The minister has been advised by the departmental officers, perhaps very properly, but I am afraid they are too susceptible to influence of this kind and that their minds are bent entirely on the collection of the revenue. They do not think of the development they are retarding. They think only of the revenue and I think the objection which is urged is rather far-fetched. The minister has stated that the manufacturers of vinegar, fulminate of mercury and soap have certain privileges under the regulations. I do not see why the manufacturers of pharmaceutical preparations do not enjoy the same privileges. The minister has stated that under the present law the manufacturers of pharmaceutical preparations can get alcohol at 15 cents per gallon if they comply with certain regulations; pay $100 a month to an inspector and all that kind of thing. But I do not understand that these regulations are now in operation. I understood from a conversation I had with the deputy minister that these were withdrawn in consequence of the frauds that were perpetrated against the revenue some 25 or 30 years ago.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No; they are in force.

Mr. BOLE. Then there is energy enough in Canada to have taken advantage of these regulations were they known to exist. I am very glad to hear the minister say they do exist, and I hope I will be able to quote the minister's statement to the officers of the department when I make further representations to them.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOLE. The minister has asked me to amend this resolution in such a way that he can support it, and as I would prefer to have some inquiry rather than none at all I will comply with his wish, although my inclination is to leave the resolution as it is. I will amend it by commencing at the fourth line from the bottom and saying:

In the opinion of this House the minister should inquire and report, &c.

Thus striking out the phrase which says that the government should appoint a commission to inquire. I feel that if the minister makes this report he will go about it in earnest, and that he will give us some information which will enable parliament to deal intelligently with the matter. But if the report is to be made entirely by departmental officers, I feel that they will do everything to safeguard the revenue and place that object before any idea of industrial development. That is what they are trained to; they know nothing else except the gathering in of the revenue and the protection of every avenue by which the revenue shall be preserved.

Mr. SPROULE. Why say the minister should inquire? Why not amend it so as to say the government should inquire?

Mr. BOLE. That would be satisfactory to me. I am disappointed that the minister does not accept the resolution as originally drafted, but I am willing to amend it as suggested.

Mr. SPROULE. Who would the report be to?

Mr. BOLE. To parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is proposed that the resolution be amended by striking out the words 'appoint a commission to.'

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton) moved :

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, reports, memoranda, resolutions and any information in the possession of the government, relating to changes in postal charges or regulations within the past two years, between the United States and Canada.

He said : I urge upon the Postmaster General the necessity of bringing down these papers so that the people of the country may understand what the reasons were which induced the minister to change the regulations last May so that Canadian newspapers and periodicals were placed at such great inconvenience, expense and loss of revenue. I feel confident that the United States government is quite willing to allow our weekly papers or daily papers or periodicals into their country under the regulations which existed previous to the 8th of May last, and I urge upon this government to restore these regulations. A change has already been made by the Postmaster General under which there is interchange of the American and Canadian daily newspapers under the regulations which previously existed and without restriction. The weekly papers are wondering why they should not be put in the same position, and the Postmaster General gives the excuse that he objects in some way to the advertising matter which would come into Canada. If the Postmaster General has any fear on that score, I would advise that he should appoint a board under which there would be a censorship of all publications that come into this country, and on the advice of whom objectionable periodicals would be excluded. I feel satisfied the Post Office Department of the United States would not object to such censorship. The present regulations have caused a serious loss of revenue to hundreds of Canadian weekly newspapers and periodicals on account of the increased cost, which amounts to about fifty cents on each annual subscription, and the consequent cancellation of many subscriptions. I would also call the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that if he has made a mistake in this matter he has also made a mistake in his policy with regard to rural free mail delivery. Surely he does not take the stand now that he did a few months ago, when he said we would have to wait for rural free delivery until the population of the Dominion was 20,000,000.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will see that he is reviving a discussion which has taken place during the present session.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then I will direct my remarks to the mistakes which the minister has made in another direction. He has frankly admitted that he made a serious blunder when he changed in May last the postal regulations affecting daily papers, and I think he will see now that he has made a mistake with regard to the weeklies and periodicals. He has never been able to give any satisfactory explanation to the House why, if it was right that the daily papers should be shut out last May, he has changed his attitude and is allowing them in at the present time. I am sure that the minister will admit that our weeklies and periodicals are doing a lot of splendid advertising in the United States in regard to our Dominion and its resources. They are going into that country by the hundreds and thousands, and there is not an objectionable feature in these publications. We are spending over $900,000 in advertising the advantages of this country throughout the civilized world ; but no more advantageous means of advertising can be conceived of than that which is done through the Canadian weeklies and periodicals which go into the United States, but which are now practically barred from that country by the restrictions which the Postmaster General has placed upon them. I ask for this return in order that we may have a full and complete investigation of this matter and of the reasons why the government took the action they did last May, particularly in regard to the daily papers, which have suffered a loss of circulation as a result. I believe it is the duty of the Postmaster General to explain this matter fully to the whole country, so that the people may understand the position which Canada occupies.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I must apologize to my hon. friend for not being here when he introduced his motion ; I was receiving a delegation in my office on a question affecting my department. However, as I read the motion, I find no objection to its being voted unanimously by the House. I have nothing to conceal regarding the action taken by the department and by myself on the question of postal relations between the United States and Canada. As you are aware, we had a postal convention with the United States, dating as far back as 1875, under which the United States post office authorities arranged with the Canadian post office authorities to send to this country letters mailed in the United States at their domestic rate, and we were to distribute them through the post offices all over the Dominion and they, reciprocally, ours. A similar clause existed with regard to newspapers and periodicals. There was no serious objection to that convention. At that time there were very few daily newspapers published in Canada, and hardly any periodicals or magazines. In the United States there were only a limited number of magazines published and they were of the best class.

But since 1875 the development of the printing and publishing industry, especially in the United States, has been so great that in a few years the number of magazines, periodicals and daily newspapers increased to an enormous degree. The result was two-fold: first, the post offices were made the dumping ground of all that literature. The postal authorities could not check this sudden influx; they could not enforce the spirit of the classification established. The publishers of legitimate periodicals protested in vain during twenty years against this abuse of the mails. There are many sheets published in the United States under the cover of a newspaper or a periodical which are nothing else but mediums of advertising. There is a novelette in the paper, but the rest is covered with advertisements. Sometimes these novelettes are of the worst kind. As I said a moment ago, there were very loud complaints in the United States against the abuse of the postal privilege. Several conferences were held, and commissions were appointed by Congress, but the commissions never reported, or if they did, the influence of the politicians with the government at Washington was so great that when the moment came of putting into force the recommendations of the commissioners nothing was done. But what was the result as regarded Canada? Our frontier extends over 3,000 miles from one end of the country to the other. It is a purely artificial boundary line.

The result of the convention of 1875 was that our country became the dumping ground of American literature, good, bad and indifferent. The question became quite a vexed one, and I thought it my duty to face boldly the issue and come to some understanding with the United States Post Office Department. I had not been in charge of the department two months when I was the recipient of numerous protests directed against the objectionable magazines which were being read by the young in our large cities and towns all over the country. These protests came, in the first place, from the clergy, and besides several of the very loyal associations of this country also protested against the spirit of this literature as affecting especially the loyalty of the new settlers in the Northwest Territories. Some people wrote to me—and they were very important people on both sides of politics—that we should not allow the Americanization of our new settlers by this literature. We know that many Americans settle in our west every year. Was it not better and more in the interests of Canada that I should follow the advice given me and at the same time protect Canadian journalism as against American journalism? I am told that in literature there are no boundaries and no frontiers. No doubt that is true in the most intellectual sense, but we must, as much as possible, create a national spirit from one end of our country to the other. Is not the press and the literature published in this country a great instrument of nationalization? That is my opinion, and it was with that end in view that last year I took the step I did when I went to Washington. My hon. friend has a grievance against the department on that subject, and it is quite natural he should air it in this House. Many subscribers to the American press have also asked some explanations; but when the explanation was given, which I am now giving frankly, when I told my fellow-countrymen that the reason we took that attitude last year was, in the first place, to stimulate the national idea, and, in the second place, to protect our youth in our large cities and towns against an objectionable literature which was being sold at every station, on every news stand, they confessed that the action of the department was wise and timely. But the amendment was only in the nature of an experiment as regards the daily press. We found after a while that the large dailies published in the United States had only a limited circulation in Canada. As regards the periodicals—and the amendment last year was specially directed against the periodicals—we found that we were the mail carriers of some advertising firms in the United States. Would you believe me, Sir, that in small towns like Cobalt and New Liskeard the postmasters spent all their time in distributing that literature to the public. It was the same all over the country, especially in the Northwest and the large cities. When we increased the rate on periodicals and weeklies we practically purged the mails of this country of all that objectionable literature. I do not suppose my hon. friend is objecting to that. No one will cavil at the action of the department as regards that immoral literature, and it was only by raising the postal rates that we could obtain that result. My hon. friend wishes to know what have been the changes made this year. Last year, when I went to Washington, both departments agreed to raise the rate from one-half cent a pound, which was the rate in existence until that time, to four cents a pound. This year, as the American dailies have very little circulation in this country, and as some of the Canadian dailies have a very large circulation in the United States, especially in the eastern and in some of the western states, we thought we should relax the regulation, and instead of charging four cents a pound charge only one cent a pound. But my hon. friend says: Why discriminate against the magazines and weeklies? Well, if I were to revert to the one cent a pound rate for the magazines, the periodicals and the weeklies we would simply reopen the gates which were closed so effectively last year against the yellow literature. We have not given the rate of one cent a pound to the magazines and the weeklies, but we have practically cut the

figure in two by giving them the benefit of the remailing privilege, and instead of charging four cents a pound, they will pay, between the express company and the United States post office, only two cents a pound. I would not have yielded if I had not made this other arrangement with the United States government. Under the old convention we were obliged to accept the classification of the United States Post Office Department. The United States post office, as I explained a minute ago, gave indiscriminately the mailing privilege to all newspapers, magazines and all periodicals. On many occasions the Postmaster General in the United States made an effort to stop the flood of this pseudo-literature, but he was simply compelled to recede before the influence of American politicians. This year, however, our agreement with the United States is that while we give their periodicals the remailing privilege, we shall accept only those which come under our own classification. That is to say, we now are what Rudyard Kipling has described in his 'Lady of the Snows,' a mistress in our own house, which we were not formerly. Under the old convention we had to accept any paper, periodical or magazine which came under the classification of the Washington office. We will give the remailing privilege to any weekly newspaper or periodical, provided it comes within the definition of our classification.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Why does not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) put it back to the same old rate ? He says his classification protects the public from this objectionable literature ; now, why cannot the classification be worked under the old rate ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lefurgey) had followed my explanation, he would know that the arrangement is reciprocal—if we make a reduction in Canada, they will make it in the United States.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understand the minister to say that he recently reduced the rate on weeklies and periodicals from four cents to two cents. When did that go into force ? The reason I ask is that the impression the minister gave the other day was that the weeklies and periodicals were still charged four cents a pound.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, I think the change was made about January 7, but I have not the documents before me, and cannot speak with certainty. I hope I explained clearly the reasons for the change brought about a year ago. The effect of that change was to give a measure of protection to our own periodicals. Coming from a Liberal minister, I think that was a good move. Another most important one, is that we have purged our mails of all objectionable literature. I have a report, which I will lay on the table, written by the able superintendent of post offices for the Dominion, Mr. Ross, of Toronto. Mr. Ross travels from end to end of the country visiting every post office. He has noted what changes have taken place as regards the yellow press exchanged between the United States and Canada, and he has reported to me that the change had been simply marvellous, in the removal from the mails of objectionable literature, and noticed the encouragement given to that which is sound and pure. There is another important point which hon. gentlemen should not lose sight of. Last year when we amended the convention existing between Canada and the United States, we obtained at the same time from the Postmaster General of Great Britain a very substantial reduction in the postal rates. The rates on newspapers, magazines and periodicals from Great Britain to Canada, up to May 8 last, had been eight cents per pound. This was reduced to two cents per pound. And the result has been most gratifying. With the shutting out of the objectionable literature coming from the United States, we have noticed a substantial increase in the number of British periodicals, magazines and newspapers coming to Canada. The quantity of this matter in January last, as compared with January last year, shows an increase of no less than 347 per cent. The other day I received from the Postmaster General in Great Britain a blue-book published by that department accompanied with this letter :

February 7, 1908.

Dear Mr. Lemieux,—I think the inclosed will interest you as showing the number of magazines which have registered themselves under the Canadian magazine post.

That is a new department which was created last year at our request when that reduction took place.

I am glad to find also that the better class magazines are especially in request in Canada.

Yours very truly,
SIDNEY BUXTON.

I have here the blue-book referred to and it bears out what I have stated that we have replaced the objectionable literature which formerly burdened our mails, with this sound and patriotic literature coming from the old land.

Mr. KEMP. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) be kind enough to explain what he means by the objectionable literature from the United States.

Mr. LEMIEUX. For instance, these novellettes, dime novels, the ' Police Gazette ' and all that yellow literature which was simply dumped in our post offices in tons.

Mr. KEMP. But the Act is not directed against that kind of literature, but against all kinds.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is true in a sense ; it was pretty hard to expect from our post-

masters under the old convention, that they could do much to stop this flood of undesirable literature which was thrown into our mails by the carload. But now we have completely stopped it. And I should receive the help of every good Canadian in continuing that policy. Of course, legitimate newspapers and magazines will be welcome. For instance, the 'Literary Digest,' 'Munsey's,' the 'National Review,' the 'Century,' 'Colliers,' 'McClure's,' 'Harper's,' the 'Ladies Home Journal'—of course, we are pleased to read these magazines and glad to see them in every home. I cannot name all the objectionable papers, but thousands of them have disappeared from our mails since we have inaugurated this policy movement.

Mr. SPROULE. It is more due, I presume, to the right acquired of making a classification instead of allowing the Americans to make it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) that by increasing the rate from one cent to four cents we stopped pretty much all that was objectionable.

Mr. SPROULE. Could not the hon. minister stop it by the classification ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Both of these have worked in the same direction. My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) said that we had formerly in the United States an advertising medium for our own manufacturers. My hon. friend need not be afraid. I think we serve much better the interests of the country by preventing the patent medicine manufacturers and other from advertising at our expense, their goods in Canada. These advertising sheets that were coming through our mails in the guise of newspapers encouraged the purchase of American goods by Canadians. Well, we have stopped that. Is it not better to encourage our own manufacturers, our own goods, than to open, practically for nothing, this whole Dominion as a great advertising ground for the foreigner ? From every point of view, from a moral point of view, from a national point of view, from a commercial point of view, the change which was made last year was most beneficial to the country. I do not take the credit to myself. The whole House gave me a free hand on the question, and encouraged me, as I thought last year, to take that action. The change that has just taken place will not affect the future. We will have the same results except that our daily newspapers will benefit, by being able to send their issues to the large Canadian population in the United States, while in return we receive very few American daily newspapers. The United States are now bound to accept our own classification, and we will accept from the United States only such periodicals as we believe should be circulated among our people. These are the explanations I have to give, I will be able to give more when my estimates come up. Suffice it to say, again, that from a moral point of view, from a national point of view, and from a commercial point of view, the change which took place last year was most beneficial to the country.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince). I understand the position of the Postmaster General to be that he is trying to rid the country of an objectionable class of newspapers. To accomplish this he has made a trip to Washington, and so far as he has gained his object we will give the Postmaster General due credit. But when he went down to Washington last year, he claimed that he had raised the rates on all periodicals from the United States from half a cent a pound to four cents a pound. But when he came back to this country he found that the arrangement was absolutely unworkable, was an absolute injustice to the newspapers of this country. Under pressure of the newspaper men in this country, he apparently changed his mind, with regard to the daily papers, as he informed us on the 14th of February. But the Postmaster General did not tell us on the 14th of February that he had reduced the rate on weekly periodicals from four cents, to two cents for he distinctly said that the rate remained the same. Mr. Armstrong said :

When the minister took steps towards allowing the American dailies to come into Canada, what was the objection to including the weekly or semi-weekly newspapers of both countries in the arrangement?

The Postmaster General replied :

There has been no change made with regard to the weeklies or the semi-weeklies. The alteration last year affected only the daily papers, and the periodicals still remain at four cents a pound.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, they did not come under our classification. I think the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) asked me a question on the same lines, except that he gave a concrete case to which I made an answer. I think my answer to the member for Sherbrooke corrects the impression which may have been conveyed by my first answer.

Mr. LEFURGEY. If the change was made before that, it would seem that the minister wanted to cover it up. The whole of the discussion on that day went to show that no alteration had been made with regard to weekly newspapers. Apparently the great thing the minister wanted to accomplish was to get clear of these objectionable publications that were being dumped into Canada, and for that purpose his mission to the United States was a laudable one. But at that time we had not the right to our own classification, as the minister said ; since that time this right has been

given to us, and therefore I cannot see why, if he can reduce the rate now to two cents, he cannot place the weekly newspapers back to the half cent rate, because after all he says it is a matter of concurrence between the two governments. His trip to Washington in May last year was to secure concurrent action, and that concurrent action brought about the four cent rate. The United States is allowing us to go back as regards daily newspapers to the half cent rate, as under the old convention. They have been willing to meet the minister on the two cent rate with regard to weeklies, and I would like to know if the minister approached the United States government as to the half cent rate with regard to weekly newspapers, and if they refused to go back to the old convention and allow our own classification.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I could not answer offhand. The negotiations this year were not carried on by myself, but by the acting Postmaster General, Sir Richard Cartwright, when I was away from Canada. But when the papers come down the hon. gentleman will get further information. At all events, I may say that if we were to revert to the half cent a pound rate, we might just as well open the gates.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The hon. member said it was a matter of concurrent arrangement.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It was a treaty.

Mr. LEFURGEY. If the minister cannot tell us that he tried to get these concurrent rates for half a cent a pound that we had under the old convention, then we will presume he was satisfied to take the two cents, and failed to get justice for our weekly newspapers. Now this really means more to our weekly newspapers than to our dailies. Our people who are living in the United States do not want the daily newspapers of Canada nearly so much as they want the weekly newspapers published in the localities from which they emigrated. And it is a manifest injustice to these people if the weekly newspapers cannot be put back to the half cent rate per pound, so that they can get them at a reasonable cost. It seems to me this could readily be done under the regulations, as the minister says that we have control of our own classification at the present time. If we can reduce the rate to two cents under this classification, I see no obstacle in the way of reducing it to the half a cent rate per pound on weekly newspapers. I trust, as the minister has seen fit to make these changes from the position into which he got himself last year, he will go further and place the weekly newspapers back to the status they enjoyed before.

Mr. KEMP. I would ask the minister if he knows what extra revenue this regulation brings to the United States. They all get the extra postage, do they not? It really amounts to a protective measure. Would it not be better for us to regulate it by tariff than by an arrangement of this kind, so that we may get the revenue rather than the United States, who are getting it now?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We have a convention which was made between the two countries in 1875 and it is under that convention that we are working.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is it not the Canadian who is paying that extra postage to the United States government? I know of cases where a magazine was $3 a year previous to this arrangement and now it is $4.50. The subscriber is paying that extra postage to the United States government.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Similarly there were newspapers published in Canada circulating in the United States charging $3 a year and which, under the amendment have charged the Americans $4.50. The Americans are paying for it. It cuts both ways.

Mr. J. D. REID. But it is a very small proportion that goes to the United States from here.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No. 'La Presse' of Montreal has a circulation running from 30,000 to 35,000 a day in the eastern states. The Toronto 'Globe,' I think has a circulation of between 5,000 and 6,000 a day in the United States. All the newspapers of Toronto—my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) knows them very well—the 'World,' the 'Mail and Empire,' the 'Daily Globe,' the 'Daily Star,' the 'Daily News,' and the 'Daily Telegram' have large circulations in Buffalo and the cities across the boundary. The papers published in Winnipeg, Vancouver and all the border cities have very large circulation in the United States, now that the reduction has been made I do not think that there will be any more complaints.

Mr. KEMP. That does not apply to magazines.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It does not apply to magazines, it is true, but we had to take the position and stand firmly by our guns in order to obtain the result that we have achieved. People may think it is displaying too much patriotism to put a restraint upon American literature coming in such great quantities in this Dominion of ours, but my hon. friend who comes from the good, loyal city of Toronto must know that by encouraging our own national literature, by encouraging our own periodicals and our own newspapers, we are working to the best interests of Canada. The people who can afford to read periodicals and magazines published in the United States do not care two pins whether they pay forty cents or thirty cents more a year. If they can enjoy that luxury they are quite willing to

pay twenty-five or thirty cents a year. I, for my part, believe that we should not begrudge the twenty-five cents we pay if we choose to read American literature in preference to our own.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would it not have been possible last May when the inspector to whom the hon. gentleman has referred undertook the inspection of literature coming into our country to have made a satisfactory arrangement with the American postal authorities. I think it is going to come to the establishment, as I said a few moments ago, of a board of censorship which will inspect all the papers and periodicals coming into the country.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Well, a board of censorship exists to-day in my own department. According to the Postal Act I can examine every newspaper and periodical which is being circulated in the country and pass judgment upon it. But I am not a superman; I am only a man. I cannot devote all my time to the work of censorship, and it would take such a large staff that it would probably cost the country too much money. No, I believe we have attained results which the future will justify. We have in our department the necessary power to stop the circulation of objectionable literature. The Post Office Department is in itself a bureau of censorship, but we do not need to exercise our own powers. There are enough intelligent, honest people in this country belonging to both creeds and to both nationalities to inform our department if objectionable literature is being circulated. I trust that the public will always help us, and I must thank those who in all parts of the country have heretofore helped the department in that arduous task.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). I appreciate very much the action of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) in excluding literature of a questionable character. But he has not made one point sufficiently clear to my mind. Since this convention between this country and the United States, was entered into the minister, a few months ago, had made some relaxation of its terms in regard to the postage rate on daily newspapers. There is a feeling in this country that that should be extended to weekly newspapers. There are many Canadians in the United States. We want them not to cut loose from us altogether. We want them to have our Canadian papers, not only Canadian dailies, but Canadian weeklies. Some of the best papers we have in Canada are weekly papers, and I cannot see why the Postmaster General has drawn the line between the daily and the weekly newspapers. He told us that the increase in the rates has excluded some questionable periodicals and next he quoted Kipling as saying that we were masters in our own house, that we made our own classification, and he went on to say that it was the classification that excluded those questionable periodicals, and next he quoted the postage and then he goes a little farther and says that it was the classification. I think he would do a good deal for this country if he would extend to weekly papers the privilege that he has extended to daily papers. I do not want for one moment to jeopardize the action which he has taken against the flooding of this country with doubtful literature. But I think that he should include the weekly newspaper with the daily in the reduction.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. HAGGART. Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to know from the government what business will be taken up to-morrow.

Mr. FIELDING. Several of the resolutions which stand on the Order Paper; the first relates to the battlefields of Quebec, and perhaps one or two others, and then Supply.

Mr. TAYLOR. What Supply?

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 27, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 110) respecting a certain patent of Frederick C. Rehm, Elias Frank and Isidore Frank.—Mr. Beland.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Steamboat Inspection Report: Supplement to the 40th annual report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the fiscal year 1907.—Mr. Brodeur.

QUESTIONS.

DREDGING WORKS.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. What are the total amounts spent from December 1, 1904, to February 1, 1908, on dredging works; (a) at or near the entrance of the Nicolet river; (b) at Port St. François; (c) at River Godfroi; (d) at the wharfs of Ste. Angèle, Bécancourt, Gentilly, and of St. Pierre-les-Becquets?
2. Was the dredging done after tenders had been called for publicly through the newspapers? If so, what newspapers?
3. Was the said work executed by the lowest tenderer?
4. What was the name of the dredging contractor in each case, and the amount received by each contractor for the work done?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) to kindly put this in the form of a motion for return, as it embraces a number of different works.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand as notice of motion for return.

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS.

Mr. LAPOINTE asked :

1. What is the number of experimental farms organized and worked by the federal government?
2. Where are they situated, and in which provinces?
3. What is the date of the establishment of each of such farms?
4. What amount has been paid out by the government for each farm during the year 1896-7?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. Seven.
2. At Ottawa, Ontario ; Nappan, Cumberland County, Nova Scotia ; Brandon, Manitoba ; Indian Head, Saskatchewan ; Lethbridge, Alberta ; Lacombe, Alberta ; and Agassiz, British Columbia.
3. Ottawa—November, 1886.
Nappan—May, 1888.
Brandon—July, 1888.
Indian Head—April, 1888.
Lethbridge—August, 1906.
Lacombe—March, 1907.
Agassiz—September, 1889.
4.

Ottawa	$36,441 24
Nappan	8,515 73
Brandon	7,156 34
Indian Head	4,429 08
Lethbridge	8,213 61
Lacombe	11,179 09
Agassiz	5,256 83

Other expenditures not classified by farms :

Expenses in selecting new farms.	$ 603 66
General expenditures connected with all the farms, including distribution of seed grain, &c.	20,759 54

I should add that the expenditure in connection with Lacombe and Lethbridge include considerable capital expenditures.

BROCKVILLE CHEESE CURING ROOM.

Mr. BRODER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

Is the government cold storage or cheese curing room at Brockville under lease? If so, to whom leased, at what rent, and how long does the lease run?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The government cool cheese curing room at Brockville is under lease to A. A. Ayer & Company, Montreal, at a rental of $300 per year. The present agreement will expire December 31, 1908.

WHARF AT POINT PRIM, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the government completed the construction of a new wharf at Point Prim, Prince Edward Island?
2. Was the contract let by tender? If so, to whom?
3. If by tender, (a) how many tenders were received, (b) the names of the tenderers, and (c) the amount of each tender?
4. What is the depth of water at outer end, at low tide and at high tide?
5. To what length will it be necessary to construct the wharf to get sufficient water for cargo vessels?
6. Is it the intention of the government to extend the work?
7. What amount was expended on construction of work to date?
8. Who were the inspectors of the work, and how much was paid to them?

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

1. Yes.
2. (a) Yes ; (b) Coffin & Quinn.
3. (a) Six ; (b) and (c) :

Kimble Coffin & John Quinn	$4,160
Alexander Compton & Wellington Compton	4,750
D. W. B. Reid & Lewis Archibald	5,840
Hugh Macdonald	5,875
Lyons & White	5,990
Thomas Campbell	6,200

4. Dry at low tide ; 7 feet at high tide.
5. 1,000 feet, or 720 feet more, to obtain 6 feet at low water and 15 feet at high water.
6. Matter under consideration.
7. $4,526.08. I may say that amount of $366.08 has been paid outside the contract for such services as inspector, advertising, &c.
8. Inspector, John Campbell, $2.50 per working day.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Did the government or the Minister of Militia, or any department of the government, have any information from any source, a communication, directly or indirectly, from the Imperial War Department or War Office, by letter, cable, message or otherwise, that while the Ross rifle would take the same ammunition as the Lee-Enfield rifle, 303, it differs so much in mechanism that the different parts of the two rifles would not be inter-changeable, which would be a great drawback?
2. Was the government or the Minister of Militia, or any department of the government, in or about the year 1903, or at any time since the year 1901, informed of any report, or had they any information as to a report respecting the Ross rifle made by the officers of the school of musketry, Hythe, or by any other British officers representing, that two or other

number of Ross rifles had been tried in competition with the Lee-Enfield rifle and that the test disclosed a marked inferiority of the Ross rifle?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. There is, in the Department of Militia and Defence, a communication from the War Office, through the Colonial Office, dated May, 1902, marked 'Secret,' referring to the Ross rifle; but such correspondence does not admit of the construction implied in this question. Nobody ever pretended that there could be inter-changeability of parts between two rifles of different patterns.

It is a fact, however, that no serious inconvenience can result from the use by two forces co-operating in the field of rifles of different pattern but firing the same ammunition.

2. The same 'secret' correspondence referred to an alleged trial at Hythe of two rifles said to have been supplied by an agent of Sir Charles Ross; but subsequent correspondence established the fact that an error had been made, as no such rifles were supplied either by Sir Charles Ross, his agent or any one on his behalf.

HOUSE OF COMMONS EMPLOYEES.

Mr. OWEN asked:

1. By whom are appointments and increases of pay made in the clerk's and sergeant-at-arm's departments of the House of Commons in regard to permanent and sessional employees?
2. On what recommendation are such appointments and increases of pay made?
3. What changes have occurred in above services since July 1, 1907?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Appointments in the Clerk's and Sergeant-at-Arms' Departments of the House of Commons, in regard to permanent and sessional employees, are made by the Speaker of the House.

Increases of pay are made on the recommendation of the Board of Internal Economy of the House.

Mr. Speaker accepts such recommendations as he deems advisable in making appointments.

No record is kept of recommendations.

Increases of pay are generally made on the recommendation of the Clerk of the House or of the Sergeant-at-Arms, as the case may be.

Question No. 3 had better be made a notice of motion for return.

Mr. SPEAKER. The third question will stand as a notice of motion for a return.

PROPRIETARY AND PATENT MEDICINES.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. Was a committee of the House appointed to inquire into proprietary and patent medicines within the last five years?
2. If so, who composed the committee?
3. Did the committee sit, and did they examine witnesses?
4. How many witnesses were examined?
5. Where are the testimonies to be found, and if in the Department of Inland Revenue, will the minister bring them down to the House?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue):

1. Yes.
2. The committee was composed of Hon. Wm. Templeman, chairman, and Messrs. Stockton, Fisher, Bole, Beland, Sproule, Maclean (Lunenburg) and Bergeron.
3. Yes.
4. Fourteen.
5. The evidence is in the hands of the clerk of the committee, Mr. L. C. Panet.

MONTREAL 'GAZETTE' BUILDING.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

1. How much did the government pay for the Montreal 'Gazette' building for post office purposes?
2. Who had the contract for demolishing the building, and was it done by contract?
3. Who has the contract for the erection of the new building on said premises, and were tenders asked for?
4. Who were the tenderers and what was the amount of each tender?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works):

1. $200,000.
2. Removal of building forms part of the contract.
3. (a) Peter Lyall & Sons. (b) Yes.
4. Peter Lyall & Sons.. .. $487,537 00
   James Ballantyne.. .. .. 499,000 00
   G. W. S. Nicholson.. .. 520,000 00

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to renew the inquiry regarding which the right hon. the First Minister wished to have some notice. It had reference to the two Japanese immigrants who have been recently referred to by the press as having entered Canada from the United States. How did they come into the country in contravention of the recent order in council? If they have been deported, under what law and by whom? Is there any system of immigration inspection along the western border between Canada and the United States, as I am informed there are over 20,000 Japanese who have entered American territory within the last year?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Up to the present we were not prepared to enforce that order in council at railway points. That order in council was passed with the view of meeting conditions at ports of landing, but we are now in the course of preparing to inspect and exclude immigrants at railway points on

the border between Canada and the United States. The two Japanese referred to were deported under the authority of the immigration officials at Vancouver. Finding them in the country in defiance of this exclusion order, these officials called upon the railway company, as they are entitled to do under the Immigration Act, to take these people out, and they were taken out. There has not hitherto been a system of inspection with a view to the enforcement of the exclusion order along the American border, but we are providing the necessary machinery for that purpose. I am not able to answer definitely the last question. The department may be aware, but the information has not come to my knowledge yet.

RAILWAY SERVICE BETWEEN TORONTO AND SCHOMBERG.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to a statement made to me last night, which I believe to be accurate, that there has been no railway service between Yonge street and the village of Schomberg the last two weeks.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will have to put his question on the Order Paper.

QUEBEC BRIDGE COMMISSION.

Mr. BARKER. I have been told that the government have received the report of the Bridge Commission. When will it be laid on the table?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The report is just received, but the appendices are not yet completed.

QUEBEC TERCENTENARY.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the House go into committee to consider the following resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the sum of three hundred thousand dollars ($300,000) be appropriated towards the preservation, in a suitable manner, of the historic battlefields of Quebec, in connection with the tercentenary of the said city of Quebec.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

He said : I am prepared to give an explanation to-day, but I have received word from my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that he was obliged to be absent to-day and wanted to take part in the debate. If agreeable, I shall introduce the resolution without debate, and reserve discussion on the second reading of the Bill. It is important that this legislation should be advanced a step to-day.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the resolution.

Mr. LENNOX. I presume that when we go into committee on the second reading of the Bill, we will have the opportunity to discuss it as fully as if we discussed it now?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would also take this opportunity of asking the Prime Minister, in connection with these monuments at Quebec, whether an effort will be made to restore or recover the burial place of Champlain. He was really the founder of that city, and was buried there, and he had a grave and monument which in some way have disappeared. If there is to be a restoration of these monuments I should think the government could well afford to devote some attention to the recovery of the grave of Champlain, which has been entirely lost, according to history, and not only to recover it, but to erect some kind of a monument on that very spot.

Mr. SPROULE. I presume that the right hon. the first minister, if he does not give his explanations at this stage, will give them later on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. ARMAND LEVERGNE. I would ask the First Minister if the government has received any petition from the city of Quebec asking that certain latitude should be given to the commission in expending the money voted by the government ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no communication of any kind.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 111) respecting the Canadian Battlefields of Quebec.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I wish to draw the attention of the First Minister to a point in connection with this matter. I do not know the terms of the Bill, but he will remember that last year when the matter was mooted, I drew attention to the fact that Champlain had traversed the Ottawa river, Lake Nipissing, the French river, the Georgian bay waters, and made an expedition to the Trent waters. I also drew attention to the fact that all Canadians would be delighted to have the government make some recognition of that trip taken by Champlain. The First Minister promised to look into the matter, and erect some suitable memento at some point along the line. The Postmaster General also appeared to be much impressed with the idea, and between the two I think they promised to give the matter consideration, and to make some memorial of Champlain's trip to the Trent waters. I propose at the proper time to make a suggestion to the First Minister in regard to that expedition.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Does my hon. friend think that the government should do something in memory of Champlain at Quebec ?

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Certainly.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE ROSS RIFLE FACTORY.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). I would like to ask the First Minister to bring down some papers in connection with this matter before we deal with it again. In the session of 1903, Mr. Casgrain moved for papers and correspondence in connection with the establishment of the Ross rifle factory upon the Plains of Abraham, and on the 3rd of April, 1903, an order was made for the papers to be brought down, as will be found on page 2109 'Hansard.' Mr. Casgrain called attention to the fact that a petition of prominent residents of the city of Quebec had been presented, but did not appear in the return; and the right hon. gentleman said that he would see about it. I have examined the returns to-day, and I am not able, or the official who is in charge has not been able to place his hand upon it. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman would make a note of it, so that we may have the papers when this matter comes up for discussion again.

THE RAILWAY COMMISSION.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Railway Act as respects the constitution of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, and to provide for the appointment of an assistant chief commissioner at a salary of $9,000 per annum, and of two additional commissioners at a salary of $8,000 per annum each.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the Minister of Railways ought to give us an explanation of what this Bill intends to do.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The object of this Bill are comprehensive yet few in number. The first is to add three commissioners, three members to the board of commissioners, one of whom shall be called Assistant Chief Commissioner, and whose qualification must be that of a Superior Court judge, or of a barrister of at least ten years standing. He will receive $9,000 per annum. The other two additional members of the board will receive $8,000 each. The board will have power to hold more than one sitting at the same time. The Bill will require that each company shall have at Ottawa an agent upon whom notice may be served if desired.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that all the outline the minister is going to give ? Surely we ought to have something about their respective duties. This appears to be a sort of double barrelled commission. I presume that there would be certain lines of inquiry that it would be proper for one to take up, and certain lines for the other to take up ; otherwise they might both be doing the same work.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

Mr. GRAHAM. They might both be doing the same class of work, but not the same work. The object of the Bill is that whatever portion of the commission is sitting it is a board, and its decisions shall have the effect of decisions of the board, no matter how many members may be sitting upon it. But we are not dividing the board, the Bill is not cutting the board up into divisions. It is all one board, and any part of it is a board.

Mr. LANCASTER. Do you state what proportion of the board shall be a quorum?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are not in this Bill requiring any certain number to be a quorum because the board can divide itself into two different numbers and you cannot say how many will be a quorum.

Mr. BARR. If a decision is given by two will there be a right of appeal to the majority ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Under the Bill there will not be a right of appeal to the majority of the board.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would a decision by one member constitute a decision of the board ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The minister is increasing the number and also, I imagine, greatly increasing its power. I think he should take the House and the country into his confidence and tell us what the increased duties of the board are to be. We are all in favour of largely increasing the powers of the Board of Railway Commissioners; I believe the whole country favours that, and I think the minister should tell us his intentions in this respect. We have been told that he intends to take jurisdiction over telegraph, telephone and sleeping car companies and other branches of railway service. I have discovered still other branches of the railway business that ought to be covered by the Railway Commission. It may be that they are covered now, but I would like to have an explict statement. For instance, many freights consist largely of cartage charges and it is a question whether cartage companies should not be covered. Then too, the transfer companies which handle baggage in cities make charges which are becoming very monopolistic and ought to be regulated. It is a question whether the railway news companies, as well as the express companies should not be controlled. We should also know whether the board are to have jurisdiction in connection with the question of demurrage which will certainly open a wide field of activity to it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I hope to introduce the two Bills together but unfortunately we were not able to have the other Bill ready for presentation to-day. However, I can assure my hon. friend that before this Bill passes the stage where investigations and

explanitions can be made, the other Bill will be introduced and fully explained.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to impress on the minister at this stage, so that we may have a broad measure when the Bill is introduced, the necessity of very much enlarged powers being given to the Railway Board. When measures are crystallized by the government and brought down it seems very difficult to change that at all, and therefore I would impress on the minister the importance of making this a broad and comprehensive measure. We have great trouble about making connection between roads that are incorporated by the provincial legislation and these incorporated by federal legislation, and in appearing before the Dominion Railway Board, we are met by the difficulty that they say they are not sure that they have entire jurisdiction and a similar difficulty is met in appearing before the Provincial Railway Board. This applies to electric roads and to other roads under provincial jurisdiction. There should be no great difficulty in framing an Act to provide for joint action between the federal and provincial boards in such cases so that shippers depending on an interchange of traffic between roads so situated will have the same protection as others enjoy. This question has actually arisen in several cases and will arise again. I hope the minister will endeavour to bring in a measure that will remedy that. When actual physical connection is made I do not understand that there is any very great difficulty as the Railway Board have jurisdiction to control the interchange of freight; but until actual physical connection is made I believe there is great doubt as to their jurisdiction.

The minister promised the other day that he would see that ample provision is made and justice done in regard to demurrage. Other matters of difficulty have arisen and doubtless the present members of the board can make many valuable suggestions as to what is required. It may be necessary to amend the Act with reference to the classes of persons who may initiate proceedings before the board extending its provisions.

Mr. TAYLOR. I approve of the minister's suggestion that this measure go through committee pro forma on the understanding that there will be full latitude of debate on the third reading after the introduction and explanation of the other measure. I would suggest that in the other Bill provision be made that the Board of Railway Commissioners shall have power to compel a railroad to deliver goods handed over to it by another road at the rate agreed on by the railroad that first took charge of them. If I purchase a car on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway the Canadian Pacific Railway issues a tariff rate and signs a bill guaranteeing to deliver the car at my place at a certain rate per 100 pounds. When it comes to my town the Grand Trunk Railway, having taken charge of it at Brockville or some other point, demands sometimes $10, $50 or even $200 extra charges. I have had cars come in with $200 overcharges, over and above the signed contract rate of the shipping company. The Railway Board should have power to compel the railway delivering the car to carry out the contract at the rate agreed on by the first company. Every manufacturer has had heavy overcharges of this kind, the rate being increased either by mistake of clerks or some other cause. The only way to get the car is to pay the freight and put in a claim, but the claim may lie sometimes three or four years before it is adjusted. I had to pay charges in April of last year of $103. I had a contract signed by the railway to ship the goods at a price, but the Grand Trunk would not deliver the car unless I paid the amount. I paid it and put in my claim, having first objected to receiving the car. The Grand Trunk wrote asking me to receive it, and saying they would settle in a month but it is now over a year. In several cases since that I refused the cars and let them lie there until the matter was adjusted, as I have become tired of receiving cars and waiting until the claims were adjusted by the adjusters. This is very important as goods are sold delivered and knowing the through rate to any point, say on the Intercolonial Railway, we credit the retail merchant on the invoice with the amount of freight he should pay, according to the tariff rate; but he may write back asking for an additional credit of $2 to $5 on a small lot, owing to these overcharges that he has had to pay. Every manufacturer has the same experience. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Kemp) told me that he had much trouble in this way. The Railway Commission should be empowered to adjust and settle these matters and to bring the railways to time.

Mr. KEMP. The only explanation I understood the minister to make was in regard to the qualification of the assistant chief commissioner, who would have to be a lawyer. What qualifications are required of the other two gentlemen?

Mr. GRAHAM. We hope that the qualifications of the other two gentlemen will be such as to meet the approval of all classes in the Dominion of Canada. Almost every class in the community, the Manufacturers' Association, the commercial travellers, the shippers, and the farmers ask to be represented as a class. Every class in Canada appears to believe that it has some man in its ranks who would fill that position better than a man selected from any other class. The idea of the government is to select two men who will be broad enough to view these questions from the various sides from which they will be presented and adjudicate upon them in a way that will be fair to everybody.

Mr. BARR. Will they require to be lawyers or laymen ?

Mr. GRAHAM. They will not require to be lawyers or laymen—they will require to be good men.

Mr. HAGGART. We have not had a statement from the minister as to the necessity of the appointing of these three new commissioners, whether the work is too heavy for the present commissioners; nor has he stated why he appoints an assistant chief commissioner and why this gentleman is to get $1,000 a year more than the others. The minister says he hopes to appoint parties who are well qualified, whether they are mechanics, agriculturists or members of any other class. He is indifferent about that. But what is extraordinary in this case is that one of these gentlemen must be a lawyer and a lawyer of ten years standing at that. What is there to necessitate the appointment of such a man on the Railway Board ? Surely there are enough good prizes in the grasp of the lawyers already. To fill nearly every public and political appointment, you have to be a barrister. And not only is it a pre-requisite that a .railway commissioner should be a lawyer, but the representative of this distinguished class in the community must receive $1,000 a year more than the other men. If there is a chief commissioner who knows the law there is no necessity in the world for a lawyer assistant chief commissioner, and as to the duties of the other two men the Minister of Railways seems to be in perfect ignorance regarding that point. The minister is now asking for appointments which will mean $30,000 a year, and of course other officials will have to be appointed which will bring it up to $50,000 a year, for there will be two or three new clerks and two or three new messengers.

Mr. BENNETT. And a new car.

Mr. HAGGART. When the minister makes such a proposition to this House he ought to be able to show the necessity for it. I for one enter my protest against the appointment of another lawyer to the Railway Board. The lawyers are perfectly well taken care of by the public already.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens). Is it the intention of the government to make this law apply to the government railways ?

Mr. GRAHAM. This Bill simply applies to the appointment of commissioners. That would come up under the next Bill if it would come up at all.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens). In my opinion the time has come when the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission should be extended to government railways. I have recently received communications from business men not only in the maritime provinces but in Ontario and Quebec complaining that the freight charge on goods from the maritime provinces to the west is excessive. The opinion of those with whom I have come in contact is that the Railway Commissioners should have power to deal with freight rates not only on privately owned railroads but on government railroads and on all steamships which are subsidized by the Dominion. Let me give an instance of the disadvantage shippers labour under. A gentleman in Toronto wished to obtain some goods in Charlottetown and he was told that the freight rate would be 40 cents per 100 pounds whereas the Canadian Pacific Railway will carry goods from Montreal to Sydney, which is a slightly less distance, for less than 6 cents per 100 pounds. Here is an instance of great discrimination and the proper tribunal to remedy it is this Railway Commission which is supposed to be an independent body. It would take all this work out of the hands of the Minister of Railways and lessen his labours and responsibility. I would suggest to the minister that he provide in the Act that it shall be the duty of these commissioners to regulate the freight rates on the government railways and the subsidized steamers.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that the old Act provides that in the absence of the Chief Commissioner the Deputy Chief Commissioner may act as Chief Commissioner ? Under the new law who will act in the absence of the Chief Commissioner ? Will it be the assistant or the deputy ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think my hon. friend will find that the assistant will act.

Mr. SPROULE. We have no information except what the minister gives us, and we are only endeavouring to ascertain what the provision will be. I understood the minister to say a short time ago that there would be no quorum of the commission. The old Act provides that a quorum should consist of two. What will be the quorum of the commission under the new Act, or will there be a quorum at all ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I imagine that in reference to the quorum the old Act is not changed.

Mr. SPROULE. The old Act provides that on questions of law the decision of the Chief Commissioner shall prevail. What status will the Assistant Commissioner have on questions of law, provided both he and the Chief Commissioner are present at a sitting ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Chief Commissioner would have the status he has now. In his absence, if the assistant presided, he would have all the powers of the Chief Commissioner.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose there is a difference of opinion between them ?

Mr. GRAHAM. If the two were present, as the Act provides, the ruling of the chief would prevail.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have a suggestion to make to the hon. gentleman with the view of increasing the usefulness of this Bill to the country ; it is in regard to the delays now involved in cases before the commission. I do not think these delays are the fault of the commissioners ; I think they are rather because the statute too much limits their powers. The very matter mentioned by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), that on a question of law only the Chief Commissioner can give a decision, causes a lot of trouble. A railway company deliberately raises a question of law which there may be nothing in, which a man of common sense without being a lawyer would see that there was nothing in, but because the statute requires that questions of law must be dealt with by the Chief Commissioner alone, none of the others can deal with it, and it is wantonly raised by the railway company in order to hold up, perhaps for months, an application that ought to be granted and granted promptly. I would say to the hon. minister, who has not the disadvantage of being a lawyer in this discussion, that in any court in any British country to-day, a suitor cannot delay a matter for five or six months before the trial takes place, simply because he disputes it, but he has to show that there is a bona fide dispute on the merits of the case ; but a matter before the Railway Commission, which ought to be dealt with at once, may be held up for months, by a railway company, while elaborate proceedings are gone on with, questions are raised and replies given, witnesses are subpoenaed and everything else is done as if it were a matter seriously in dispute as to the right of the applicant to obtain an order, when it is simply a matter of arranging details in an hour or so. I think the commissioners are rather handicapped by the rules which they have to make under the statute. It is expedition that people want in dealing with railways ; it is not a delay of six or seven months, during which perhaps the crop which should be moved is all lost. I would therefore suggest to the hon. minister that he should allow any one of the commissioners to deal with the matter, unless in his opinion it is so serious that it requires a quorum of the board. I do not think any harm would result from such a provision. There ought to be in the Railway Commission, as in every court of justice, a summary way of dealing with these matters. There is certainly a great deal in the statement that justice delayed is injustice, and although finally people probably get from this commission the order to which they are entitled, they get it so many weeks or months after they should get it that its efficacy is largely lost.

The present system gives the railway companies the power of blackmail. They have their lawyers paid by the year and their witnesses are in their employ the year around, so that it costs them no special expense or additional trouble to go to litigation before the commission, and the party who gets a decision in his favour and is found to be entitled to what he asks is not indemnified for the damages he is caused by the delay. A railway company says to him: We will give you so much; if you do not take that, we will put you to all the expense and delay of going before the commission, and if you should win you will be out all your costs. The applicant ought to be able to get summary justice from the commission and ought not to be burdened by a lot of multifarious proceedings such as marked the old chancery suits some forty or fifty years ago. This Railway Commission ought to be able, just as a city police court is, to deal with a thing, which is probably only a trifling matter, at once. I submit that it is well worth while considering whether there should not be a power in any one member of the board to deal with any matter which he think does not require any delay and which need not go before the whole board. If the party against whom he decides thinks the decision is not a good one, we might give him the right to appeal to a quorum of the board. But the appellant should be bound to pay damages as well as the expenses caused the respondent, if it was afterwards found that the respondent was entitled to what he claimed.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Inasmuch as the hon. minister does not intend to give his views regarding the widening of the powers of the board to-day, this may be an opportune time to give him information with regard to some other things concerning which the board might have its jurisdiction extended. But first I wish to refer to the question of having two lawyers on the commission. I would prefer having the highest class of railway man on the board. We want to see on the board the best railway traffic man in the country. I have two or three such men in my mind who could give the public the benefit of the knowledge which they have acquired by long service in connection with railway traffic. We ought to have a railway expert on a board of this kind just as well as a legal expert.

Mr. GRAHAM. Would my hon. friend favour the putting on this board of an experienced railway man?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Certainly. I want a man who knows the traffic requirements of the country, and you can get such a man.

Mr. GRAHAM. One of the difficulties would be that we would have to pay such

a man a good deal more than is provided in this resolution in order to get the best man.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. We ought to pay that and the country would be quite willing that we should. I also want to suggest that the minister should take into consideration what my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has said in connection with what I propose to tell him now regarding speedy enforcement. When that board gives a deliverance it ought to go into force immediately. Take a case in which I had some interest, in which the board found that the Grand Trunk Railway was in duty bound to give the people a penny a mile service. The company went from the board to the Supreme Court and propose to go from the latter to the Privy Council. The commission should say: You may go to the Supreme Court and the Privy Council, but pending that appeal you must accept our decision.

Mr. LANCASTER. And pay all damages.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes. There ought to be no such appeal. The whole object of this commission was to give speedy findings and give the shippers relief. I think the commission to-day, in view of the decision given by the Supreme Court, should say to the Grand Trunk Railway: You can only go to the Privy Council provided you give the penny a mile service that we have found you are bound to give. Just to give another piece of information to the hon. minister, I want to tell him of another grievance against which he ought to make provision when widening the powers of the commission. Here is a letter which I have received from Burlington:

Burlington, February 23, 1908.

My Dear Sir,—You have been fighting the Grand Trunk Railway so persistently that even another instance where you might do some good would not be out of place. I live in this village and have to go to Hamilton every day. The Grand Trunk Railway fare is 35 cents, but they will not issue any commutation tickets, while people in Oakville can buy commuter's tickets to Toronto and from Waterdown to Hamilton and from Grimsby to Hamilton. These places and intermediate stations are all given cheaper rates to those who have daily and other tickets good for a year. From here we can get only ordinary fare. It is rumoured that this is on account of an agreement with the Hamilton Radial Company, which company pays the Grand Trunk Railway for not running trains on the beach and not issuing reduced tickets. By this means the Radial Electric Railway have increased the commutation tickets 60 per cent, so that now there is no difference. In fact we have no commutation tickets between Burlington and Hamilton. The Grand Trunk Railway do not run trains over eleven miles of the northwestern division—that is passenger trains; and I believe this road was bonused by either the Dominion government or the provincial legislature. The Radial Railway does not now carry out the by-law as agreed between them and the village of Burlington as regard the issuing of tickets between Burlington and the canal. We cannot buy them, nor will they issue them.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does the hon. gentleman say that the municipality made a contract with the Radial Company which is not being kept?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The writer says so.

This is the road which is applying for a Dominion charter. They had better be left alone under provincial rights, or at least before they apply for other powers they should carry out the promises they have now agreed to.

The great point is that some jurisdiction must be placed somewhere to regulate this. The great railways assume to themselves the right to give suburban service where they think fit. Montreal has a very excellent suburban service, over which a system of commutation tickets prevails. Toronto, almost as large, has no suburban service and no general system of commutation tickets. There commutations are a matter of grace on the part of the railway. The railway companies distribute their favours where they please. Oakville to the west has a regular commutation system and cheap tickets, but to the east, to such places as Pickering and Whitby, there is no commutation service. I do not know if even Brampton has such a service.

Mr. GRAHAM. You do not compare Brampton with Oakville?

Mr. HENDERSON. That is owing to the Hamilton Radial.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If it is J. M. Gibson who is to give relief, I do not expect a great deal in that direction. The point I want to come to is this, that this is a duty which must be assumed either by the minister or the commission. There should be provision for equality of treatment, so that if any railway gives commutation service at any point, it should treat similar points similarly. Now, I do not say that a small place is entitled to a commutation or suburban service. It may pay or it may not. But I do say that if Montreal has a first-class suburban service as it has by both railways the same should be given to Toronto. And also if the Grand Trunk choses to give the town of Oakville a commutation service it should give it to Whitby to Brampton to Newmarket. This Act has been in force for three or four years. Above all it was to secure equality of treatment. I trust the minister will find a way to empower somebody to speedily and effectively secure equality of treatment to the different places, as of right, and not through the mere grace of the great railway companies. And again,

I say that it is a crying shame, and a blot on the record of the Railway Commission, that, after we have spent all this money upon it, it has allowed the Grand Trunk to continue its refusal to carry out a specified duty placed upon it by the law of the land while an appeal from the decision of the board on the subject is taken to the courts.

Mr. GRAHAM. Do I understand that the commission have given the Grand Trunk until a certain date to begin the penny-a-mile service ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The commission made an order that the railway should give this service, but withheld the enforcement of the order until appeal could be made to the Supreme Court. When the Supreme Court made their deliverance, and a motion was made that the order of the commission should then go into force, but the commission, in their wisdom, saw fit to withhold the enforcement of the order until appeal might be made to England. Now, that is contrary to the spirit of the railway law, and it disappoints the reasonable expectations of the Canadian public. The people thought that if a finding was made, enforcement would follow, and not that enforcement would be suspended pending appeal. I trust that the minister will see to it that this commission, which is doing good work, does not get into this way of hanging up decisions, but that speedy enforcement will be characteristic of the commission in contradistinction to the ordinary action of the courts. I think the minister should be glad of suggestions, and I hope that, in widening the duties of the commission his Bill extending the duties of the commission will be at least co-extensive with the additional expense he is putting the country to in increasing the number of commissioners. Again, I say to the hon. minister that if the best man in Canada—or in the United States for that matter—can only be induced to give his time and abilities to this work by a salary of $15,000 or $20,000 a year, I, for one, would be prepared to vote that salary. They are giving a very fair salary to the commissioners in New York state, higher, I think, than those at Washington. You have to pay a good salary for a good judge.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that what the country has been led to expect from this proposal of the government is not going to be realized. I do not see that under this resolution, or the Bill to be founded upon it, there will be any greater expedition than under the present commission. The whole complaint is that the commission is overworked, and that its work is in arrears. I thought the government was going to provide means by which the work would be caught up, and that by appointing new commissioners with an assistant commissioner at their head double work could be done. I thought that one division of the board could sit in Vancouver, while another was sitting here in Ottawa. I fail to see where we are going to be one bit better off in this respect with this enlarged board than we are now with three commissioners. It is often said that half as many members of the House of Commons would do the work just as well and more expeditiously than a House of the present size. I apprehend that the same thing would apply to the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. GRAHAM. Perhaps the hon. member (Mr. Henderson) will allow me to interrupt him with a view to saving time. The object he desires is the one to be attained by appointing additional members of the board. The commissioners can sit in twos or in threes. Half the board may be sitting in Vancouver, while the other half is sitting in Halifax.

Mr. HENDERSON. If the hon. minister (Mr. Graham) had made that statement half an hour ago, I think his resolution would have gone through by this time, and we could have proceeded with the other business of the House. But either his desire to withhold information or his failure to understand just what the House desired to know has led to this long discussion. I am glad to hear his explanation, because I think the plan he indicates is the only one by which the country can be compensated for the expense of three additional members of the board.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has brought before the Minister of Railways and Canals the complaints of his part of the country, so I think I may speak of some things that we need in the province of Quebec. As the minister (Mr. Graham) is aware, some days ago, I introduced a Bill providing that in the province of Quebec the French language should be given equal treatment with English in relation to public utilities. Some may think that I am a little late in introducing this Bill. I waited to give the government a chance to introduce it if they desired to do so, as they did not move, I have done so myself. I would urge the Minister of Railways—in whom I have every confidence; I think he is one of the best Ministers of Railways we have had since confederation, and a true Liberal—to give us an effective interpretation of the Railway Act in the province of Quebec. There are two articles of the Railway Act which apply to the French language. The first is that the regulations of the company shall be published in French in the stations of the railway. The railway company seem to make some effort in the direction of compliance with this provision, but I would ask the minister to see to it that the companies publish these regulations in French and not

in Iroquois. In fact, the present publication seems to be a mixture of languages which has not a name so far as I am aware. Another provision is that the publication at the stations of the arrival of trains shall be in the French language. As a matter of fact it is always in English. I myself have written twice to the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway and have received very nice letters from them, but nothing has been done. At the Windsor station in Montreal, the Place Viger station, the Bonaventure station of the Grand Trunk, and most of the stations in the province of Quebec the arrival of trains is bulletined in English only. Now, my Bill does not cover that, it is already in the Railway Act. But I would like to see the rights of the people of the province of Quebec respected in that matter, as I think the spirit of the constitution requires. At the same time, I think the administration would do well if they accepted the Bill and passed it as a government measure. To-day in the province of Quebec when a man has to sign a contract or a bill of lading of the railway company, he has to sign invariably in English. Most of the time he does not know English, and yet he signs a severe contract which binds him, and his goods are not delivered or his freight is not transferred if he fails to carry out a contract which he did not understand and which he had not an opportunity to read. The Minister of Railways is to be congratulated upon the steps he has taken in having time-tables on the Intercolonial printed in French. I know that the people are very grateful. I think that the Railway Commissioners should compel all the railways to have their time tables in the province of Quebec printed in French as well as in English. I think the two languages should be put on an equal footing in this regard in order to carry out the spirit of the constitution. It would also be a great convenience to the people in the province of Quebec.

Mr. GRAHAM. In regard to what my hon. friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne) has said, the government road has set a good example, as far as example counts, and it is a matter worthy of consideration whether information should not be given in French to those who do not readily understand the English language, particularly in regard to notices of trains and to bills of lading. That is a matter worthy of consideration. I am glad that my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) and myself understand each other as to the division of this Railway Board. I thought I made it plain in my first explanation, but perhaps I did not. The board can sit in three divisions if necessary, or in two. The Act merely says that they can hold more than one sitting at the same time in different places. My hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), who always has something interesting to say when we approach the subject of railways, has given me some information which is valuable, as he usually does. Of course we cannot be held responsible for the variation of the rates or for the contents of that letter concerning the Hamilton Radial across the park. As those matters will come under the Dominion board, I am sure their powers will be large enough to look after them. In the meantime we cannot be blamed, as they are not under our jurisdiction, or they are under it, according to the point of view from which you look at it. But the necessary powers have not formally been obtained in this House. I believe consequently that our board has not had jurisdiction over local rates, but they come properly under the provincial board.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But these suburban rates and these commutation tickets are on federal railways.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am coming to that. I had reference to the electric route across the park, and it was stated in the letter that the Radial had brought some person to do something in order that they might raise their rates, with which we have nothing to do at the present time, as I think. Now, as to the commutation, I think the House will agree with me that the broad powers held by the commission as to tolls of every description must be applicable to the tolls to be charged either for a long haul or for a short haul, or for places near large cities or places remote. I think if any injustice is done the commission have absolute powers to control the tolls at any place on Dominion railways. Further, in regard to the powers of this board, I think I am not making too broad or too extravagant a statement when I say that the Board of Railway Commissioners of Canada possesses wider powers than any court in the Dominion of Canada; I think there can be no question about that. I might give you the opinion of one or two prominent legal gentlemen who have told me that this Board of Railway Commissioners is the most competent court, if you will allow me to put it that way, or the best court, in the Dominion of Canada. I dare not go any further along that line or I might get into trouble with the Justice Department.

I am glad my hon. friend from South York modified his request before he sat down, and proposed that at least I should take some of the suggestions he made. I fear that if we endeavoured to place everything in the heavens above or on the earth beneath under the jurisdiction of the Railway Board we might not be able to accomplish what we started in to accomplish, that is, that railways should be controlled in the main in the public interest. We must not add too many minor details, but let us work out what we have undertaken to work

out as rapidly as possible. It is true there may be delays, but in the establishment of this board the Dominion of Canada took an advanced step, and the little difficulties that may arise, or the impediments that may come in the way, will disappear as time goes on and as the people become more conversant with the practice and the machinery gets properly oiled and running. Only by practice can difficulties be found and remedies applied. In fact, the Bill that I hope to introduce in a few days is founded on information gleaned from the practice of the past two or three years of the board in which certain difficulties or certain doubts have arisen as to their jurisdiction and their powers.

Now, as to the necessity of the enlargement of this board. I admit that in my earlier remarks I made an oversight. But my only reason was that I thought the necessity for enlargement was universally accepted throughout the business portion of the Dominion of Canada. One of the things that has been urged on this government perhaps more than any other is that the Board of Railway Commissioners should be enlarged. The reason is that the work has now so accumulated that they are at least three months behind, fully three months. The work does not all appear in public hearing. Scores, and I think I may say, hundreds, of what I may call petty or small applications come to the board of which the public know nothing, but they are straightened out by correspondence and an immense amount of work is thrown upon the board in this way. It is acknowledged by business men that the board has done excellent work. It is overworked. Now, even if we were not adding to the duties of that board, I believe it would be necessary to add members to the board in order to keep up with the duties now incumbent upon it. Being about to add a considerable amount of work to the board, it is absolutely necessary, if we are going to get the good which it was designed we should get from its establishment to enlarge the board, so that the members can hold more than one sitting at the same time and keep the work more up to date. I realise the force of the suggestion that decisions long delayed may become an injustice, and they may go beyond the point where there is any necessity for a decision at all. Prompt decisions are needed just as well as just decisions. Now, we hope that this board will be able to catch up with the great amount of work, some of which is now behind, and be able to perform the new duties. But let me give this note of warning. Let us work out this problem gradually. Do not ask us to add a multiplicity of duties to this board that will make their work insurmountable, and smother, if I may say so, the real object for which the board was established. Let us keep the main objects in view and add to their duties as necessity arises in order to work out what we first undertook, namely, the control of public utilities in the interest of the people.

The necessity of having a legal gentleman arises from the fact that the board may sit in more than one division and it has been found absolutely necessary that the head of that board, the chairman conducting its affairs, should be a legal man with power to grasp the legal situation, with a firm grasp of the Railway Act and all that it means. Then, in addition to him, of course we would have good practical men. Because a man is a lawyer does not mean that he cannot be a practical man as well; we hope to get that combination.

The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean)—to be honest, I wanted him to say what he did—urged strongly the placing of a big railway man on the board. One of the difficulties, as I pointed out to the House, that has arisen, is that almost every class in the community suggests a name out of that class, the Manufacturers' Association, the business men, the shippers, all say: Do not put a railway man on the board.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GRAHAM. The reason they give was advanced by Mr. Maclean on another branch of the argument. I will not say whether it is a good or a bad reason, because I want to have an open mind to select the best man we can from any calling. The reason given by the Manufacturers' Association, the shippers, is that the railway companies are invariably represented before that board by the best legal talent they can employ, that their interests are never going to be sacrificed for the want of full representation before that board; but if the shippers' and the manufacturers' interests are to be fully maintained before the board it must be by having a man conversant with their side of the question on the board as they will not be represented by counsel before it. That is their argument which I give for what it is worth. The hon. member (Mr. W. F. Maclean) will have to make peace with them when he goes to Toronto.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The remedy for that is for the government to appoint the best possible counsel to take the side of the people in all these cases before the commission, exactly as is provided by the New York State Act and the Interstate Commerce Act. In other words the Attorney-General of the United States is charged with the duty of enforcing the law in regard to the Interstate Commerce Act and the best counsel they can get in New York state has been appointed to take the side of the people in all cases before the commission.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does my hon. friend not see that the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr.

Haggart) would object to another good office for a big lawyer.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Not as counsel for the people.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why should not a good lawyer be appointed to the place—if you can get a good one.

Mr. GRAHAM. If we are going to appoint one, it should be a good one of course, but the question arises as to the necessity of a lawyer.

I have pointed out the main features of the Bill. I am obliged to hon. gentlemen for suggestions as to the Bill I am to introduced in a day or two, and these will have full consideration.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will the Bill provide for the control of rates where the system is part railway and part water and possibly railway again ?

Mr. HAGGART. It does already, I think.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will see that that will properly be discussed in connection with the next Bill, and I would not care to take it up now.

Mr. THOMPSON. I may say for the minister's information that in the Yukon we are in a unique position in regard to railway rates and transportation facilities. We are supplied by the White Horse Pass and Yukon Railway. This company has one terminus in Alaska and the other at the headwaters of navigation in the Yukon. The service is carried on by one company incorporated under the laws of Alaska, another incorporated under the laws of British Columbia, a third incorporated under the laws of the Dominion of Canada applying particularly to the Yukon Territory, and a fourth a navigation company whose boats ply on the Yukon river between Dawson and Whitehorse. When we come to work out the problem of transportation we find that our Railway Commission is absolutely powerless to either control or interfere with the rates charged by that company. Not long since I addressed a letter to Mr. Justice Killam, chairman of the Railway Commission and in reply he practically admits they are powerless to control either a through Bill of laden or freight rates from Alaska to the Yukon ; first because they have not been able to work in harmony with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and second, because there is a further question as to whether the Interstate Commerce Commission has power to control the railways in Alaska which is not a state of the American union. It is the fact that along our border these railways cross and recross at Duluth, at the Soo, at Seattle, at Spokane, and it seems to me that in drafting this legislation the Minister of Railways might very well get in touch with the Railway Department of the United States and see if the two nations cannot work in harmony when it comes to controlling freight rates on through bills of lading. Another point is that the chief commissioner informed me that while he had some doubt as to the power of the commission to control a railway company that was incorporated under the laws of British Columbia, he had no doubt that the powers of the Railway Commission at the present time prevented them from having any control whatever over the rates charged by boats on the Yukon river. I suggest to the Minister of Railways that it may be possible in framing this legislation to include cases of that kind. Some two years ago the railway commissioners went to Dawson, they sat there and took evidence from the people of that city; they also sat at Whitehorse and in Alaska, but they have not reported yet. I verily believe their report is delayed because they have not power to deal with the question, and indeed Judge Killam told me that himself.

Mr. TAYLOR. They should have known that before they went up there and lost all that time.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, there are the facts, and if the Minister of Railways and Canals would at this juncture get into communication with the Railway Department in the United States it might help solve this problem which I can assure you is rather an accute one in the territory I have the honour to represent.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I wish to call to the attention of the minister the situation in the maritime provinces, especially as it affects Prince Edward Island, with regard to the railway haul on the Prince Edward Island Railway, the railway haul on the Intercolonial, and the intermediate haul by water, on freight shipped from Prince Edward Island to other parts of Canada. For my part I can see no reason why the Intercolonial and the Prince Edward Island Railways should not be under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners, so that the shippers along the lines of these railways may have the same opportunity to present cases of injustice and excessive rates before the board as have the shippers in other parts of Canada. There are very serious grievances with regard to the freight rates charged in Prince Edward Island. A return was brought down, on my motion, some two years ago by which it would appear that the rates from Montreal to St. John, 735 miles, on carload lots was 9 cents per 100 pounds, and from Montreal to Halifax, 832 miles, 9 cents per 100 pounds, while the rates on grain in carload lots from Tignish to St. John, 428 miles, was 26 cents per 100 pounds, from Tignish to Halifax, 309 miles, 23 cents per 100 pounds, and from Tignish to Sydney, 380 miles, 26 cents per 100 pounds.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not conversant with that locality, but am I right in understanding that there is a haul by rail on Prince Edward Island, then by water, and then by rail again on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Yes. There is a haul on the Prince Edward Island Railway which belongs to the government, then on the winter steamers which belong to the government, and then on the Intercolonial Railway which belongs to the government, in all three short hauls. I mentioned this to show that the situation is entirely under the control of the Dominion government because the three carriers in question are owned and controlled by the government and so an entirely different situation is presented from that to which the hon. member for the Yukon has alluded. It is very easy to see the disadvantage under which the shippers of Prince Edward Island labour in sending their products to the market in competition with places that are hundreds of miles further away from the point of consumption. Then, in regard to our local rates on Prince Edward Island Railway, as compared with the rates for somewhat similar distances on the Intercolonial Railway it will be found that we have to pay quite a percentage more per 100 pounds than is paid on the Intercolonial Railway. I might point out that from Tignish to Charlottetown, 117 miles, compared with goods carried from Halifax to Amherst, 138 miles, there is a discrimination of 3 cents per 100 pounds against Prince Edward Island on first-class goods, 2 cents per 100 pounds on second, third, and fourth-class goods and one cent per 100 pounds on fifth sixth, seventh, eight, ninth, and tenth-class goods. I can see no reason why the local rates on Prince Edward Island should be greater than they are on the main line of the Intercolonial. These instances go to prove that the Railway Commission should have control over these rates so that justice may be done to the Island. As I have said, the rate from Montreal to Halifax, 832 miles, is 9 cents per 100 pounds, and I have here a letter from a gentleman residing at Myrtle about forty miles east of Toronto who is trying to get grain from Prince Edward Island, and the House will be surprised to know that the rate from Prince Edward Island to Myrtle is 40 cents per 100 pounds while the distance is only about 330 miles further than from Montreal to Halifax. There is something radically wrong in this and it is certainly an unfair discrimination against Prince Edward Island in shipping its grain to the west. I might give further instances of this discrimination. The freight rate from Charlottetown to Pictou, 70 miles, is 11 cents per 100 pounds while from Pictou to Myrtle, over eleven hundred miles, it is only 29 cents per 100 pounds, so that for a distance that is seventeen times as great, the rate is only three times greater. I have several letters from residents of my province with regard to the shipment of seed grain to the west and they point out that it is impossible for them to ship grain to the west in competition with Ontario points because the freight rates against them are prohibitive. Therefore, unless the government give the shippers a through rate in this particular case the people of Prince Edward Island will be unable to do any of this grain business with the west. This whole question of freight rates between Prince Edward Island, and the maritime provinces and the west, needs to be gone into thoroughly and the only way it seems to me by which the people can get justice is that they should have an opportunity of laying their grievances before the Railway Commission. I should like to hear from the Prime Minister what the intention of the government is with regard to bringing the freight rates on government railways under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. It has been mentioned several times in the House and it is certainly a matter of great importance to the people of the maritime provinces and to the people of the Dominion as a whole. Can the Prime Minister tell me what the government intends to do about it ?

Mr. KEMP. As I understand the Minister of Railways, it is the intention of the government to make the six commissioners experts in all questions, and that there is going to be no division and classification of the work assigned to them. I would suggest that the commission would be facilitated if the work assigned to the commissioners were classified. There are questions coming before the board regarding the construction of railway crossings, and disputes between railways, and there is another class of questions respecting transportation and freight rates in which the public are very greatly interested. It seems to me that if these two classes of work are not divided and a portion of the board assigned to deal with one class and a portion of the board with the other, you will not facilitate as you otherwise would the work of the commission. It seems to me it would be far better to subdivide the work and assign a certain part of it to some members of the commission and a certain part to other members. The Minister of Railways said that representations had been made to him that it was unwise to put railway men on this commission. I have seen a reference made to these representations in the press but I would not go so far as to say that because a man is a railway man he should be debarred from being on the commission. I would point out that as the commission is at present constituted, the business men and business interests of this country are not represented.

I recognize that it is necessary to have the chief commissioner or the assistant chief commissioner a man of high legal attainments, and in the present chief commissioner we have such a man. If the men to be appointed to this board are of the standard of the present chief commissioner I do not think any one would have any cause to complain. I admit that the present commissioners have been over worked; certainly the present chief commissioner has been tremendously overworked and I am sorry that such is the case because I fear his strength will not be equal to the enormous task imposed upon him. I therefore see the necessity of something being done towards dividing up the work. We must remember however that a very great number of the questions which come before the commissioner are really elementary business questions and while I recognize that business men are not any more clever than men of legal attainments, yet, when a man's mind has been directed in a certain groove for a number of years he can sometimes grasp and settle difficulties much quicker, and he can give advice to professional men which would be of value, and thus facilitate and help to perfect the work of the commission. I hope that the government will see its way clear to appoint of the six commissioners at least two men of business experience capable of properly filling a position of this kind, if such men can be secured, as I have no doubt they can be. It seems to me that the representations which have been made to the government, if carefully looked into, will be found to have gone no further than that. I certainly would not go so far as to say that a railway man should be barred from serving on the commission. I think such a man would be a very valuable member of the commission, if his services could be secured; but I hope that the government will, at any rate, try to facilitate the work of the commission by appointing two of its members from the ranks of the business men of the country.

Mr. LEWIS. I think the minister will agree that most of the cases that come before the commission are cases between large corporations and companies on the one hand and railway companies on the other or between railway companies; but a number of cases arise between railway companies and poor men. For instance, a farmer has an underground or overhead crossing on his farm and the timber breaks down; the railway company, contrary to its charter or agreement with the people, fills that up. What is the poor man to do in these circumstances? He is not able to employ a prominent solicitor to appear for him before the Railway Commission. Then there are such cases as those of small telephone companies who desire to cross railway lines. There should be some officer at the beck and call of the Railway Commission, to whom the commission could say, when they are notified by any person that he has a grievance against a railway company and is not able to press it before the commission: Prepare this case for us to look into further. This matter was brought to my attention some time ago by one of the Railway Commission, and if the minister confers with the present Railway Commission, I think he will find that they agree that there should be some such officer. He need not be an expensive officer. The commission, standing between the people and the railway companies, would then see that justice was done in such cases.

Mr. MARSHALL. I would like to ask the minister when he proposes to appoint these commissioners. I am quite in sympathy with the move. Being connected with a large shipping industry, I know the difficulties we have to contend with, principally in making our claims against the railways. We have in our office a staff occupied almost wholly in looking after these claims. I would like to see the commission have full power to settle such claims. I quite agree with what has been said by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) about the difficulties in shipping over two lines of railway. For instance, there is an overcharge at the other end; the railway asks us to put in our claim; we put it in; sometimes it is not settled for six or eight months, and sometimes not at all. This is very unsatisfactory, and for that reason I would like to see the commission given full power to settle these claims. I do not care who are on this commission so long as they are practical men. What is keeping this parliament back to-day is the fact that there are too many lawyers in it. My idea is that we want more practical men, business men, commonsense men. I quite understand that this business could not be carried on without lawyers, as we are up against law here all the time, and an ordinary man like myself does not know where he stands. For that reason I would like to see practical men appointed on the Railway Commission. I have no objection to the salary at all; often the dearest man is the cheapest. I think we should have a railroad man on the commission, because a good smart railroad man is familiar with all the details of the matters that come before it. I hope the minister will consider this very carefully before he appoints the additional commissioners.

Mr. HAGGART. Just a few words before the resolution passes. The hon. Minister of Railways has explained why he proposes to appoint three additional commissioners—that the work of the commission is at present three or four months behind, and that he intends to put new work upon them. Before arranging for the appointment of the additional commissioners, I think he should

have introduced the Bill providing for the work they have to do. At present we know nothing at all about that. The salary proposed, with the retiring allowance, is a very handsome salary for any man in the community, and fully sufficient. One of the powers of the chief commissioner ought, I think, to be abridged. I would suggest that no commissioner should have the sole power of deciding a case on a question of law. At present the commissioners other than the chief commissioner can be put out of court at once by the chief commissioner simply saying, This is a legal question which I will take upon myself to decide. It is an extraordinary power. As the minister says, the powers given to this court are greater than those given to any other railway commission in the world; and this is an extraordinary power to place in the hands of one man because he is a lawyer. It does not require any extraordinary knowledge in a man, if he is full grown and of age, to decide a legal point as a railway commissioner.

There should be no exceptional powers given any commission to decide on questions of law. When a question comes up between two railways, the points at issue are nearly always technical; but if the point to be decided is both legal and technical, we leave the decision entirely to the Chief Commissioner. He decides on the law point, subject to the right of appeal to the Supreme Court and Privy Council. Such power ought not to be vested in any one man. No man on the commission should be so much superior to the other members of the board, that to him is solely given the decision of legal points. There is not a man on the board, there is not a man of ordinary intelligence, who cannot decide the legal points just as well as the Chief Commissioner. I would therefore suggest that the powers given the commission should be given to all its members alike and that no one should have any special power vested in him over the others. I protested at the time against this discrimination. We were told that a distinguished lawyer was to be put at the head of the commission. Well, giving him such special power, virtually gives him the control of the board. In no railway commission in any country in the world is there a favoured commissioner who has the power of taking the jurisdiction out of the others and deciding a question because it happens to be a legal one. Any discrimination of that kind is an anomaly. When you appoint a man to the commission, all that you should require of him is that he should have first class intelligence, and such intelligence you will find diffused in abundance in this country, and the government can get it at any time for the handsome salary they are paying and the retiring allowance. The minister can get men of first class requirements fit to fill the position, and it is not at all necessary that he should confine his selection to men of technical knowledge. It is not at all necessary that any commissioner should have been for twenty or thirty years in control of a railway or engaged in trade. The requisite ability can be acquired without anything of the kind. When the minister introduces his Bill, we shall have an opportunity of discussing its various points, and I would suggest an alteration of this kind.

Mr. BENNETT. Will there be a clause providing that a certain class of persons shall be ineligible to become members of the board, for instance, members of parliament or Senators who have been members of either body during the past two years ?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no such clause.

Mr. BENNETT. There will be no such clause in this Bill ?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. BENNETT. We shall discuss that when it is brought up.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). The hon. minister does not appear to pay much attention to the point brought up by my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey). It is an anomaly that we should appoint commissioners to regulate railway freights and other difficulties and exclude the Intercolonial Railway from their jurisdiction. What do we find at present ? We find the greatest anomaly in freight rates over that line. For instance 100 pounds of grain is charged 40 cents from Prince Edward Island to the west, or about 13½ cents a bushel for a distance of a little over 1,000 miles. Yet you can take a barrel of flour, which is twice the weight, from Toronto to Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, for the same sum. The freight on a barrel of flour from Toronto to my province by the car load is 40 cents or about half the freight that is charged on the same weight from Prince Edward Island west. Is there any reason why the Intercolonial Railway should not be placed under this railway commission ? I have no hesitation in saying that if this independent board had jurisdiction, those anomalies would disappear. We have letters every day protesting against them, but the trouble is that the Intercolonial Railway is altogether run, and always has been, in the interests of the party in power ; and when there is any grievance to be remedied, the first thing to be looked at is the politics of the party who complains. If his politics are not of the right kind, he has no remedy. I think that the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is a very necessary one. In increasing the number of the board, I think the government are doing right ; but when they double the number, they should bring

the Intercolonial Railway under the jurisdiction of the Board and then a great deal of the injustice existing at present, especially as regards my province, would disappear. The only reason why the Intercolonial Railway is not made subject to the Railway Commission is that the government want to keep it under their own control so that they may make its rates to suit their party purposes. It is time that should be remedied, and I would ask the minister to give us an expression of policy on that point. And if he thinks he can treat the representatives of my province with contempt, I think he will find that he has something to do before the session is over. I would advise him to state to this commission, while we are making these changes, why he does not make the proposition to have the Intercolonial Railway, as well as the other railways, under the charge of the Railway Commission.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) does not mean that I am treating any representive from any place, or any suggestion from any representative, with contempt. But I cannot answer a question until it has been asked, and I must allow an hon. member to have the floor until he has finished his speech. I want to answer in the frankest manner, so far as I can answer at all. Now, the cry in this country has been partly in favour of one policy and partly in favour of the other. One policy is government ownership and control; the other policy is private ownership with government control. Most of the railways are privately owned, and our object now is to bring them under government control. But the Intercolonial is already both owned and controlled by the government. By means of this commission we secure only indirect government control over the other railways, but the Intercolonial is under government control direct. And those who control the Intercolonial are responsible to the people's representatives. A question of freight rates, for instance, is a matter for my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) to bring before the governmental management of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island railways. The freight rates of the other railways could not be brought before the government in that direct way, and we have this Railway Commission before whom these grievances can be brought.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). I do not think the argument is very sound. For the other railways the government have appointed an independent commission, men who are not influenced by political considerations. But I do not know that I can so far compliment the Minister of Railways as to say that he will act in these matters outside of political lines. We want to have the Intercolonial, as well as the other railways, under an independent body. We have been taking these grievances before the Railway Department for ten years, but they turn a deaf ear to us. But if their friends were to go to them a remedy would be found. I have a letter here, which I shall not detain the House by reading, but I think if I were to read it the minister would see that there is too much truth in what I say. The people have no confidence in the Intercolonial, for it is run on party lines and for party purposes. We want to place it under the control of some independent body, such as I believe the Board of Railway Commissioners to be.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I think this legislation is on proper lines, if proper officials are appointed on the commission. I desire to call attention to a class of cases which should come within the scope of the Railway Commission. There has been a good deal of complaint in my district by wholesale liquor merchants who import liquors in case lots from the old country. In almost every shipment certain proportions of the shipment are missing. The railways refuse to accept the responsibility and the loss falls on the merchant. But there should be some responsibility either on the Railway Company or Steamship Co. I cite this so that the minister may make a note of it, to provide for it under this proposed legislation or at some future time. Another case is one which I think properly comes before the Railway Commission, in fact I have this case before the Railway Commission. There is a line of railway running from Chatham to Detroit which was originally the Great Western Railway of Canada. It was chartered by Canada, and the people had their privileges under that charter. The Great Western Railway Company sold to the Grand Trunk, and the Grand Trunk saw fit to lease running rights to the Wabash, I believe, without the sanction of parliament or of the old Railway Committee of the Privy Council. At first, under this arrangement of running rights, the citizens of Chatham and vicinity were allowed, on purchasing a ticket, to ride either on a Wabash or a Grand Trunk train. But after about two years some petty quarrel arose between the concerns, and now we may ride only on the trains of the company whose ticket we hold. Therefore, we are deprived of the privileges we used to have under the Great Western charter. I believe the Railway Commission have the matter before them, but if the minister could do something to give us our rights it would be highly appreciated.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) has gone over a number of classes from which it might be desirable to make selections for the Board of Railway Commissioners. I would suggest that he should take into consideration the question of the appointment of at least one commissioner who would have a thorough knowledge of the position of the railway

employees. I understand that the number of railway employees in Canada is something like 30,000. Of course, the efficiency of a railway finally rests upon the men who operate that railway. It does seem to me that a man in touch and sympathy with the railway men, one, of course, possessing also the other necessary qualifications, would be a very desirable addition to this commission. The army of railway men is large, there are many able men in its ranks, men of education as well as of practical every day experience. It seems to me the government might well consider the appointment of one such man, so that among the six members of the board of commissioners there might be one in touch and in sympathy with the interests and the duties of the large body of railway employees in Canada.

Mr. KEMP. I desire to say a word with reference to the matter of claims. The present Railway Act is insufficient in respect to the matter of claims made by shippers for goods that are lost. It is one of the most aggravating things that shippers have to contend with. The railway may lose part or whole of the goods, or may overcharge, and the railway says to the shipper, whenever part of the goods are delivered : Pay the charge whatever it may be, and send in your claim. There is no provision in the Act by which the railway is obliged to deal with a claim within a reasonable length of time. My experience in dealing with railways is that sometimes they seem to pursue a policy by which the shipper, or the man making the claim, will be inclined to drop it rather than follow it out. They drag the matter out sometimes one or two years, perhaps longer sometimes a claim is settled within a year. But I appreciate the fact that this question I am now dealing with, and which was referred to by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) does not come within the scope of the present Bill. But the Minister of Railways intends to introduce another Bill to amend the Railway Act, in which he might deal with this question. In looking through the Railway Act I see no provision with respect to this matter. I think it is very essential that some law should be laid down with respect to it. It is not a practical question for a shipper to take to the courts, all such claims, the matter may be a small one, too small to make it worth his while. But some law should be enacted whereby the railroads should be forced to deal promptly, within a reasonable length of time, with claims by shippers. As I say, it is one of the most aggravating questions with which shippers have to deal in their transactions with railways.

Mr. J. D. REID. There is another matter with which I think the commissioners should have power to deal, if they have not already and that is where railway companies send their carloads of freight all in a bunch. I have had experience of this kind. So many carloads of goods are to be shipped each week, but something happens by which they are kept in transit a month, and then they are all brought along together. Then you cannot unload them without some demurrage, and the railroad companies won't deliver the goods unless you pay that demurrage. Then you have no way of collecting from the railway. Again, if you put in a claim it is referred to this man in Toronto who represents all the railways, and if he says no, as he generally does, there is no way of collecting the money. I do not know whether the Railway Commissioners have power to act in a case of that kind; if they have not, I think the Bill should contain a clause empowering them to act in questions of this kind.

Mr. OWEN. I wish to put in a word on behalf of the farmers. I was glad to hear from the Minister of Railways and Canals that in making up his board of commissioners the farmers would not be overlooked. I have not heard a great deal about the farmers during this session, and I was pleased to hear that the government were not going to overlook them. I cannot agree with what has been said here this afternoon by some hon. members, that a railway expert should be appointed to that commission. I do not think we need any railway expert. What we need is every day businessmen, men with broad minds, men who are not tied to any railway corporation, men who will be free to act justly between the railway companies and the people. I was glad to hear the minister say that men would be appointed who would be acceptable not only to business men but to the farmers. I think the farmers' interests should be considered in this House, as well as those of other people. Great care should be taken in making these appointments to make them on the ground of fitness, and not from political considerations. I do not think a man should be appointed merely because he has been a good party man. Appoint men who, as I say, will keep in mind the interests of the people, and at the same time will deal justly with the railway companies.

Mr. CHRISTIE. In connection with the enlargement of this Railway Commission, I wish to mention a case that has occurred in the town of Oshawa, in the county I have the honour to represent. Oshawa is situated about thirty-three miles from Toronto. The railway companies formerly charged us 3½ cents a mile as passenger rate, and now they have reduced the rate to 3 cents a mile. This reduction means a difference of between $3,000 and $4,000 in favour of the town of Oshawa. But now I understand that the people of Oshawa have been notified by the Grand Trunk Railway that after the 1st of April next they will charge 10 cents additional per ton for bringing in coal. That will mean between $3,000 and $4,000 in in-

creased freight to the people of Oshawa, and will wipe out all the advantage they have received from a decrease in the passenger rate. The new rate will make the freight on coal about equal to that which is paid by the city of Belleville, which is a great deal further away. This is a matter that the Minister of Railways might well bring to the attention of his commission. Now perhaps it was through me that the question was brought up of bringing freight from Prince Edward Island to the western provinces. I wished to bring up a lot of oats, and wanted to know what it would cost. I spoke to one or two members about it, and they told me that the freight was 40 cents a hundred pounds, or 13½ cents a bushel. Now that is almost half the price of the grain itself, and is too much money to pay for transportation to the west. If it is going to cost that much to take seed grain from the eastern provinces to the west, it will be a pretty expensive thing to get it through.

Mr. GRAHAM. Would that be by car lot?

Mr. CHRISTIE. Yes, an hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island tells me that it was by car lot. Certainly 13½ cents a bushel is an exorbitant price to charge for bringing grain from one province to another. Now in regard to these additional Railway Commissioners, I would like to see the minister appoint a practical farmer; if he does so, I do not think he will ever regret it. I am satisfied that no other class in the country are imposed on to the same extent as the farmers.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I wish to call the attention of the minister to the fact that while the amount stated is charged for sending grain from my province up to the point mentioned by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, you can send oats or grain from points thousands of miles west of Halifax, for 6 cents a bushel. You can load a carload of oats in Toronto and send it to Truro or Halifax at a charge of 6 cents a bushel; but when you send it west you are charged twice as much. If that is a fair proposition for the east I do not know what fair play means.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister has not replied to the question raised by myself and referred to by Mr. Kemp. Mr. Kemp said that the present Railway Act does not authorize the Railway Commissioners to deal with this question. Will the minister deal with this question of compelling a railway delivering goods to deliver them at the contract price agreed on by the railway, whether in Canada or the United States, that made the contract? Suppose the Grand Trunk takes over a car at Chicago, it should not take it with any back charges. I have a letter which I sent to the Grand Trunk saying that some railways do this intentionally so as to get possession of the money and have the use of it for two or three years. This is a serious matter and one which would be properly dealt with only by the Railway Commission. When I spoke of it the other day a railway man who was in the gallery told me that it was a grievance and it should be dealt with. The board should compel the delivery of the goods at the contract rate.

Mr. GRAHAM. The matter will be considered. It has a good many difficulties. To say that a railway shall be liable to specific performance of a contract made by another in the United States and that it shall not accept shipment until it knows all the details of the charges, may be harder to work out than it looks. Then, too, we pile a lot of work on the commission that does not properly belong to it; we will deprive ourselves of the good we want to accomplish.

Mr. KEMP. There are other features besides that in connection with this same question.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend gets close to what might be called a claim for damages, which should not come under the commission. We are prepared to go pretty far but to ask the commission to deal with claims for damages, beyond the penalties provided by the Act, would be going too far.

In answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Christie), Dr. Mills, of the Ontario Agricultural College, was apointed on the Railway Commission at the request of many farmers' associations throughout this country as the representative of the farming interest.

Mr. LANCASTER. The minister did not reply to the question when he expects to appoint the commissioners?

Mr. GRAHAM. They will be appointed in due course without undue delay.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that Dr. Mills was appointed at the request of many farmers' associations. I would not like to find fault with the judgment of the farmers on that question, but I must confess that I could never see what special qualifications Dr. Mills had to act on that board in the interests of the farmers of this country. He was a professor in a college with no knowledge of railway crossings or farm crossings or the practical shipment of farm products. If a practical man was wanted, Dr. Mills was not the man to fill the bill. If he is the nearest representative to the farming community the minister can give, I fear the farmers will still think they have not representation on that board. I am reminded that Mr. Bernier is a farmer. He may be something the same kind of a farmer as the Minister of Agriculture, a theoretical farmer, a man who never goes between the plough handles. The First Minister shakes his head. I am surprised to

know that the Minister of Agriculture ever did any ploughing. I thought he was a theoretical farmer.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, no, I have seen him at the plough.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, if the Prime Minister had been in my county 40 or 50 years ago he might have seen me between the plough handles, but it only occurred on one occasion and then only part way across a field when I gave it up.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would not put you on the commission either.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think we are on a par. But I am under the impression that either of us is more of a practical farmer than Dr. Mills. If the farmers are to have a representative on the board let him be a practical man and not a theoretical man.

Mr. MILLER. I was considerably exercised over this matter and I thought perhaps there ought to be a farmer on the board, but since the hon. gentleman from Halton has assured us that Mr. Bernier is as good a farmer as the Minister of Agriculture, I am perfectly satisfied.

Resolution reported, read a second time, and concurred in.

Mr. GRAHAM moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 112) to amend the Railway Act as respects the constitution of the Board of Railways Commissioners.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. When will the minister bring down the other Bill amending the Railway Act ?

Mr. GRAHAM. In two or three days ; it is about completed.

Mr. LENNOX. I understood from the minister that this Bill would not be proceeded with until the other Bill was brought down.

Mr. GRAHAM. What I said was that we would not press it beyond the debatable stage.

Mr. LENNOX. It ought not to be set for second reading until the other Bill is before us, because we are voting money to enlarge the Board of Railway Commissioners and we ought to know what the government proposes which will extend the scope of their duties.

WINDING UP ACT.

Bill (No. 102) to amend the Winding Up Act—Mr. Aylesworth—read a second time, considered in committee, reported, read a third time and passed.

A six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY—PELAGIC SEALING IN THE NORTH PACIFIC OCEAN.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. WM. SLOAN (Comox-Atlin). Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the notice given a few days ago, I desire to discuss a matter of public importance, viz.: the seizure of the Canadian schooner 'Carlotta G. Cox' on May 29, 1907, and other matters concerning the Canadian pelagic sealing operations in the North Pacific ocean.

This question is one which has long been a source of irritation and conflicting interest between the United States and Canada; the United States for years endeavouring to control and assert jurisdiction over the high seas in the interest of the seal monopoly on the Pribyloff islands; Canada, on the other hand, following what she claimed for her citizens to be a legitimate and honourable calling in the pursuit of the fur-seal at sea.

The Canadian sealers, known as the Canadian pelagic sealers, have followed with varying success their hazardous occupation, severely handicapped by the persistent efforts made to drive them off the Pacific ocean. They have been interfered with and molested from the very commencement of their enterprise. Seizures, arrests, imprisonment, confiscation and other high-handed acts were of common occurrence on the part of the United States, assisted by Russia.

Great Britain strongly protested against the treatment of her Canadian subjects, claiming for pelagic sealing that it was 'the legitimate development of the original method of taking seals practised by the Indians on the coast of America.' Great Britain further claimed for her subjects 'the right to come and go upon the high seas without let or hinderance, and take therefrom at will and pleasure the produce of the sea.' Russia and the United States paid substantial sums to Great Britain for assuming to treat sealing in the open sea as 'piracy.'

Restrictive regulations have also been imposed upon our sealers, but without having the effect desired. Recently, however, Japan, not being subject to any such restrictions, has engaged in pelagic sealing. This new condition is one which I propose to discuss later on in my remarks, but before doing so I desire to give a brief review of the main incidents connected with this industry in which we are so directly interested.

The historical features in connection with this question date from the exploration and discoveries of Behring who was dispatched by Russia in the year 1728 on a voyage of discovery to the North Pacific ocean. It

was not until 1786, however, that the important discovery of the Pribyloff seal islands was made by Russia. From that time on and up to the date of the purchase of Alaska by the United States, Russia enjoyed a practical monopoly of the fur-seal industry. Following the acquisition of Alaska by the United States in 1867, legislation was adopted on the 1st of July, 1870, under which the Alaska Commercial Company secured a lease for a term of twenty years from the 1st day of May, 1870, for the exclusive right to take seals on the Pribyloff islands. Prior to the transfer of this territory from Russia, the seal hunting conducted by British subjects was practically confined to the West Coast Indians, but about that time, and for some years after, the business began to attract attention and some attempt was made to hunt seals by the method now known as pelagic sealing. About the years 1878 and 1879 several vessels were engaged therein; the number was gradually increased, although the operations were confined to the North Pacific ocean, outside of Behring sea. It was not until about the year 1885 that anything like a concerted movement to Behring sea commenced, although in previous years some vessels had entered these waters with interference occurring to, but two or three United States vessels, which approached close to the islands. The attention of the lessees of the Pribyloff islands was attracted to this menace of their hitherto practical monopoly of the sealing business in this locality, and strenuous efforts were made by them to discourage and prevent the growing industry of pelagic sealing.

In the summer of 1886 the United States government for the first time sought to exercise as against foreign nations exclusive jurisdiction over Behring sea, outside the territorial limit (three miles), by the seizure of three British sealing schooners and the warning out of a fourth. Great Britain immediately remonstrated against these extra territorial claims and reserved all rights to compensation.

In 1887, while diplomatic correspondence was proceeding, six additional British sealers were seized and one was ordered not to enter Behring sea by United States authorities. All the vessels seized were condemned, and the masters and mates were fined and imprisoned. Renewed protests were filed and diplomatic correspondence resulted, having in view the settlement of the main question as to the right of the United States to territorial claims in the Behring sea.

In consequence of pending negotiations, no attempt was made during 1888 to prevent British vessels from participating in the seal fishery of Behring sea.

In the year 1889, negotiations not having resulted in a satisfactory solution of the questions at issue, the United States government issued a proclamation against sealing, and five British vessels were seized in, and three ordered out of, Behring sea.

A conference was held at Washington in the spring of 1890, resulting in a proposed convention providing for a mixed commission of experts to report on regulations on land and at sea, pending which a spring and fall close season was to be observed on land and at sea north of a line to be drawn; the pelagic sealers to be prohibited from approaching within ten miles of the islands, &c. This proposal was eventually rejected by the United States, and orders were issued for the seizure of log books and seal skins of vessels found sealing in Behring sea. Great Britain formally protested.

During the pendency of negotiations, for the purpose of avoiding difference and with a view of promoting a settlement of the questions existing between the two governments touching their respective rights in Behring sea, and for the preservation of the seal species, a modus vivendi was effected on the 15th June, 1891, by which it was agreed that Great Britain should, on the one hand, until May, 1892, prohibit seal killing in that part of Behring sea lying eastward of the line of demarcation described in the treaty of 1867 between the United States and Russia, and that the United States should, on the other hand, prohibit seal killing for the same period in the same part of Behring sea and on the shores and islands thereof, in excess of a stipulated number—7,500—for food for the natives. This prohibition was strongly protested against, and claims were filed, which resulted in the payment by Her Majesty's government of compensation to the sealers for loss that season through insufficient notice, to the amount of $100,234.

On the 29th of February, 1892, a treaty between Great Britain and the United States, providing for arbitration respecting the seal fisheries in the Behring sea, was signed, and it was deemed expedient that a similar arrangement to the modus vivendi of 1891 should obtain during the period necessary to secure the award of the arbitrators. Consequently a formal convention was concluded on the 18th April, 1892, which effected such a purpose, and under which the sealers were debarred from entering Behring sea during the sealing seasons of 1892 and 1893.

Thus forced from the eastern half of Behring sea in 1892, the sealers, instead of returning to Victoria from the Aleutian passes and abandoning their voyages, exploited the Asiatic waters, and six were seized and four were interfered with by the Russian authorities.

During 1892 the steamer 'Coquitalam' was chartered by the sealers to convey their coast catch home and to supply them for a continuance of their voyage in Asiatic waters. Before she had fulfilled her mission and after she had made a few transfers of

provisions and collected about 6,000 skins, all of which took place outside the territorial limit in the North Pacific ocean, she was seized by the United States authorities for unloading cargo within four leagues of the coast. This case was defended in the United States courts, until finally a decision was given adverse to the United States, resulting in claims amounting to $107,446.14. This claim has not yet been paid.

In 1893, growing out of the Russian seizures of the year previous, Great Britain entered into an agreement with the Russian government, providing protective zones of 30 miles around the Russian seal islands and ten miles along the Russian coast, from which limits the Canadian sealers were debarred. During the year the award of the Paris arbitration was reached. In the first five questions of right which had been raised, the claim to any extra territoral jurisdiction in Behring sea by the United States was disallowed, and the second branch of the award provided concurrent regulations for the protection of the seal fishery.

The operations of the pelagic sealers during the year 1894 were conducted under new conditions imposed by the Paris award and legislation of the respective governments for its application. At the outset the prevailing opinion in Canada, especially among the sealers themselves, was that the restrictions were severe and the legislation unnecessarily penal. These views were corroborated by the United States authorities connected with the commission, who were of the opinion that pelagic sealing could no longer proceed with profit under the new condition of affairs. Although the catch that year proved to be the largest in the history of the industry, being 95,048, 57,000 skins were taken in Asiatic waters, which number alone was larger than the total take in all waters of any previous year except the one immediately preceding. This year the supplementary arrangement for the sealing up of implements during the close season, entered into by exchange of notes between Her Majesty's government and that of the United States, was put in force, but instead of protecting the sealers from unnecessary interference as intended, it proved only another excuse for seizure, and two vessels, the 'Wanderer' and the 'Favorite,' were seized for the possession each of one unsealed gun on board.

In 1895, for reasons previously explained, Great Britain was unable to agree to the renewal of the arrangement of sealing up of arms, and complaint was made of the excessive interference and boarding of vessels. This year strenuous efforts were made by the United States government to bring about a revision of the Paris regulations, the inefficiency of which it was stated was shown by the results of 1894, and the closure of Behring sea from America to Russia was asked and a resort to a quadripartite convention, including Russia and Japan.

In 1896 practically the same proposals were renewed, to which Great Britain was unable to accede. But in view of conflicting and indiscriminate contentions touching the effect of pelagic sealing, scientific inquiries on the islands and at sea were undertaken by Great Britain and Canada, as well as by the United States. This year also a convention for the assessment of the claims growing out of the seizures previous to arbitration was signed, and the work of inquiry thereinto begun.

An adjustment of Great Britain's claims to compensation followed, the award of $437,145.44 rendered by the claims commissioners in December, 1897, after full and exhaustive examination of witnesses by counsel on both sides, thus finally disposing of United States obligations attending unlawful seizures of British vessels in the open sea.

In 1897 contiued proposals for supplementary arrangements for the sealing up of firearms during the close season in Behring sea and the examination of seal skins at Victoria by United States officials were received. Her Majesty's government finally consenting to the sealing up of arms. This year the schooner 'Kate' was seized in Behring sea, two fur-seal skins being found on board bearing evidence of having been shot. She was afterwards released, as she did not have any guns on board.

The sealers continued to press for relaxation of the Paris regulations, suggesting the reduction of the protective zone from 60 to 30 miles and the permission of pelagic sealing in the Pacific until 30th of June instead of 1st of May, the protection of vessels from unnecessary boarding and searching and consequent delay, and some other amendments in the regulations to prevent unnecessary seizure, while the United States government insisted for the revision thereof looking to greater restriction.

The United States proposed that the government of Great Britain and the United States agree at once to a modus vivendi providing for the complete suspension of the killing of seals in all the waters of the Pacific ocean and Behring sea for one year from the 31st December, 1897, and for suspension of all killing of seals on the Pribyloff islands for the same period.

To this proposition Canada was unable to agree.

By the terms of the Paris award, the regulations for the government of the seal fishery were to be subjected to a new examination every five years, so as to enable both interested governments to consider whether, in the light of past experience, there was occasion for any modification thereof.

The year 1898 concluded the first five-year term of the regulations; the time, therefore, had arrived for any revision that might

be considered necessary. The representations made to the Canadian government by those engaged in the sealing industry in British Columbia were to the effect that no modifications of these regulations should be agreed to in the nature of further limitations to the business, but that, on the contrary, the successful prosecution of the industry demanded that the existing restrictions should be curtailed alike as to the close season and as to the protective zone around the Pribyloff islands.

Summarized, these restrictions are: Under the regulations provided by arbitration and the arrangement entered into with Russia, as well as under admitted principles of international law, the sealers are to-day operating under the following prohibitions:

1. They are excluded at all times from the three-mile limit along the coast of the United States in the north Pacific ocean;
2. They may not at any time approach the Pribyloff islands within a zone of 60 miles;
3. They may not at any time use firearms in Behring sea;
4. They may not use rifles, but are confined to shot-guns, in the open season, in all that water area situated north of the 35th degree of north latitude, and eastward to the 180th degree of longitude from Greenwich till it strikes the water boundary described in the treaty of 1867 and following that line up to Behring straits, comprising approximately 5,000,000 square miles;
5. They are precluded from using nets or explosives in the above area;
6. Within the above area they cannot take seals in any manner whatever between the 1st day of May and the 31st day of July;
8. They may not take seals within a zone of 30 miles around the Kommandorski islands and Copper islands;
8. They may not take seals within a zone of 10 miles along any of the Russian coasts on the mainland in the north Pacific ocean, and these restrictions have been extended by legislation to give them effect and application.

The Behring sea question was also one of those that received the consideration of the Joint High Commission, which formally opened at Quebec, August 23, 1898. A proposal was submitted, in effect, that pelagic sealing be prohibited in the North Pacific ocean, and that the government of the United States pay to Great Britain a certain sum in full compensation for the relinquishment of the rights of her subjects to engage in sealing in that ocean. This proposal was not favoured by Canada, as it was felt that our present rights should not be further relinquished.

Up to the year 1902, pelagic sealing had been recognized mainly as a Canadian industry, but during this year, as a result of a bounty of $10 per ton given by the Japanese government to encourage the development of the deep-sea fisheries, including pelagic sealing, there were nineteen vessels flying the Japanese flag sealing off the Japanese coast. Since that time the Japanese operations have extended over the North Pacific ocean, without regard to the regulations imposed upon Canadian subjects, with the result that their untrammelled operations are proving disastrous to Canadian interests. Recent despatches from Japan state that there are now some thirty-five pelagic sealers under the Japanese flag, who are operating without interference or restriction.

This point was emphasized and brought very forcibly to the attention of the people of Canada by the seizure of the Canadian schooner 'Carlotta G. Cox' by the United States revenue cutter 'Rush' on May 29th, 1907, while in north latitude 59° 10″ and west longitude 141° 19″. This locality is known as the Fairweather Grounds, and the point of seizure is about 40 miles from the shore. The seizure was made for an alleged violation of the regulations of the Paris Tribunal of Arbitration, the offence claimed being sealing in the closed season, namely, May 1, to July 31.

The humiliating feature of this may be more fully understood when I state that there were in that immediate vicinity, when the seizure was made, no less than five Japanese sealing schooners pursuing their calling unmolested. The only schooner seized was the one flying the British flag. Further comment upon this incident would appear unnecessary.

Such, in brief, Mr. Speaker, is an outline of the history of pelagic sealing up to the present time.

I have referred briefly to the treaty between Great Britain and the United States for the arbitration of the seal fisheries in the Behring sea, signed at Washington 29th February, 1892, and I wish to consider the last paragraph of Article VII. of this treaty, reading as follows:

The high contracting parties furthermore agree to co-operate in securing the adhesion of the other powers to such regulations.

Great Britain in the outline of argument presented to the Tribunal of Arbitration was also emphatic on this point at this time, as on page 9, British case, I find the following:

Great Britain has throughout been favourably disposed to the adoption of general measures of control of the fur-seal fishery, should these be found necessary or desirable with a view to the protection of the fur-seals, provided that such measures be equitable and formed on just grounds of common interest and that the adhesion of other powers be secured, as a guarantee of their continued and impartial execution.

Again, on page 9 of the argument of Great Britain:

So long as the claim of the United States to impose regulations on pelagic sealing is based on the assertion of a legal right, that claim is strenuously opposed, and the right as strenuously denied.

But when the question is put on the lower and practical plane of common benefit to all

the nations interested, on the recognition of the right of the pelagic sealers as well as of that of the island sealer, then the British government will cordially co-operate in giving effect to such measures as may be found necessary for the preservation of the fur-seals.

Should any regulations be the outcome of this arbitration, it is confidently expected by Her Majesty's government that they will be such as not to protect only the United States in the manner which their present contention urges, but to protect an industry in which all the nations of the world have an interest.

It were useless to make regulations which should bind only the citizens and subjects of the United States and Great Britain. As in the case of the Jan Mayen fisheries, so in the case of the Pacific fisheries, the subjects of all the nations who now participate in them, or who may be reasonably expected to do so, ought to be equally bound.

With special reference to this, I am going to read to the House some correspondence which passed between the two governments interested and the other powers also, and propose to make some comment upon the apparent indifference displayed in securing this adhesion. This correspondence is taken from a United States Senate return, dated 11th February, 1895. The first note is from Mr. Gresham, Secretary of State, to Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British Ambassador at Washington :

Department of State,
Washington, May 7, 1894.

Excellency,—The two governments having provided by legislation and regulation for the enforcement of the award of the Paris Tribunal under the treaty of February 29, 1892, the time appears to have arrived for carrying out the stipulation of article 7 of the convention. I am therefore directed by the President to invite the attention of Her Majesty's government to the matter, to the end that with all convenient speed the two governments may co-operate in securing the adhesion to the award of other powers, especially Russia and Japan. .

I have the honour to be, &c.,
W. Q. GRESHAM.

Again, on not receiving a reply, on May 22, 1894, another note was addressed to Sir Julian Pauncefote as follows :

Excellency,—Referring to my note to you of the 7th instant, regarding the joint invitation of foreign powers to adhere to the award of the Behring Sea Tribunal, I beg to inquire whether you have received instructions from your government on the subject.

In the judgment of the President prompt action is very desirable.

I am, &c.,
W. Q. GRESHAM.

These communications remained unanswered until the 30th July, when Sir Julian Pauncefote wrote to Mr. Gresham the following :

Washington, July 30, 1894.

Sir,—With reference to the identic note which it is proposed that the government of Great Britain and of the United States should address to the maritime powers inviting their adhesion to the Behring sea regulations, I have the honour to submit for your consideration the accompanying list of powers to whom it is suggested by my government that the identic note should be addressed. I should be glad to be informed whether the list meets with the approval of your government, and, if so, of the date on which you would propose that the identic note should be issued.

I have, &c.,
JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

Inclosure.

Argentine Republic, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Brazil, Chili, China, Colombia, Costa Rico, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hawaii, Havti, Honduras, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Peru, Portugal, Russia, San Salvador, Spain, Sweden and Norway, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela.

This list was approved of by the United States, and August 20, 1894, was agreed upon for the dispatch of the identic note. I have here a United States draft of the identic note to the maritime powers :

Sir,—I have the honour to address you, under instructions from my government, on the subject of the regulations established on the eastern side of the north Pacific ocean, from the thirty-fifth degree of north latitude to the Behring straits, for the proper protection and preservation of the fur-seal species.

Those regulations which are at present applicable only to the subjects or citizens of Great Britain and of the United States are prescribed by the award of the tribunal of arbitration constituted under article 1 of the treaty concluded between those two powers at Washington on the 29th day of February, 1892. The preservation of the fur-seal species, however, being an object of interest and concern to the whole of the civilized world, the high contracting parties agreed, by article 7 of the above-mentioned treaty, to co-operate in securing the adhesion of other powers to such regulations as the arbitrators should deem necessary to carry out the purpose in view, having regard to the particular condition of fur-seal hunting in the waters referred to.

The governments of Great Britain and the United States of America have given effect by suitable legislation to the regulations prescribed by the award, and the time has therefore now arrived for inviting the adhesion of the other powers thereto. Accordingly, I have the honour to transmit herewith a copy of the award setting out in substance the provisions of the treaty and prescribing the regulations in question. I have also the honour to transmit a copy of the United States Act of Congress passed to give effect to those regulations as regards United States vessels and citizens.

It only remains to me, on behalf of my government and in execution of my instructions, to invite the adhesion of your government to the regulations prescribed by the award with a view to their application to the vessels and citizens of your country and to their enforcement by appropriate national legislation.

My government will be much gratified to learn that your nation is willing to support

the efforts made by Great Britain and the United States in so beneficent a cause.

All the replies received have not been made a matter of public record so far as I can find, and the subject appears to have received no very great consideration from the various powers. For the information of the House I quote from a few of these replies. Belgium, for instance, stated that:

As no Belgian vessel ever visits the regions in question, my government thinks—and it has instructed me to so inform Your Excellency—that there is no reason for proposing any special measure to the legislative body of Belgium. It adds that it nevertheless renders sincere homage to the efforts that are made by the United States, together with Great Britain, in behalf of a cause which interests the entire world.

Germany's reply was to the effect that:

Upon investigation, it is shown that German shipping has never taken part in seal hunting in Behring sea and that under these circumstances the imperial government does not consider it sufficiently important to resort to imperial legislation for the protection of seals in the manner proposed. The imperial government, however, will gladly take occasion through public notices, and by executive means, to issue warnings to its people interested in shipping, in conformity with the laws enacted by Great Britain and the United States.

Italy's reply was more satisfactory, as the following will show:

His Majesty's Minister of Foreign Affairs, to whom I hastened to communicate the contents of the note of your honourable department of the 30th of August last, instructs me to thank your excellency for this communication, and at the same time to announce the adhesion of the King's government to the rules established by agreement between the federal government and that of Her Britannic Majesty for the regulation of seal fishing in Behring sea.

Portugal also was favourable, stating:

The government of His Majesty, however, desires that it be distinctly and clearly established that its adherence is restrictive simply as regards the taking of fur-seal, and in the waters comprised within the limits traced by the tribunal of arbitration of Paris.

Russia could not agree unless the restrictive measures were applied to all the waters of the Pacific north of the thirty-fifth degree of north latitude, the reply being:

That Russia having to the same degree as the United States an interest and an imperative duty to equally assure in her waters the preservation of fur sealing, the imperial government could not give its adhesion to the Paris regulations and to the legislative measures adopted in consequence thereof at Washington and at London unless the totality of those measures be applied likewise to all the waters of the Pacific situated to the north of the thirty-fifth degree of north latitude.

As a matter of fact Russia's reply could be well anticipated for when the agreement between the United States and Russia for a modus vivendi similar to the agreement of the year previous between Russia and Great Britain, was ratified at Washington on May 4, 1894, the Russian ambassador in signing this agreement on behalf of his government, April 22, 1894, sent a communication to Mr. Gresham, Secretary of State, of which the following is an extract:

In signing to-day this essentially provisional arrangement, I hereby reiterate to you in writing, the declaration that the imperial government is, for is part, prepared to negotate and sign with the United States, England and Japan, a treaty in virtue of which the principles and regulations of the Paris tribunal of arbitration shall be applicable, indifferently, to all the waters of the Pacific ocean situated north of the thirty-fifth parallel of north latitude.

Japan acknowledged the receipt of the identic note through her representative at Washington, stating that, the matter would be brought to the attention of the government and a formal reply would be given at an early date. The attitude of Japan was, however, well known from correspondence of a few months previous, which it may be well to incorporate. Reports having been circulated that certain United States and Canadian sealing schooners would be placed under the Japanese flag, in order to evade the Paris award regulations, the following telegram was sent to Mr. Gresham, Secretary of State, to Mr. Dunn, the United States representative at Tokio:

Department of State,
Washington, November 22, 1893.

It is reported that American and Canadian seal fishery vessels may be placed under the Japanese flag next season. Comity will naturally counsel Japanese government to defeat any such attempted abuse of friendly flag to evade results of Paris arbitration.

This telegram was answered by wire as follows:

Tokio, November 27, 1893.

Japanese government agrees to take measures to prevent foreign vessels using the flag of Japan to evade seal fisheries regulations, but declines to require *bona fide* Japanese vessels to observe regulations unless protection asked for should be given Japanese seal fisheries.

(Sgd.) DUNN.

A few days later this was followed by a communication from Mr. Dunn to Mr. Gresham, as follows:

Legation of the United States,
Tokio, Japan, December 1, 1893.

Sir,—On the 24th ultimo, the day following the receipt of your telegraphic instruction dated November 22, 1893, I sought an interview with Mr. Matsu, His Imperial Japanese Majesty's Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Owing to the illness of Mr Matsu, I was received by Mr. Tadasu Hayashi, vice-minis-

ter of foreign affairs, to whom I communicated the reading of your telegram and expressed the hope that Japan, in the spirit of friendship that has always governed the relations between the two countries, would meet the wishes of my government in respect of requiring the observance by vessels flying the Japanese flag of the regulations proposed by the Paris tribunal.

I said to Mr. Hayashi that this action on the part of Japan would not in my opinion, weaken her claim for protection for her own seal fisheries; that the regulations of the Paris tribunal could not be extended to the waters near the Japanese islands except by special arrangements between Japan and foreign powers; that, although I was not authorized to say what position my government would take in the premises, I felt confident that the United States was favourably disposed to meet Japan's wishes in regard to reasonable proposals for the protection of her seal fisheries; but that however well disposed the other great powers might be toward Japan's proposals for the extension of the principle of protection to her seal fisheries, it would necessarily take time to complete the negotiations and determine upon a reasonable zone within which that principle should apply; that in the meantime the regulations of the Paris tribunal of arbitration had been announced to the world and it was the intention of the United States and Great Britain to put them into operation next season; that Japan was invited, as a matter of comity and good neighbourhood, to adhere to those regulations in order that her flag might not be used to evade them.

I also pointed out to Mr. Hayashi that Japan had not yet, submitted to the United States and Great Britain definite proposals for the protection of her seal fisheries; that no zone had been defined within which the taking of seal should be prohibited; that the Paris tribunal having completed its labours, any arrangement that might hereafter be made for the protection of Japan's seal fisheries must be separate and distinct from the finding of that body; and that such being the case, it appeared to me to be hardly in accord with Japan's well-deserved reputation for fairness that she should make her adhesion to the regulations formulated by an international tribunal of arbitration, for the protection of an American interest, conditional upon the favourable reception by several foreign powers of her proposals not yet sufficiently matured to admit of definite consideration.

At the close of our interview, Mr. Hayashi said he could not say what action his government would take in the matter until he had consulted with Mr. Hatsu.

On the 26th ultimo Mr. Hayashi called at this legation and informed me that he was authorized by the minister for foreign affairs to say that the Japanese government would do everything in its power to prevent the use of the Japanese flag by foreign sailing vessels to evade the regulations of the Paris tribunal, but that it could not, pending present negotiations, issue an ordnance requiring bona fide Japanese vessels to observe them unless the proposals submitted to the United States and Great Britain for the protection of Japanese interests in the same direction were favourably entertained.

On the 27th ultimo I had the honour to convey to you the substance of this response from the Japanese government in a telegram.

As a matter of fact, bona fide Japanese vessels have not hitherto been engaged in hunting for seal beyond the immediate waters of the northern islands of Japan, and the fear of disastrous consequences will doubtless, prevent this class of vessels extending their operations hereafter to waters where the regulations of the Paris tribunal apply.

I have, &c.,
(Sgd.) DUNN.

In the meantime the Japanese government, in view of the representations made by the United States regarding the report that foreign vessels proposed to use the Japanese flag to evade the seal fisheries regulations, under date of December 1, 1893, sent out the following caution concerning the granting of temporary certificates of registration to their various consuls at the ports on the Pacific.

Department of Foreign Affairs,
Tokio, Japan, December 1, 1893.

Having recently heard that there are certain foreigners abroad who, with the object of carrying on illicit fishing, may attempt to make use of the names of Japanese in the sale and purchase of vessels and the transfer of registration of the same to Japan through the recognition at the imperial consulates, and thereupon to proceed directly to the various localities in pursuit of such purpose, you are instructed in the issuance of temporary certificates of registration of vessels to act in the matter with strict caution, so that no certificates shall be granted to parties carrying on such dishonourable business.

(Sgd.) HAYASHI TADASU.
Vice-Minister.

A notification was also sent to the governors of territories and prefectures on the sea-board of Japan, as follows :

Department of Communication,
Tokio, 1893.

I am instructed to inform you that an agreement has been concluded between Great Britain and the United States concerning fishing in Behring sea, and that report has reached here that since Japan is not a party thereto, and not bound thereby, some attempts were likely to be made to have vessels belonging to nationals of both countries registered under the names of Japanese and fly the Japanese flag for the purpose of following the pursuit of fishing in Behring sea.

As the control of fishing by the different countries has become strict, no doubt these designing schemes are contrived to evade the law. In cases, therefore, of the purchase of foreign vessels, if the transfer of registration is requested, you are, upon strict examination, to act in the matter so that no such malfeasance as the above may arise.

(Sgd.) SAITO HIDE-AKI,
Chief Marine Bureau.

The treaty between Great Britain and Japan, ratified July 17, 1894, marked, as has

been recently stated in this House by the hon. the Postmaster General, 'a new era in the history of Japan.' The negotiations leading up to this treaty occupied months, during the very time that the Behring Sea question was prominent, and although I have read the published correspondence which took place between Great Britain and Japan at this time in reference to this treaty I fail to find where Great Britain had even suggested, much less urged, upon Japan the desirability of her adherence to the Paris award. On the contrary, although the United States had written Great Britain as to the urgency with special reference to Japan and Russia of despatching the identic note on May 7, and again on May 22, it was not until after the treaty with Japan, signed on July 17, that any attention was paid by Great Britain to the request of the United States. Japan at that time would, no doubt, have readily consented to respect the regulations adopted for the protection of the fur seals if requested to do so by Great Britain, rather than jeopardize the treaty which was to give her a new status in the world's nations.

It is difficult to understand Great Britain's failure to protect the Canadian pelagic sealers and the regulations for the protection of the fur seal with so favourable an opportunity presented, especially when I remind you that she was emphatic on this point both in the case, and in the argument presented to the tribunal.

The United States also concluded an important treaty of trade and commerce with Japan on November 22, 1894. But the United States did not exhibit the aggressive spirit which we generally associate and credit her with possessing. They, too, appeared to have been as indifferent as Great Britain in securing Japan's adhesion to the identic note.

The Hon. Elihu Root, the present Secretary of State, has stated on many occasions his friendly interest in Canada, but by exacting from Canada a strict adherence to the regulations for the protection of the fur seal, in view of the inability of the United States to make the same operative as against Japan, it cannot in any sense be construed as sympathetic to our interests.

Especially is this so when it is apparent that while the United States is patrolling over 5,000,000 square miles of the North Pacific Ocean as against the Canadian sealer, yet as I will show they are evidently powerless to protect even the Pribyloff Islands and their territorial waters there from the Japanese sealers, who have taken thousands of seals within the three mile limit around their islands and actually landed and killed seals on these same islands, proving conclusively to that extent that the concurrent regulations are now useless and their enforcement against Canada by the United States is inconsistent to say the least.

It is doubtful, at this time, if the people of the United States would be prepared to concur fully in a policy which discriminated against the Canadian sealers and in favour of the Japanese sealers.

In support of what I have just stated let me quote briefly from a report of Mr. Edwin W. Sims, dated 31st August, 1906, of the Department of Commerce and Labour, on the Alaska Fur Seal Fisheries, to the United States government, page 4:

The vessels of the Japanese fleet not only took thousands of seals within the territorial waters of the United States surrounding the Pribyloff islands during the past summer, but during a period of two days—July 16 and 17—the crews of four of the schooners committed a series of unlawful acts which terrorized the native inhabitants and injuriously disturbed the seal life on the rookeries of St. Paul Island. Raiding parties from three of these schooners actually landed on the island. One of the parties which landed killed 185 seals and got away with 120 skins before it was discovered.

As a result of the raids, five of the poachers were killed while attempting to escape arrest, and twelve, including two wounded, were captured. Three small boats and some arms and paraphernalia for killing seals on land were also captured. The force protecting the islands suffered no casualties, although it was subject to a rifle fire from the decks of a schooner anchored close inshore while making arrests on the second day.

On page 12:

The Japanese pelagic sealing fleet which operated in Behring sea during the summer consisted of at least 16 vessels, each of which carried a crew of about 30 men and from 5 to 7 small boats for sealing. It is evident from the number of vessels sighted from the islands that the entire fleet operated exclusively in the waters surrounding the islands, and on many occasions killed seals within the three-mile limit. The seals which breed on these islands have been undisturbed in the waters surrounding them for many years, and they undoubtedly fell an easy prey to this unexpected onslaught. In view of this fact, and in view of the further fact that large numbers of breeding females are continually passing from the islands to the feeding grounds about 150 miles southwest, and from there back to the islands, the seal herd has without doubt suffered a heavier blow as the result of the operations of this fleet during the past season than has been administered to it for many years past.

Wholly aside from the fact that this fleet of vessels engaged in pelagic sealing at the very doors of a reservation which has been set aside by this government for breeding purposes, the crews of some of the vessels engaged in a series of high-handed and outrageous depredations within the land and water territory of the United States which included repeated violations of expressed provisions of its laws. They used shot-guns to kill the seals in the water, and used cannon, probably for signalling. The reports of shot-gun firing and the boom of cannon, which were continually heard on the shore nearly all of two days, were so close as to disturb injuriously the rookeries. The crews killed seals in

the water close to the shore, easily within the three-mile limit, and landed on St. Paul island. They killed seals on land, 95 per cent of which were females. At the time of these depredations the entire armament of the 38 men over 21 years of age on St. Paul island consisted of 12 rifles. On the other hand each schooner probably carried a crew of more than 30 men. If the four schooners which were seen hovering around the islands on these days, and which were undoubtedly acting in concert, had united their crews in a raid they could have mustered a force of upwards of 120 men.

Again on page 18 :

Upon making an examination of the rookeries at the point where the small boats were first seen, the government agents discovered that the raiders had practically wiped out of existence one section of a breeding rookery. More than 183 seals had been killed. Of this number, 120 had been skinned and the skins loaded into the boats, which had unwittingly been permitted to return to the schooner. It was apparent that the raiders had been frightened away in the midst of their raid, because 63 dead and wounded seals, some partially skinned and others untouched, were found. That part of the rookery which was raided was what is known as a breeding rookery and was occupied by several hundred female seals, new-born seal pups, and a few breeding bulls. Bachelor, or young male seals do not frequent these breeding grounds.

All of the seals killed with the exception of two, were females. When it is remembered that the killing of female seals is universally condemned, was prohibited by the Russians as early as 1835, and has never been permitted by this government, the fact that over 95 per cent of the seals killed on the island by the marauders were females stands out as especially malevolent.

No doubt the incident which I have just given to the House was responsible for the recent utterance in another place that pelagic sealers were a 'horde of pirates.' If it was intended to include Canadian pelagic sealers and brand them also as pirates, then Mr. Speaker, I must protest on behalf of the Canadian sealers who are law-abiding, upright and loyal citizens of this Dominion carrying on a legitimate occupation in pursuit of the fur-seal at sea, in conformity with the regulations imposed by the Paris award. The statement could have been made only in ignorance of the industry carried on by British subjects.

Japan being an ally of Great Britain, it might even be reasonable to suppose that she would respect the regulations entered into and which were binding upon the subjects of Great Britain. But Japan, on the contrary is ignoring these regulations entirely, while British subjects are labouring under the disabilities imposed upon them by the regulations which I have previously summarized.

When the attention of Japan was called to the report that efforts would be made by the Canadian Pelagic Sealers to evade the regulations by the use of the Japanese flag, prompt measures were taken to prevent this, and it was characterized as 'dishonourable business' and, 'designing schemes contrived to evade the law.' I do not know if the report was well founded or otherwise. It is now immaterial. But the attitude of Japan was and is that it was dishonourable for the Canadian sealers to use the Japanese flag to evade the regulations; but it is not dishonourable for the Japanese flag to ignore the regulations. It was dishonourable for the Canadian sealer to evade the regulations ; but it is not dishonourable for the Japanese sealer to ignore the regulations. It was dishonourable for a subject to evade the disabilities imposed upon him by his nation ; but it is not dishonourable for the subject of another nation to take advantage of these disabilities. It is, however, apparently perfectly legitimate for the subjects of Japan to not only set aside the regulations but to even invade also the territory and territorial waters of the United States in their pursuit of the fur-seal, as I have just pointed out.

The advent of the Japanese sealers operating without restriction has materially decreased the catches of our sealers as the following figures would indicate :

1905 Average skins per vessel.....725
1906 Average skins per vessel.....596
1907 Average skins per vessel.....359

For instance, this can be more readily understood when it is remembered that there is a 60-mile zone around Pribyloff Islands which Canadian sealers may not enter, and outside of this zone they are confined to the use of spears. The Japanese sealers operating within the zone area and using fire-arms make the seal more wary and impossible to approach within spearing distance. The final result is not difficult to foresee. This government is in no wise responsible for the bringing into existence of these discriminating restrictions, but I trust, Mr. Speaker, that this government will not be saddled with the responsibility of their further continuance, and that an earnest effort will be made for an arrangement of a more equitable and satisfactory character.

What I contend for, is this, Mr. Speaker, that so long as unrestricted Pelagic Sealing is to be recognized, as in the case of Japan, then Canada must have equal rights.

Mr. SPROULE Would it not have been an opportune time to make representations before the treaty was finally accepted by Canada ?

Mr. SLOAN. I think I made that clear, that it was done on the part of Great Britain. Some proposals have been submitted by the United States looking to a settlement of the question. One of the first was in the form of a Bill, introduced in the United States House of Representatives in 1892, which provided that if the President should

fail to secure a suggested modus vivendi with Great Britain, then authority be granted for the destruction of all seal life on the islands, except 10,000 females and 1,000 males. A Bill of a similar nature was introduced by Mr. Dingley in 1894. To my mind this proposal was unworthy even of criticism.

In 1895-6 the United States made strong efforts to get the other powers, viz.: Great Britain, Japan and Russia with herself into a conference, to be known as the quadripartite convention. From the fact that Russia and Japan being owners of seal islands, and having already expressed a desire for the extension of the Paris regulations to the whole of the North Pacific ocean north of the 35° of north latitude, and their interests at this time being identical with those of the United States, it can readily be seen that Great Britain acted wisely in not committing herself and her Canadian subjects to what would have most assuredly resulted in a further abridgement of our privileges on the Pacific ocean.

In 1898-9, originating at the Joint High Commission, was a proposal to prohibit pelagic sealing; the United States government agreeing to compensate in full the pelagic sealers. If, as is understood, this proposal meant the abandonment of our birthright for all time to kill seals at sea, then, Mr. Speaker, it is one which this government could not well entertain.

In the speech from the Throne at the opening of this session of parliament it was announced that an agreement had been arrived at to submit, in conjunction with Newfoundland, to the Hague Tribunal for interpretation Article I. of the treaty of 1818.

I have no intention of making further allusion to this proposal at this time, other than to say that any abridgement of Article I. of the treaty of 1818 may have serious results to our fisheries on the Pacific coast, as it is by virtue of this treaty that our fishery rights are secured and maintained.

W. F. MACLEAN. Does the treaty refer to the seal fisheries?

Mr. SLOAN. What treaty?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The treaty of 1818.

Mr. SLOAN. I have not so contended.

The submission, however, of the fur-seal fisheries, which I have been discussing to the Hague tribunal would I think, be received with favour. And I would suggest the total prohibition of killing seals, both on land and sea for a term of years, or until such time as the various herds had recovered from their present depleted condition. This would involve the compensation of the pelagic sealers by their respective governments.

When the herds had again recuperated the killing could then be supervised and the skins divided pro rata among the four nations interested until such time as they had been recouped for the amounts expended on compensation. The other maritime powers, in the meantime, agreeing to the above proposal. Afterwards, if desirous of sharing in the industry, they could not be denied.

This proposal will preserve to Canada equal rights to the seas with the other nations of the world and relieve us of our present disabilities.

Unless commercial and monetary considerations are elimated and some such arrangement entered into, there will in a few years be nothing left for which to negotiate. It is fruitless to rely upon concurrent regulations as between individual nations, or even groups of nations, for a settlement of this question. The only permanent solution in my judgment is the adoption of a universal law of nations and the Hague conference is the tribunal to give it a definite expression.

With further reference to this, Mr. Whitlaw Reid, United States ambassador to Great Britain, on the eve of his departure to London, in publicly speaking on matters relating to the two countries is reported to have said:

> We have little list of other matters unadjusted between our two countries. They relate chiefly to Canada. Peoples who have large interests along three thousand miles of frontier, as well as around the globe, must constantly have outstanding questions; but we rely upon the fairness of our Canadian friends, headed by the accomplished statesman, whose services they enjoy as premier, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to get most of them equitably adjusted between ourselves, and what we cannot settle the Hague conference surely can.

Because Mr. Speaker, we refuse to recognize the property rights to the fur-seal in the open sea, which is claimed by the United States, our attitude has been referred to by them as 'unneighbourly, in that it is destroying a valuable industry of our government.'

We have in Canada a parallel case in the important salmon fisheries of the Fraser river which have been for many years recognized as a Canadian industry.

Yearly, we have the runs of salmon coming in from the ocean through the Straits of Fuca and ascending the Fraser to the spawning grounds. During recent years the United States fishermen have in their territorial waters trapped these salmon in extravagant quantities with the result that it has almost destroyed our industry. And, although these salmon spawn in Canadian territory and are returning to Canadian rivers when caught, we do not characterize the action of the Americans as unneighbourly; but on the contrary we are adopting more stringent regulations upon our fishermen. We are yearly spending increasingly large sums even in artificial propagation

and taking every means possible to preserve the industry to the benefit, not only of Canada, but of the United States.

Before resuming my seat I shall give briefly some figures showing the commercial importance of the fur-seal industry under discussion. The figures submitted are also taken from the report on the Alaskan fur-seal Fisheries, made 31st, August, 1906, by Edwin W. Sims, from the most authentic data obtainable :

The total number killed on the Pribyloff Islands from the years 1868 to 1906, inclusive, was 2,464,248.

The revenue paid to the government of the United States by lessees was $9,311,-054.77.

Price obtained for raw skins, (London sales) was $36,935,639.

The figures relating to pelagic sealing for the same years and from the same source are as follows :

Total number pelagic catch in the North Pacific ocean 877,331.

Total price obtained for the raw skins (London sales) was $10,307,359.

These figures do not include fur-seals killed by Russia on the Kommandorsky islands, Copper islands and Robben reef, or by Japan on the Kurile islands.

Having referred to the depleted condition of the seal herd frequenting Pribyloff islands during the breeding season, a few further remarks might also be of interest.

When the United States took possession of these Islands in 1868 the approximate size of the seal herd was 2,000,000. It will be seen from these figures that the herd had not been depleted by Russia ; Russia's average killing for the previous ten years being 35,039, while during the first year of the United States' possession, no less than 242,000 seals were killed.

The exclusive lease given to the Alaska Commercial Company, for twenty years allowed this company to kill 100,000 seals per annum. On the expiration of their lease in 1890 it was estimated that the herd had decreased to 900,000.

In 1890 an exclusive lease was given to the North American Commercial Company, with restrictive regulations—as to the number of seals to be killed. This lease expires in 1910.

The last estimate of the herd was made in 1906 and it is given as under 200,000. At the present ratio of decrease the herd will be practically extinct in five years.

I have shown that Canadian pelagic sealers are victims of discrimination, fatal to their industry.

I have shown the value to the world of the fur-seal fisheries of the North Pacific ocean.

I have pointed out the urgency of action being taken to save this valuable animal from total extinction.

I have suggested the Hague Tribunal as competent and unbiased to deal with this question.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the destruction of the fur-seal species would be unwarranted ; furthermore it would be an unnatural, immoral and unpatriotic policy.

The protection and conservation of the fur-seals of the North Pacific ocean is an obligation due posterity by the nations of to-day who are directly responsible and directly interested.

This question is not one that can be settled on lines of selfish consideration. It can only be settled by compromise and generous broad patriotic statemanship.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I did not quite follow my hon. friend's reference to the treaty of 1818.

Mr. SLOAN. In reply to the right hon. gentleman, I stated that as the treaty of 1818 applies also to the Pacific coast, I claim that any abridgement of that treaty would affect equally the Atlantic and Pacific fisheries.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON (Yukon Territory). The facts which have been placed before the House by the hon. member (Mr. Sloan) show the position in which Canada finds herself to-day on the seal question, the Japanese can fish for seals while the Canadians cannot, and if I understood his remarks correctly if Great Britain had pressed for the protection of this very important industry it would now be preserved practically intact for Canadians. That being so, I think the time is auspicious for us to look over our position as a colony of this great empire of Great Britain. We have just come through a diplomatic incident with Japan and there are other questions of a similar nature looming up with China and India. It does not require the vision of a prophet to see that China will very soon resent the head-tax and the Indians will ask why British subjects cannot enter a British colony.

Speaking from a Canadian standpoint, the next decade will be one of the most important in our history.

At the present moment it is well for us to consider the position of Canada as being a colony of the British empire and a neighbour of the great Republic of the United States. In discussing this question I shall trace the chain of events which have led up to Canada being a colony of the greatest empire and a neighbour of the greatest republic. Our geographical position is such that we become of prime importance as between Great Britain and her ally Japan. What is the history of these great colonies which now cement and adorn the British empire. They were established by Great Britain under what is known as her colonial system, and France established colonies under the name of the Pacte Coloniale. The colonies were close corporations

for the mother country. The colonial system in England was administered under three heads (1) to produce raw material and send it only to the motherland; (2) to consume manufactures only of the motherland; (3) to provide room for the surplus population of the motherland. In return the motherland undertook to protect the colony from foreign invasion and the colony undertook to protect herself so far as local defence was concerned. Spain was the first of these great colonization nations and her career in the new world is well known to all; the great republics in South America to-day are a remnant of her power and her colonial empire only ceased at the close of the recent war with the United States. Holland was also a great colonizing power and as the power of Spain lowered the Dutch became more powerful. England did not become a great colonizer until Spain began to wane under Dutch antagonism. England's greatness was based on the mercantile system which had its origin in the middle ages, but was systematized in Cromwell's time. The basis of that system was a long series of navigation laws which prevented goods being carried in other than British ships, and these laws existed from Cromwell's time until 1849. They were changed constantly but only to make them more prefect, the object being to cut down the carrying trade of Spain and Holland and build up the mercantile marine of England. The coasting legislation of Canada and the United States are remnants of these laws. All the colonies of England on the Atlantic seaboard were under the colonial system and those that remained loyal after the United States revolution were under it until 1845 (and under the navigation laws until 1849). France also planted her colonies under the Pacte Coloniale and New France and New England marched under different flags for fur trade of a continent until the battle of Quebec in 1759. That battle excluded France from the American continent with the exception of Louisiana. Then came the great revolution, the Napoleonic wars, the improverishment of France and the final sale of Louisiana to the United States in 1803 for a mess of pottage, and the great French colonial empire vanished to a few islands in the Atlantic and few trading posts in India. As some one said:

> For attempting the empire of Europe she lost the empire of the world.

It is interesting to note that France is to-day again a great colonial empire; that she has 56,000,000 of colonial subjects and governs an area twenty times the area of France. All the colonizing schemes of Spain, Holland, England, and France were trade schemes and all were on the same basis, and because England placed restrictions on trade she lost the thirteen colonies and half the continent of North America. Her maxim from Cromwell to Victoria was:

ships, colonies and commerce, and of recent years her maxim is free trade. Up to 1846 when the colonial system was replaced by free trade, the trade advantage was with Britain because we had to send and receive our goods in British ships. In 1836 Great Britain's trade with Upper and Lower Canada doubled that to Russia with her 60,000,000, and exceeded by $2,500,000, Great Britain's trade with France, Spain, Russia, Sweden and Denmark, which combined had a population of 65,000,000 people. I might mention, to show the importance at that time of the colonial trade of Great Britain, that in 1836 the Hon. John Beverley Robinson wrote that there were more British goods consumed in Toronto and its near vicinity than were consumed in the whole of Prussia with a population of 14,000,000. About this time the legislature of Upper Canada felt the restrictions placed upon trade and they passed a resolution asking that the duty be removed from wheat, and in 1836 the same legislature passed a resolution asking for a relaxation of the colonial system and for reciprocity with the United States. We did have a slight preference in the British market, but because we had to carry our trade in British shops and the freights being higher the preference was really destroyed. The Canadian market was so valuable to the British manufacturer at that time that Great Britain threw every obstacle possible in the way of the Canadian manufacturers. In Nova Scotia, in 1768, the Governor received orders to prohibit coal mining in Cape Breton, to prevent manufacturing, and to discourage settlement near the coal mines, as will be found in Campbell's history of Nova Scotia, page 159. In 1846 Britain adopted free trade. Our policy was immediately reversed and as you know there was an annexation movement in Montreal and in New Brunswick. We had spent $35,000,000 on our canals to carry our trade east and west and when the British government reversed their policy we found ourselves in a moment without any railways to carry our trade north and south and with our canals of no use to us. The wheat we were shipping to Great Britain and buying in the United States became a drug on the market and the milling industry of Montreal was paralyzed. In 1846 the Cunard line was subsidized and the idea set forth was that it was for the purpose of developing Her Majesty's possessions in North America. The Cunard ships were to call at Halifax on their way to New York and they did so for three years. The Allan line was established a few years later and it was refused a subsidy. Quite recently the British government has bonused the 'Mauretania' and the 'Lusitania,' and the British government are to-day making an expenditure of about $750,000 a year for that purpose. About this time the people who were governing Great Britain, Disraeli for instance, referred to the colonies as being

mill stones around the neck of the empire, and the Queen herself referred to Canada as being a source of weakness to the empire. Our fiscal freedom dates from 1859 when our first tariff Act was passed. Great Britain at that time threatened disallowance but Sir A. T. Galt told the British government that if they did not allow the Act to pass they would have to be responsible for the whole government of Canada. About this time, as you will remember, Lord Durham in his report compares Canada and the United States to the disparagement of Canada, and he frankly admits the failure of the British policy.

That was the time when we first began our fiscal independence, in 1859, when the Tariff Act was passed, and it is rather interesting to know that about forty years later we gave to Great Britain a preference of 33⅓ per cent in our markets, not for Upper Canada only, but for the whole of Canada. This ends our commercial account with Great Britain. While under her colonial system we were exploited for her benefit, our trade was in her hands and our merchandise was carried only in her ships ; our manufactures were prohibited in favour of her own and our coal mines were condemned to idleness. We had chronic discontent, eternal government disorders, rebellions in two provinces and nearly rebellion in three more.

A great deal is said about the protection of Canada by the military arm of the British empire. Let us note, in passing, the military account of Canada with Great Britain. Has Canada been loyal to the empire? We shall see. Canada was taken over in 1763, and since that time we have helped Britain in many of her wars with our men and money, and we have had some internal troubles of our own ; but never since that time has a British soldier fired a gun in a Canadian quarrel. The revolutionary war occurred in 1776 because of what Lord Beresford called the savage stupidity of the British government, and Canada helped England against the United States. Although only seventeen years after Quebec, the French stood loyal. The Bishop of Quebec issued a mandement urging the people to stand loyal to the Crown, and to their credit they did so, notwithstanding the blandishments of Franklin, who came over to Canada to get them to join the United States. While in Washington a few days ago I saw a copy of a letter which General Washington sent to the people of Canada at that time asking them to join the United States against Great Britain.

The next war was that of 1812-1814. This was no affair of ours. Napoleon's Berlin decrees prohibited commerce between Great Britain and Europe, and as a reply Britain passed orders in council prohibiting commerce between Europe and any place else. She also declared her right of search of any vessels, and searched those to the United States. The United States objected and war ensued. It was no quarrel of ours, but we took the side of Britain as against the United States. We fought for three years, thousands of our men were engaged and many were killed, and our progress was retarded for many years. We protected Britain, not Britain us ; and our legacy from that war is a glorious one of Lundy's Lane, Chrysler's Farm, Detroit, Queenston Heights and Chateauguay.

The next incident was the Trent affair. Fortunately, we did not go to war on that occasion, because England did not ; but we were ready again to assist in protecting the empire. One of the results of that affair was a pamphlet written in 1867 by two British officers, Bolton and Webber, advocating the giving away of all of Canada west of Montreal, and showing how indefencible it was.

Next we had the Fenian Raids of 1866 and 1870. These were England's fight again, no quarrel with Canada. But Canada was the nearest piece of British territory accessible and the vulnerable part of the empire. We were attacked and we defended ourselves. The only reason we were attacked was because we were a colony of the British Crown, and a little later on I will try to show how we fared when we pressed our claims against the United States for the Fenian Raids.

The next was the Boer war, which was not our war ; in it we protected Britain instead of Britain protecting us. We sent to her aid 8,400 men at a cost of $3,100,000 ; but according to a statement submitted by Mr. Chamberlain to the Colonial Conference of 1902 (per British blue-book No. 1299, page 43) our proportionate share to that of Great Britain would have been 51,000 men and about $159,000,000. In the same blue-book, at page 45, you will find a note addressed by Mr. Chamberlain to the Defence Committee asking that committee to give him some basis upon which to calculate the forces the colonies would send to help the empire in the event of a European war. The reply is obvious. Of course, Canada said : When the event arises we shall decide ; but we shall not anticipate the event or pledge our forces in advance. If England were involved in a European war it would be a very delicate question for us to decide whether we would send troops to help her or not. We have had one or two rebellions which, of course, we have settled ourselves. That closes the military account of Canada with the empire.

There remains, Mr. Speaker, the diplomatic account, and the story from Oswald to Alverstone is one of continuous and ignominious surrender of Canadian rights. After the Alaskan boundary award, the 'Literary Digest' published a cartoon representing a huge lion of dejected appearance, his ears and tail touching the ground, hauling northwards a rail fence marked

'boundary line.' This tells our diplomatic story in a sentence; it tells what the diplomacy of Great Britain has done for us. In 1882 Mr. Blake said that the history of the diplomacy of Great Britain with regard to Canada was a history of error, blunder, wrong and concession.

The first treaty was the treaty of Paris at the close of the United States War of Independence in 1783, when the British lion hauled the rail fence north from the junction of the Ohio and the Mississippi, including the whole of Lake Michigan and one-half the other lakes, and gave to the United States a territory which to-day comprises the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin, and has a population of 17,500,000 people. If Britian had kept this territory for us, we would have had the foreshore, so to speak, of the great middle west, and, having that, would have been the natural successors to the hinterland reaching to the Pacific. After the War of Independence the United Empire Loyalists could have moved into this territory and made it a second Ontario. Great Britain in this treaty abandoned the Indians who had been her allies, and Canada had eventually to remove them to Brantford, in Ontario. Not only that, but the United Empire Loyalists were never adequately compensated for their losses during the war or for their subsequent removal. If that territory had been preserved for us, what a difference it would have made in the link that connects our east and west. We would not have had to carry our commerce along the bleak, inhospitable north shore of Lake Superior with no settlement between Kenora and North Bay—no people, no commerce—nothing but rocks and the dead haul for our railways. If we had that territory, we would have continuous settlement from the east to the west, and every pound of freight from the east to the west or from the west to the east would have been carried at a much lower rate because of the local population.

Another legacy we got from that treaty was the fisheries dispute, which we are still fighting over, with our modus vivendi and reference to the Hague Tribunal. The fishery concessions of the treaty of 1783 were abrogated by the war of 1812. During the negotiations for peace the United States tried to get a re-acknowledgment of the fishery rights. England refused to grant it without compensation. There was no agreement. In 1818 new negotiations for a commercial treaty were launched, and the United States got a renewal of those fishery rights. This gives them the right to fish within the three-mile limit of some shores in some places; and now the United States claim that we have no right to make regulations to govern this industry, and, according to press reports, the question is going to the Hague Tribunal. Lord Shelburne, who was at that time in power in Great Britain, believed that by giving them those rights over our fisheries he was preserving the friendship of the United States. Franklin's remark, 'You know that we shall bring the greatest part of the fish to Great Britain to pay for your manufactures,' was too much for him, and we have suffered from that day to this for his credulity. Colonel Coffin wrote a pamphlet on this question. In it he says:

> Canada, like a rabbit vivisected in the interest of science, has over and over again been placed on the table of diplomacy and vivisectetd in the interests of the empire.

The next treaty is the Ashburton Treaty of 1842 to settle the boundary between New Brunswick and Maine. The lion hauled the rail fence north once again, and a perusal of the correspondence shows that Ashburton did not have the interests of Canada at heart or have any idea of the value of the country he gave away. When his attention, after the treaty, was called to Franklin's red line on what is known as the Jared Sparks map, he said he was glad his attention had not been drawn to an overwhelming bit of evidence in his favour so that he did not have to consider it at the negotiations. If this piece of Maine had not been given away, the Canadian Pacific Railway could have run through an all Canadian route, and the Grand Trunk Railway would have been two hundred miles shorter to say nothing of our own road the Intercolonial Railway.

Let me now give you the opinion of one whom nobody would consider an anti-imperialist, on this question. Sir Sanford Fleming, in his history of the Intercolonial Railway, on page 234, says:

> The boundary question, no pleasant page in our records, might have been briefly passed over: The consideration of it adds little to national pride or national satisfaction. But when we find that railway connection with the nearest British Atlantic port is now attained by traversing twice the distance which, under a just settlement of that question, would have been necessary, the subject prominently presents itself; and the events which led to this condition of affairs claim investigation that could not be avoided.
>
> At this date we look back with bewilderment at the extraordinary series of negotiations which ended in the establishment of the Maine boundary—a result which converted undoubted British territory into foreign soil, which alienated the allegiance of thousands of British subjects without their consent, and which made a direct connection on our own soil between central Canada and the Atlantic an impossibility.... No Canadian can reflect, without pain and humiliation, on the sacrifice of British interests in the settlement that was made.

Sir Sanford Fleming can hardly be charged with not being an imperialist. When the Ashburton Treaty was completed, a large number of Canadians had their allegiance changed in a single night to the United States, without a word of say in the matter.

In 1846, when the Oregon treaty was negotiated, the lion again pulled another section of the rail fence northward. We should have had the whole of the country west of the rockies and north of the Columbia river and could have had it in 1818, as any one who has read Twiss on this question can see. The United States practically offered that in 1818, but Great Britain did not accept and from that time on the United States, in the word of Twiss 'increased their claims and reduced their concessions while Great Britain 'decreased her claims and advanced her concessions,' until in 1846 they surrendered the whole contention and gave the United States the magnificent state of Washington and the most of Oregon including the whole of Puget Sound, a territory which to-day has 1,500,000 souls.

The next treaty is that of 1871. There were general negotiations with Sir John A. Macdonald as Canada's representative. The United States put forward the Alabama claims, and after a good deal of talk England paid fifteen millions. At this time Sir John insisted on payment of claims for the Fenian raids, but was overruled by his colleagues, who said these claims were distasteful to the United States and that insistence on them would prevent ratification of a treaty by the United States because of the Irish vote. England offered to pay these claims herself. Sir John, of course refused, but he compromised with England by getting her to endorse Canadian bonds. I just mentioned this to show that we got no protection from England against the United States, and that England acknowledged herself unable to obtain any for us. At this time Sir John wanted to use our fisheries as means of getting trade reciprocity with the United States, but his policy was overruled by his English colleagues who sold our fisheries for a term of years to the Untied States for a cash consideration.

In the life of Sir John Macdonald by Mr. Joseph Pope. volume 2, page 105, will be found some correspondence which passed between Sir John and his government. Sir John wrote as follows :

I must say that I am greatly disappointed at the course taken by the British commissioners. They seem to have only one thing on their minds—that is, to go home to England with a treaty in their pockets, settling everything, no matter at what cost to Canada. I was at first a good deal encouraged because both Northcote and Bernard stood by me against any permanent cession of the fisheries, but the four have since gone together against me.

Again, on page 108, I find he wrote:

We had rather a warm discussion on the subject, in which, as usual, I stood alone.

And on page 117 :

That was intolerable that these New England fishermen should say they were resolved to fish in our waters right or wrong, and if not allowed would force on a war between the two nations; and we ought not to sacrifice our property by reason of such threats. That, as there was an anti-colonial party in England, so was there an annexation party in Canada; and if we were told that England was afraid or unwilling to protect us in the enjoyment of our undoubted rights, not from fear of the American government or the American people, but from fear of the Gloucester fishermen, that party would gain great strength in Canada and perhaps imperil the connection with the mother country. That in case such connection was severed, the consequence, in my opinion, would be annexation to the United States.

Again on page 124:

The absurd attempts of the United States commissioners to depreciate the value of our fisheries would be ridiculous if they were not so annoying. They found our English friends so squeezeable in nature that their audacity has grown beyond all bounds.

These extracts give the opinion of the then First Minister of Canada. The order in council which his government passed, shortly after his return from Washington, contains his opinions on the subject and shows how completely the rights of Canada were disregarded even when we had our own representative, for the first time in our history, treating, in concert with the British with the United States representatives. The dealings of Canada with the United States through Great Britain remind one very much of the story of the prodigal son. The son that stayed at home and did everything he should, got nothing. but for the wayward prodigal son they killed the fatted calf, and we might say with the elder brother : Though I have stayed at home for years, you never killed a fatted calf for me or even gave me a kid that I might make merry with my friends.

We had another treaty—the Russian treaty of 1825. In this the Russians followed their traditional policy and captured all the sea coast down to the Portland canal, the net result of which is that nearly a hundred years later I find myself in parliament representing a Canadian constituency, but unable to reach Ottawa without crossing that strip that Great Britain gave to Russia. There is no doubt in my mind that a little attention to the wording of the treaty at that time would have given us a seaport on the Lynn canal instead of the northern part of British Columbia and the Yukon being closed out from direct access to the sea. And this treaty of 1825 laid the foundation for that treaty of 1903 and the Alverstone award, and again our interests were sacrificed and the Lion drew our rail fence a little farther northeast and stretched it so far that it was near the breaking point. One more instance of that kind, and the fracture could not be repaired. Great Britain accepted the tribunal of six—an impossible court, three on each side—and it was left to the Chief Justice of Great Britain to throw

us down. It is fresh in the memory of all that the tribunal was to consist of three impartial jurists of repute on either side. And you remember whom the United States sent. One was Mr. Root, who had said that the United States case was so clear that the United States would not send it to court. The second was Mr. Lodge, who said that the President should be praised for not making concessions. And the third was Mr. Turner, who was from the state of Washington, the state most deeply interested. Canada objected to this tribunal and the men the United States appointed, and asked reconsideration of the whole subject. But Great Britain paid absolutely no attention to the protest, and proceeded to exchange ratifications, and replied to Canada's protest by saying that arbitrators appropriate to the altered conditions should now be named. Canada refused to adopt the suggestion and the original idea of appointing three judges was carried out. These were Chief Justice Alverstone, Chief Justice Armour and Sir Louis Jette. Judge Armour dying, Mr. Aylesworth, who had been offered a judgeship and declined, was appointed in his place.

Mr. LAKE. May I ask the hon. gentleman: Who nominated these three arbitrators and why did Canada, 'of course,' refuse to follow the advice of Great Britain?

Mr. THOMPSON. I said that Great Britain refused to follow the advice of Canada. Canada objected to the court, and asked that the whole subject be reconsidered. But Great Britain paid no attention, exchanged ratification and went on. Then, Canada appointed the three judges as she had originally intended. I may point out that in every one of these cases where we have gone against the United States, we have lost. It may have been our own fault, but I do not quite see it.

Mr. LENNOX. It was in this last case.

Mr. THOMPSON. The United States are still playing the same old game. All they have to do is to get Great Britain to appoint the arbitrators and the case goes against Canada. There were three points involved in this case.

1. Did the boundary cross the inlets or go around the heads?

2. Did the boundary go north or south of four islands at the mouth of the Portland canal?

3. What distance was the boundary from the coast?

Now, regarding the islands, there was no argument, written or spoken, that the boundary could be anywhere but north of all four islands or south of all four islands. Compromise was not thought of. Yet this is what Chief Justice Alverstone did—he divided the islands, giving Canada two and the United States two, and the two he gave to the United States stand guard over our territory to the south command the Portland canal, and the approach to our new city, Prince Rupert. He did this without consulting his colleagues. In the interview which was given on October 1, 1903, by the Canadian commissioners, Mr. Aylesworth and Sir Louis Jette, and which will be found in the London 'Times,' these gentlemen make the absolute statement that Chief Justice Alverstone had sided with them and that he changed his judgment without consulting them. Here again Great Britain had an opportunity to protect us and give us a port on the Lynn canal. But she again sided with the United States, and we have for ever lost our outlet to the sea at that point.

We hear a great deal about the protection afforded to Canada by the British army and navy. Well, we have done our own protecting. Had it not been for our loyalty to the empire, we should have long ago become part of the United States as Great Britain wanted us to do. We helped Great Britain instead of her helping us. And if we had to-day the territory which she gave away, we could afford to build a navy as good as her own. This may seem a strong statement. But when I tell you that these five states have a population of seventeen and a half millions, and that the section of the Pacific coast which she gave away has a million and half, you will see what it means—five of the most populous states in the Union and perhaps five of the wealthiest. Every time we have had a quarrel with the United States, Great Britain has decided against us. There cannot be a doubt in the mind of any man that if we had negotiated the Oswald-Franklin treaty, we should not have lost the five states of Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan and Wisconsin. Or, if we had negotiated the Ashburton treaty, we should not now be hauling our goods around the dog tooth of Maine. Or, if we had been negotiating the Oregon treaty, we should not have been shut out of Puget Sound, or in the Alverstone award, we would have come away with a free port on the Lynn canal. Our fisheries claims were mixed up with the Alabama claims, and I have shown the results. Great Britain's policy has necessarily been a world policy, while that of Canada, of course, has been a Canadian policy, and must be a Canadian policy for a long time to come. That is where we lose—Great Britain takes the world view while we take the Canadian view. What is the position in which we find ourselves to-day? We are a colony of Great Britain and Great Britain is an ally of Japan. The United States, a few weeks ago, was on the verge of war with Japan. What would be our position if that war should take place? There cannot be any doubt in the mind of any Canadian where we should find ourselves. We could not fight against the United States to allow the Japanese to come into Canada. People who

think realize that things are approaching a crisis. This nation of Japan is just awakening. She is armed with the most modern weapons of warfare; she has an army organized on the plan of the German army; and navy, armed, munitioned and planned on the lines of the British navy. She is not to be ignored, and our treatment of her shows it. We say we will tax every Chinaman who enters Canada $500. Do we say that to the Japanese? Of course, we do not. Why? Our premier told us practically why—we cannot afford to. Japan has an army and a navy; she is a live factor in the forces of the east. The United States policy and the Canadian policy with regard to the Japanese are identical. Neither country can afford to allow these orientals to enter their shores. I do not object to the merchant or the student, but the Japanese labourers shall not and must not come to Canada. Nor can they come to the United States. Suppose that the United States and Japan were to go to war, we are a colony of Great Britain and Great Britain is the ally of Japan. The treaty says that these two great powers join to keep Corea inviolate for Japan, and to keep England's sphere of influence in China inviolate. And, in the future we can see the possibility of England looking to her Indian frontier, and, if necessity arises, she would expect Japan to help her to protect it against Russia. Of course, we would not necessarily be drawn into war if the territory of the United States and that of Japan were kept intact. But it is also very probable that, in case of such a war, Japan would attack Alaska in order to secure a base on this American continent.

The United States government are expending some $80,000,000 to-day in making a great naval base at Cavite, in the Philippines. These are actual facts. If Japan attacked that base, Mr. Speaker, the United States and Canada would be at war, because Canada is a colony of Great Britain and Great Britain is an ally of Japan. Now in that event, is there a man in Canada who would side with Great Britain as against the United states? There may be one man, there may be a very few men, but the great majority of Canadians would side with the United States, not necessarily to join the United States, not necessarily to become annexed to the United States, but to form an alliance with the United States to protect our Pacific coast. These are facts. You may say that Great Britain does not mean anything by her alliance with Japan, and that if Japan and the United States were to go to war she would immediately withdraw from her alliance with Japan. I do not know, but I think the treaty would preclude her from doing that, if she were to live up to it. Now how is Great Britain protecting us to-day? We have not a British soldier on Canadian soil, and not a British warship in Canadian waters. She has withdrawn her fleet from our shores and her garrisons from our land. Has the British navy ever defended us? Mr. John S. Ewart discussed this question in a very ably written pamphlet entitled 'A perplexed Imperialist.' On page 33 he says:

> Our growth has been rapid in proportion to the extent to which we have ousted Downing street and been permitted to manage our own affairs. The navy has had no share in the making of us. And if the suggestion intended is that the British navy took Canada from France, the professor is very much mistaken.

He is replying to Prof. Leacock:

> Our forefathers who used to live in the American colonies had much to do with that. The British army, too, had some share in it, but should we still pay tribute to the British army?
>
> In what sense does the British navy defend us? Twice only in the history of British North America has the British navy taken part for us or against us, and on both occasions it was against us—siding once illegally with the French against the Newfoundlanders, and siding again with the Americans against the British Columbia sealers.
>
> 'Defend us!' When and where? Not in time of peace. And not in any war that we were in the slightest degree responsible for.
>
> We have never had a war, although we have fought several (including two in Canada) which the United Kingdom got itself into. We have had indeed various quarrels with the United States, but the British navy never helped us in one of them—British diplomacy always settled them for us, and usually by the easy process of concession of our rights.

Again, in a letter to the Toronto 'Globe,' discussing the Japanese invasion, he says:

> In the summer of 1886, when Canadian vessels were being seized by United States cruisers, for no cause in the world but taking seals in the open ocean among the waves that Britannia rules, 'military friends' and others were not wanting to point out what a very comfortable possession the British navy was—what would Canada do without it? The answer, apart from familiarity with Canadian history, was difficult; but to those who knew the past, the situation was perfectly simple—it was but another case to be settled, not by British warships at all but once more, by British diplomacy.
>
> And so the seizures went on, and the British navy bobbed comfortably at anchor at Esquimalt. Our schooners were swept from the sea and sent to Sitka, and the captains fined and imprisoned, while Lord Salisbury protested, and the rear-admiral sent him such news as came to his ears.
>
> In the following year (1887) the rear-admiral telegraphed that the seizures had recommenced. Lord Salisbury expressed surprise, and told his ambassador at Washington to 'make a representation to the United States government'; while Canadians did as best they could without the British navy.
>
> By 1888 diplomacy had gone so far towards surrender that the United States cruisers were instructed not to seize but to threaten

merely, and that they did, while the British navy bobbed at Esquimalt.

Diplomacies having halted a little, the seizures began again in 1889, the British navy still continuing to enjoy itself at Esquimalt. Canada however, was becoming a little restive, and her Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir C. H. Tupper) told Lord Salisbury that he failed 'to appreciate not merely any reason for the long delay in obtaining satisfaction for the aggressive and hostile action exercised against British subjects and British property by the United States, but also for the wanton continuance of this treatment.' Lord Salisbury was immovable, and told Canada that he 'proposes to wait Sir Julian's report before deciding as to what further steps should be taken in the matter,' beyond 'discussing the question with Mr. Blaine.'

Diplomacies proceeded, and Canadians, becoming at length thoroughly exasperated, openly threatened to defend themselves as well as they could, in that way hoping to put some end to an intolerable situation. Lord Salisbury thereupon formally warned the United States that he would 'leave to the United States government the responsibility of the consequences of further interference,' and the United States in return entered a protest against the course of the British government. Diplomacies were hurried, and, surrender being well in sight, the United States cruisers were once more told to frighten us (if possible) but not to seize. Out again, in 1890, went the sealers and the United States cruisers; while the British navy continued to bob at Esquimalt.

In 1891 diplomacies produced a British Act of parliament enabling Lord Salisbury to prohibit Canadian sealers from operating in certain parts of the ocean, and away went the British warships to help the United States cruisers to seize our schooners. The British navy had at last been called into active service—probably it was not as active as it might have been, for the job was a mean one, and the Nymph reported that 'the fogs greatly aided the sealing schooners in escaping observation.'

The rest of the diplomacies are well known. Lord Salisbury agrees that the question of British rights in the open ocean (a matter too clear for argument) should be referred to arbitration, and he agreed, too, mark this, what the arbitrators held that the United States had not right to interfere with Canadians on the high seas, then the arbitrators should regulate the manner in which Canadians should exercise their rights. (I was going to say, 'Was there ever such a surrender?' But I should have had to add, 'Yes, several of them').

The arbitration proceeded. Of course it was held that Canadians had perfect freedom to do as they wished on the open ocean; but, of course, the British arbitrator agreed in imposing limitations upon the way in which Canadians should behave themselves—limitations against which the Canadian arbitrator fruitlessly protested.

Now, observe the result of all this diplomatizing. To-day Canada cannot go sealing at certain seasons of the year, or in certain places, or with certain apparatus; but Japanese, with a fleet half the size of the United States, and quite negligible as compared with the British navy, can do as they please, and do it.

As the hon. gentleman from Comox-Atlin (Mr. Sloan) has told us to-night, that is the way we have been defended by the British navy. Mr. Speaker, let us be honest about this matter and acknowledge the corn. The British navy has not protected us; we have been protected by what is known as the Canning doctrine in England and the Monroe doctrine in the United States. The doctrine is one of the great national doctrines of the United States, and has never been dissented from by Great Britain who originated it. Secretary Root attended the Pan American Conference at Rio de Janeiro, in 1905, as the representative of the United States. In an address he gave at that conference he said:

> We (the United States) wish no victories except those of peace, no territory except our own and no sovereignty except sovereignty over ourselves, which we deem independence. . . He congratulated the conference on the near approach of the time 'when the recognized possessors of every foot of soil on the American continents' could be represented with acknowledged rights as equal sovereign states at the great world congress at the Hague, and this he added: 'will be the formal and final acceptance of the declaration that no part of the American continent is to be deemed subject to colonization.'

This Monroe doctrine or the Canning doctrine, originated by George Canning, was directed as much against Russia at that time as it was against Spain in the South American continent whose colonies were rebelling against her and making towards independence and Russia because she was pushing her claims down the Pacific sea coast. To-day we have no British warships nearer than the China station in the far east or the channel station in the near east. But the United States fleet is creeping up the Pacific, passing Chili and Valparaiso and there is very little doubt in my mind that the Japanese question is settled as it is to-day because of that fact. It is the greatest armament I suppose that has put to sea since the Spanish Armada. It has traversed the Atlantic coast, passed through the Straits of Magellan and is now going up the Pacific. That fact I think has had a very salutory effect upon our friends the Japanese.

We say we make our own treaties! We do not make our own treaties, nor can we. You will find that the French treaties of 1907 and 1893, are made between the Monarch of Great Britain and the President of the French Republic. The historian will not refer to any treaty made by Canada. We can never act in anything but a subservient capacity so long as we are in our present position. Would we make such a treaty with Japan as Great Britain did? I do not think so. Europe is still an armed camp and yet Mr. Chamberlain asked us

what we would do in case Great Britain went to war with a European power. Mr. Ewart in his book speaks of four different kinds of treaties, war treaties, commercial treaties, extradition treaties, and settlement of disputes treaties. There is no doubt that we cannot make a war treaty. We may send representatives to negotiate a commercial treaty but other people sign it. Of course we sign it too but it is not our signature that complete the treaty making, it is the signatures of the representatives of Great Britain. Our extradition and settlement of disputes treaties are made for us by Great Britain. We cannot enforce a treaty, and how can we make a treaty if we cannot enforce it.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the objection to Great Britain signing if the treaty suits us ?

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no objection if the hon. gentleman is satisfied. I think there are many people in Canada who are not quite satisfied that it suits us. If we are content to go on in this position for ever, it is all right, but there are some of us who are not content.

To-day we find ourselves in possession of the northern half of this North American continent, and from here to the Straits of Magellan there are only four other countries, on the North and South American continents, holding allegiance to any European power. These are British Guiana, Dutch Guiana, French Guiana, and British Honduras. I am not referring to the West Indies, the islands in the Gulf or to Newfoundland. The population of thsee combined countries is less than half a million souls. We see the republics of North and South America getting on very well without navies or armies because they are protected by the Munroe doctrine of the United States. Has the United States taken any of them? What about Cuba and the Philippines. Secretary Taft recently wrote a report for the Senate. This report is referred to in Collier's 'Weekly' as follows :

President Roosevelt has definitely set up Philippine independence, or at least the liberty of the Filipinos to determine whether they shall be independent or not, as the goal of our efforts in the islands. In transmitting to Congress an elaborate report by Secretary Taft upon the state of our Asiatic colony, he observes that when the islanders have become fit for self-government it will be their duty to decide 'whether this self-government shall be accompanied by complete independence.' But he thinks that they have yet a long way to travel before they come to that stage, and that 'it will probably be a generation, it may even be longer, before this point is reached.' Still he considers the end desirable, and hopes that it will be reached as soon as possible 'for the sake of the Filipinos and for our own sake.'

We know the history of America, north and south ; it is from colony to republic, to independence of European power. We must remember that Great Britain of to-day is not the Great Britain of twenty-five years ago, is not the Great Britain, is not the England of the time of Disraeli and Gladstone, it is the England of the suffragette the radical, the labourite, the socialist, with her House of Lords question, and we know from our own bitter experience and that of Newfoundland that we cannot hope for very much from Great Britain in the way of protection as against the United States. She values the friendship of the United States to such an extent that it seems to me she is prepared to sacrifice our interests every time to those of our great neighbour. Of course, when you consider that these two nations are great commercial nations, that one has 40,000,000 people and the other 80,000,000 people, that their interchange of commerce is enormous, that they belong to the same race and speak the same language, and between them practically control the world, while we are only a colony of some six millions struggling along, perhaps it is not strange; but it seems to me it is a mania with England to protect the United States as against Canada. Mr. Ewart in his book sums up the question. He says :

Summarizing thus far, we have ascertained (1) that Canada holds her power as the gift of a parliament which may augment, diminish or abolish it, at will; (2) that she has no power at all over a great variety of subjects; (3) that she has no part in the declaration of war or peace; (4) that, practically, she can make such commercial arrangements with foreign nations as she pleases; (5) that extradition treaties are made for her, and (6) that her situation with reference to settlement-of-disputes treaties be unsatisfactory. But our survey of Canada's powers is yet incomplete, for we have still to notice the control which our Federation Act gives to Downing street over those subjects of legislation which are within our legislative jurisdiction. Even as to them we are far from sovereign.

I consider that our present position is absolutely untenable and that it is impossible for any length of time. It is a position of subserviency and a very irksome position to many Canadians. To use Parkman's words :

If the colonies are permanently content with their present political status they are unworthy of the source from which they spring.

I say it is absolutely impossible for a section of the Anglo-Saxon race to go on as we are in this Dominion. We are a martial race and the martial spirit of the race is waning here because we are depening on the British navy and depending on the British army and not depending on ourselves. I say that the time has come when we should have a navy of our own; not a great navy like the United States, nor Germany, nor Great Britain, nor even Italy, but the nucleus of a navy which in time

will protect our shores against intrusion. What is the remedy? The remedy is that we should be lifted from this position of subserviency and placed in a position of absolute equality, as we have a right to be, with any nation on the face of the earth. And so long as we remain in our present dependence upon the British empire we shall never have that quality. If we can work out a scheme of independence within the empire all right, but it must be independence in some form. The position we now occupy is an ignoble one; it is unworthy of the people of this country. The independence I would like is the independence that would give our laws their final sanction here, and under which our own law courts would be the final tribunal of appeal. If you could work out a scheme like the Greeks worked out in the Archean League it might do; if you could work out a scheme such as Norway and Sweden worked out under which we would be joint powers that might do or the present system of Austria-Hungary. But at the present time what I object to is that a Canadian should be in a subservient position to an Englishman, or an Irishman, or a Scotchman, or a Welshman. It is a position nature did not intend we should hold. It is not for me to work out a scheme for this empire; it is for the men who are in charge of the various branches of the legislature in Canada and in Great Britain. But I see that the present condition is an absolutely impossible one. Austria-Hungary has a working alliance of two states of equal power with one sovereign. It might be possible to give effect to that system here; I do not know. Hermann Merrivale, quoted by Mr. Ewart in his pamphlet, says:

> The mere political link of sovereignty may remain by amicable consent long after the colony has required sufficient strength to stand alone. Existing relations may be observed by very slight sacrifices on terms of mutual good will, but this can only be done by the gradual relaxation of the ties of dependence; the Union must become more and more less of a protective character and more of a federated character.

If a scheme could be worked out whereby we could be the equal of the Britisher at home and not be considered a colonial any more, whereby we could go to the capital of the empire and be considered the equals of the citizens of the United States, I am willing, but to continue the present position of subserviency goes against my grain as it does against the grain of many other Canadians.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The speech which has just been delivered by my hon. friend (Mr. Thompson) has opened up very wide vistas. He has presented what he calls the inferiority, but which I would rather call the anomaly of the position we at present occupy in the British empire. That there are many anomalies I am prepared to agree, but my hon. friend has refrained from suggesting any remedy for the conditions which he now deplores. If he and I were for a moment to review British history together we would find in the course of many centuries anomalies of all kind in the British constitution, and we would also find that these anomalies were allowed to remain unremedied until such time as they had become an actual grievance. I would therefore suggest to my hon. friend, and in this I think I will be endorsed by every member of the House, that although there are many things in our present relations with the empire which are inconsistent and which are anomalous, yet on the whole our position is very satisfactory, and we have no grievance whatever in respect to our relations with the mother country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I agree with my hon. friend that in many things it would be possible to make amendment without going the length of any radical measures. For instance, in the treaty-making power I am not prepared to agree with my hon. friend that our position is one of subserviency. It is true that our position is not one of paramount power, and so long as we remain as we are at present under the British Crown the treaty-making power must remain with the British Crown. That is to say, that since we are not an independent or a sovereign power, negotiations and treaty making between Canada and other nations must be carried on through the instrumentality of the British Crown, and it is the British Crown in the last resort which must be responsible to the foreign nation with which we deal. But we must reflect that under the present conditions, in all treaties which effect us we are either consulted or we are not involved in any treaty unless our assent is given previously to it, and in connection with the commercial treaties we are allowed to negotiate absolutely with a foreign power and prescribe the terms under which we wish to deal with her. When we consider this I do not know that there is any serious grievance. Indeed, for my part I would go further and say that there is no grievance whatever; certainly there is no subserviency. The position may not be an ideal one, but again, let it be remembered that there are many things in the British constitution which though they may not be logical are essentially practical and which have saved the British people from the revolutions and from the turmoil which have desolated other lands. However, we have had a very interesting discussion on the subject brought before the House by my hon. friend, and we can well take his remarks to heart and reflect upon them, especially that part which

he has devoted to the new conditions which have arisen on the Pacific ocean. What he has said with respect to that is food for thought; very serious thought. The events which may arise on the Pacific ocean cannot escape the attention of any man who is a patriot and deems it his duty to give consideration to matters which concern his country. Luckily I do not take the very serious view which my hon. friend takes of the impending danger which may threaten our relations on the Pacific ocean. I believe on the contrary that the diplomacy of Great Britain in this matter has been far-seeing and that it will exempt us from the many troubles which my hon. friend anticipates. I believe moreover that it is probable that in this matter of the relations between the Oriental races and the Caucasian races in America we will gradually in the future, as we have when occasion required it in the past, evolve a system which will be satisfactory to all and which will maintain our dignity and the dignity of our new neighbour, the Japanese empire.

My hon. friend from Comox-Atlin (Mr. Sloan) earlier in the evening called our attention to the subject which is of great and immediate importance—of very immediate importance I might say. He has spoken of the position of the British pelagic sealers on the Pacific ocean. Our position in this respect is very unsatisfactory at this moment as has been stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Sloan). In 1886 the American authorities took the ground that they had the ownership of the seal; that they belonged to them exclusivey; that nobody but them had a right to take the seals whether on land or on sea, and then proceeded to seize the boats of several Canadians who were engaged in the very legitimate occupation of taking seals on the high seas.

The pretension which was set up by the Americans was untenable from the first. The matter was referred to a board of arbitration which sat at Paris, and the position which we took, that the Americans had no right of ownership in Behring sea, was upheld to the full. At the same time the tribunal laid down regulations for the catching of seals. The Americans represented that if pelagic sealing were allowed to be carried on unchecked and unrestricted, the result must be the destruction of the seal herds in a very few years. The Americans have this advantage over us with regard to the killing of seals. They are the owners of certain islands which are called the rookeries of these animals, and, exercising the right of killing seals on these islands, they can select the animals and kill only the young males, whereas in pelagic sealing the killing must be indiscriminate. It is impossible for the sealer who kills at sea to see whether the animal he kills is a male or a female, so that he often kills females, and gravid females at that. Therefore, the contention of the Americans at Paris was that unless pelagic sealing were restricted, the indiscriminate destruction would result fatally to the herds. With the view of preventing the indiscriminate destruction of seals, the Paris tribunal made certain rules which were intended to preserve the herds. The sealers were not to be allowed to approach the rookeries of the Pribyloff islands nearer than sixty miles; they were not to be allowed to kill seals on the high seas in the months of May, June and July; they were not to be allowed to use firearms. By means of these restrictions it was thought that the herds would be preserved. But since then something has taken place which was not at all contemplated. At that time it was not supposed that anybody but British sealers would engage in pelagic sealing, especially those coming from British Columbia, to whom, up to that time, the industry was confined. But since that time the Japanese have gone into the business, and now have some twenty-five vessels engaged in that occupation; and they can, with impunity, seal all the year round without observing any of the restrictions imposed on British sealers. While the British sealer is not allowed to go nearer than sixty miles of the Pribyloff islands, the Japanese sealer can go within three miles of the same islands. While the British sealer cannot pursue the industry in the months of May, June and July, the Japanese sealer may do so without any restriction all the year round. While the British sealer is not allowed to use firearms, the Japanese sealer is not restricted in his weapons, but can use any kind that he pleases. In these respects the Japanese sealer has an immense advantage over the British sealer. I may say that the Americans do not allow pelagic sealing by their own people. It is evident that if the Japanese are allowed to carry on the industry unrestricted, as at present, the day is not far distant when the whole herd will disappear. In fact, it has been said by the hon. member for Comox and Atlin (Mr. Sloan) that at the present rate of killing the whole seal industry will be destroyed in five years. There is only too much ground for apprehension of this contingency. Under the present circumstances, what is to be done? It has been suggested that Canada should go in with the United States to have some restriction put upon pelagic sealing and even upon the killing of seals on land. This is a matter on which I am not prepared at this moment to offer any observation; it is a matter that may come up for negotiation between Canada, Great Britain, the United States and perhaps some other nations. I may say to my hon. friend from Comox that the matter is engaging the attention of the present government, but more than this I do not think I would be justified in saying at the present moment.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, having listened with a great deal

of interest to the discussion which has taken place this evening, I would like to point out to my hon. friend from Comox and Atlin (Mr. Wm. Sloan) something that seems to follow from the very clear exposition he has made to us. The hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Thompson), after having discussed the particular question treated by my hon. friend from British Columbia, went into a lengthy exposition, which, I must say, interested me greatly. He has drawn the attention of the House for the first time since I have had a seat in it to very important questions ; and many of the grievances which he complains of are, in my estimation, matters of history. It is difficult, however, to suggest a remedy for the very serious problems which he has placed before us. Nor has he suggested any special means of reconciling what he very properly calls the Canadian interest with the world interest of the empire. Anybody who has followed public events in this country during the last ten years must have been struck with the distinction between that interest which is essentially ours and the interests of the empire at large ; and however attached one may be to the empire, the possibility of clashing between these two interests must have suggested itself very often to the minds of many of us during that time. While much has been said in the way of statements of fact by my hon. friend from the Yukon, he has, I think, failed to attach that amount of blame which necessarily belongs to us in the failure of many of these negotiations. I believe that we have very often suffered in the negotiation of treaties either through too much confidence in the Imperial government or simply through neglect of our own interests. We have not brought to bear on the negotiations that pressure which it was our duty to bring to bear in order to secure fair treatment.

If you take up Hodgins' very able exposition of all that has taken place in the way of treaties between Great Britain and the United States since the first negotiations in Paris after the revolution, you cannot help concluding that since confederation at least, we have been wanting a great deal in our own efforts to attend to our own interests. Leaving for the moment aside, what my hon. friend from the Yukon (Mr. Thompson) has referred to, because he has opened up the consideration of some very vast questions which I shall not take up the time of the House in dealing with to-day and which require serious reflection and consideration. —I must say that although my hon. friend from Comox and Atlin (Mr. Sloan) has exposed the difficulty in which our sealers are situated and has very properly given no political colour to his argument, it must have occurred to any one who listened to him that on that very question we ourselves have been most negligent. He almost said so himself when he blamed very severely the British government for having concluded a treaty with Japan in 1894 without having endeavoured to secure the adherence of Japan to the regulations laid down, under the award of 1896, in the arbitration between the United States and Great Britain. Was Great Britain at fault in not, at that moment, having endeavoured to carry out her own guaranty that she, as well as the United States, would do her best to secure the adhesion to these regulations of all the great powers interested in the Pacific ? I subscribe willingly to the allegation that England should not have concluded that treaty without making at least some diplomatic effort to secure that adherence which means so much to Canada, and which have saved our sealers from the distress in which they now find themselves. But, as my hon. friend from Yukon (Mr. Thompson) has said Great Britain at that moment had far larger interests to serve than were bound up in the business of our sealers or the interests of British Columbia. Her whole eastern empire was involved in the arrangement with Japan, and it is natural to believe that, having secured what was most vital, she may have overlooked a matter which, viewed from the imperial or world standpoint, was of comparatively of little consequence. But what shall we say about our own adherence, twelve years later, to the treaty of 1904 ? To my mind, without wishing to give in any sense a political colour to the discussion, that ought to be a lesson to us. Twelve years after 1894, after the grievances of our sealers had been intensified, after the Japanese had entered fully into the sealing industry, after they had, according to the statements of my hon. friends from British Columbia, practically refused or at any rate given evasive replies to the pressure and demands made upon them to adhere to these regulations. after they showed that they were not willing to be bound by those regulations, and consequently could go within three miles of the shores of the Pribyloff islands, whereas we ourselves were kept by the regulations sixty miles outside—after all that, what did we do ? We gave our adherence to that treaty without making a single request or making the slightest endeavour to obtain as consideration that Japan should give her adherence to those regulations.

Mr. SLOAN. Does the hon. gentleman maintain that Canada was in a position to demand the freedom of the seas to Canadian subjects ?

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend must have heard what the first minister said a few moments ago. We negotiate through Great Britain. Before negotiating with regard to the treaty made with Japan, could we not have called on Great Britain to make these representations to the Japanese ? Who was it desired our adhesion to the treaty—we or Japan ? There can be no doubt it was Japan. It was she desired our adherence to

the treaty of 1894. Japan desired to develop commercial relations with Canada and to have her subjects given free access to Canada. By whom were the great efforts made for the conclusion of the British convention of 1906 ? By the Japanese Consul here. It was Japan which wanted that convention of 1906. And it seems to me that after having suffered during twelve years the grievance which my hon. friend has exposed, we should have taken up this position. We should have said to Japan : We are prepared to treat amicably with you and will make a commercial convention which will ensure the freest interchange of commerce and also enable your people to enter our country under certain conditions, but you must first accept those regulations. Would not that have been a logical position for us to take ? What did the United States do some years ago when we began negotiations for the settlement of all difficulties between the two countries ? The commission which was appointed to settle those difficulties was told that before proceeding any further, the Alaska question must be settled. And we had to accede to that condition, and that question was referred to arbitration, with the result we all know.

What is the position to-day as regards Japan? Under terms of the convention of 1906, the Japanese have free and unrestrained access to Canada just as if they were Canadians. Modifications by diplomacy, and visits and requests, I understand, have been made; but the restriction to that number which is named in the treaty depends upon what? Upon the good will of Japan itself. And Japan has stated, in answering our requests—because we have gone begging to them : We will endeavour to restrict emigration to Canada, in so far as our dignity and the terms of the treaty will warrant. In other words, we are dependent upon them. It is true that we have passed a regulation. But, Mr. Speaker, it remains to be seen what force that regulation has. We have passed that regulation in imitation of the United States, which country passed a law forbidding indirect immigration. They are able, under the law, to exclude Japanese who come from Hawaii. But what gave them the power to pass that law? We all know it. If my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) wishes to see an explanation of it better far than any I could give, he has only to turn to one of the latest numbers of 'La Revue des Deux Mondes,' where it is clearly shown that the Americans derive that power from the terms of their treaty, in which, as hon. members will recollect, it is stated that they keep the power to make police and restrictive regulations in regard to immigration. This, as the author points out, is a police regulation. They have made a police law which obliges the Japanese to come directly from their country. We have no such restriction under our treaty. And I, for one, doubt very much if, even with the best intentions on the part of Japan, we shall be able to enforce an order in council which has no basis whatever in a treaty, since this treaty subsists. But, in regard to the particular grievance which my hon. friend (Mr. Sloan) has brought out this evening, it seems to me that we are led inevitably to the conclusion, that it was our duty, before concluding that treaty, at least to have made some effort, to have taken some tentative action at least, to obtain what would have cleared the situation—the adherence of Japan to the regulation made in Paris in 1896. The government, I am sure, can show no diligence whatever in that regard. No attempt was made. There was not even a demand or representation made to Japan, to this effect: You want to make a treaty with us; our own people are suffering because you will not adhere to reasonable regulations ; now, accept these regulations, and we will conclude a treaty with you. If my hon. friend from Yukon (Mr. Thompson) is right, when he says that we must have a more important part in the future in the conclusion of all treaties both of commerce and of settlement, surely this should be a lesson to us that, in the regions of diplomacy, we have very much to learn, and should not in future conclude treaties of the nature of this one which has been so criticised during the present session, without giving to them full consideration and making sure that we have secured from the nations dealing with us all possible advantages and the cure of all reasonable grievances.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I do not rise to deal with the observations made by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) on the Japanese question. But I cannot refrain from expressing regret that my hon. frined from Yukon (Mr. Thompson), in the very interesting speech he gave us, seemed to reach a conclusion which, I am afraid, might be misunderstood abroad, and which might receive an interpretation which he himself would not be willing to have given it. I wish to say frankly that the question is too big to be approached in a hurried way. But before the debate closes, I would like to say, that, notwithstanding that misunderstandings have from time to time existed between the imperial government and the government and parliament of Canada; notwithstanding that friction occasionally arises—and how could we expect to avoid friction in the affairs of such a vast empire as the British empire—notwithstanding irritation that may occasionally result from these treaty negotiations to which my hon. friend has referred; still, after all is said and done, it is my judgment that there is no number of persons in this Dominion of Canada who look for any radical change in our situation; there is no number of persons in this Do-

minion who do not feel that it is our intention to continue as we are, a portion of the British empire. Now, that should be a mere truism. And yet I have a fear that, when an hon. gentleman rises in this House and raises a doubt as to whether or not it is wise for us to continue in our present condition, though we understand that he is raising a very interesting question and discussing it in a very fair way—and I am far from saying that these questions should not be discussed—yet there is a possibility that the speech of the hon. gentleman may be misunderstood and misinterpreted and create the impression that, in this Dominion, there is some section of our people, possibly, that is dissatisfied with our position in the empire. My opinion is—of course I do not pretend that it is more than an opinion—that there is no such number of people; and, though these misunderstandings have existed in the past, and may exist in the future, they will not affect the determination of this people to be as they have been, a portion of the great British empire. Changes undoubtedly will come; but not radical changes. The British constitution has proved its marvellous adaptability to the changing conditions of the people; and, from time to time, as new conditions arise, the statesmen of the empire have proved that they can adapt themselves to these changes of conditions. It has been so in the past; it is so to-day; it will be so in the future. I only rise to say what, I am sure, must be in the mind of every hon. gentleman in this House, that while we are glad to see any hon. gentleman deal with these questions, looking at them fairly and pointing out causes of difficulty, yet we should regard it as a misfortune for the impression to get abroad that there is any considerable portion of the people of this Dominion who look for a change in our position. Irrespective of party, we are proud to belong to the British empire, and there are none who look for change in that respect.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). So far as I might be permitted to voice the sentiments of some people of Canada, I can heartily agree with the expression of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding). I frankly declare that I believe this to be the sentiment of the Canadian people as a whole. Reflections may be made upon the government of the time—and I do not apply this to one party or the other just now—for I believe that our difficulty is rather from the negligence of the government for the time being than from any action of the British people. For, while they have a world-wide diplomacy to keep in mind in carrying on these negotiations, we have a greater interest than they have. In carrying on these negotiations, we had a greater individual interest than they had, and yet we have not always shown as great an interest in our own affairs as the British people have done.

Mr. FIELDING.

It did seem to me when we were invited by Great Britain to agree to that treaty with Japan, that it was the best opportunity we could have had to make our representations with regard to fur sealing in the Pacific ocean, and with regard to immigration from Japan and from China. But notwithstanding the great interest we had at stake, in the negotiations for the treaty in 1892, which were finally concluded in 1906, I think there is not on record a single letter or representation to England showing the desirability of drawing Japan's attention to these questions that were of such vital importance to us. We had a valuable trade in the fisheries out there ; we had such an interest, one would imagine, as should induce the Canadian government to make strong representations to England that our rights should be preserved and protected. A similar effort might have been made to get Japan to agree with the other powers that were interested in the seal fisheries, to some regulations that would preserve this important trade in the future. But nothing was done by the Canadian government. So I think we have ourselves as much to blame as we have the British government.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). With regard to the point which has been made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), I think they are entirely mistaken. The negotiations with regard to the Japanese treaty between Great Britain and Japan took place in 1893 and 1894, and if I remember right, the treaty was signed early in 1894.

Mr. SPROULE. The negotiations took place in 1892, I think.

Mr. BRODEUR. But the treaty was signed early in 1894. At that time there was no question of the Japanese going into the islands of the Behring sea to catch seals. They had not begun to take part in that industry ; it was several years later that they started in to take part in the seal fisheries.

Mr. MONK. That is not what we heard from the hon. member for Comox-Atlin (Mr. Sloan).

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think the hon. member for Comox-Atlin stated that the seal fishery was carried on in 1894 by the Japanese.

Mr. SLOAN. In 1902 they gave a bonus to encourage pelagic sealing.

Mr. BRODEUR. No sealing had been carried on before, so when the treaty was negotiated between Japan and Great Britain the question of sealing could not have been considered because it did not exist as regards Japan.

Mr. MONK. I understood the hon. member for Comox-Atlin to say that Sir Julian Pauncefote's attention had been called to this matter by Mr. Gresham, before the treaty of 1894.

Mr. BRODEUR. No. My hon. friend will remember perhaps the negotiations that took place after the Paris award, which was made in 1894. As a result of the Paris award, the governments of the United States and Great Britain undertook to get all the nations, I think there were thirty-four of them, not only Russia and Japan, to participate in that treaty and to declare that seal fishing should not be carried on within sixty miles of the Pribyloff islands. Therefore, I say that my hon. friend has no right to state that British diplomacy has been remiss in failing to settle that question with Japan, because there was no such question then in existence, it began to appear later on.

Mr. SPROULE. I referred more particularly to the time when Canada was invited to come in under that treaty.

Mr. BRODEUR. Coming to that point, the hon. gentleman asks why did we adhere to the Japanese treaty in 1905 and 1906, and get it ratified by parliament in 1907? And why did we not then ask the British government to invite the Japanese government to assent to the proposition which had been made previously? Well, in the first place, this matter had to be undertaken jointly by Great Britain and the United States. It was a condition of the Paris award of 1894 that these two countries jointly should approach all the maritime countries, France, Russia, Norway, Sweden, Belgium, Germany, Italy, in fact nearly all the countries in the world asking them to accept the Paris award. This was one of the conditions of the treaty. It could not have been undertaken by one people only, it had to be undertaken by both the United States and Great Britain.

Mr. MONK. The hon. member for Comox-Atlin explained to us that the United States had communicated with Japan.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think he quoted a despatch signed by the two countries, asking the other countries to adhere to the treaty. Among the answers given by the other countries I remember the one given by Belgium, replying that they had nothing to do with the seal business, that they had never sent any vessel there, and did not understand why they should be called upon to participate in a treaty in which they had no interest whatever. Then the hon. gentleman asked, Why did you not take up the question with the Japanese authorities when you accepted the treaty in 1904? We had to accept this treaty as it had been drawn, or to reject it. This treaty concerned certain subjects, it had to be accepted with regard to those subjects in toto or rejected in toto. Was it advisable for us to accept that treaty as it was? I think it was, and that was the unanimous opinion of this parliament. This parliament declared unanimously last year that it was right for Canada to accept the treaty as it was. Of course, it would be much better if all these treaties could be negotiated by representatives of Canada. I do not say that they should be passed in the name of Canada, for we have no right to make treaties, all treaties have to be made by the King and signed by plenipotentiaries appointed by the King. My reason for saying that it would be better if these treaties were negotiated by Canada, is because we know exactly what would be best for Canadian interests, what we should concede and what we should get. We knew very well what we should ask. Something in those trade treaties which might be very useful for Great Britain might not be so useful for us. However, if the treaties made by Great Britain provide that they will have to be accepted by the colonies later on, the colonies have to accept or reject them in toto. We have no discretion to insert new conditions and clauses.

Mr. SPROULE. Surely you would have the right to make representations.

Mr. BRODEUR. Suppose we should make representations, would that change the condition whether the treaty should be accepted or not? In the treaty with Japan we find a stipulation that it will not apply to Canada unless there is an exchange later on of ratifications between Great Britain and Japan. If Canada could have negotiated with Japan, well and good; but they had no right to negotiate, they could simply accept the treaty as it was. I think my hon. friend was wrong when he declared that Great Britain in 1894 should have made it a condition of that treaty. The treaty did not at all concern the question of fisheries, but had reference to the political and trade relations between the two countries. So I declare that Great Britain should not be blamed for not having discussed this question then with Japan, because, according to the Paris award, this question was to be settled by joint note from Great Britain and the United States. Besides, when we came to accept the treaty with Japan it was a question of accepting it in toto or rejecting it in toto.

Mr. MONK. Did they make any representations to Japan, before accepting the treaty, as to this matter?

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh yes, negotiations took place concerning the seal fisheries, representations were made to the British government to have this question settled.

Mr. MONK. Before accepting the treaty of 1894 this government made no represen-

tations to Japan as to the advisability of accepting it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am quite sure there were representations to Great Britain several times concerning this question. We have represented to Great Britain the advisability of settling this question.

Mr. MONK. It does not appear in the correspondence.

Mr. BRODEUR. And there were negotiations with the United States on that point.

Mr. MONK. We had all the correspondence in reference to the treaty and there is no mention of it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly; I did not say it was in reference to that treaty. I said that representations had been made again and again to have this question settled in the most expeditious way possible and this treaty did not refer at all to the question of seal fisheries. It was another question which was dealt with in another way.

Mr. SPROULE. When the minister says we had to accept it or reject it, were we not advised by England that we might consider the question of restricting immigration? That was a variation from it, therefore it was not a fact that we could not import or suggest other questions that might be settled without finally accepting that treaty.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know exactly the purport of the correspondence exchanged between the two governments but I do not think it goes as far as my hon. friend suggests. I see by the treaty itself that we have to accept it in toto or reject it in toto. This question of seal fisheries is one that has always been dealt with between Great Britain and Canada and between the United States and Great Britain and Japan and the United States and Great Britain in a different way.

My hon. friend has referred to the seizure of the 'Carlotta G. Fox.' This was a seizure made by the United States authorities under the provisions of the Paris Award Treaty. It was made because this boat was supposed to be fishing in violation of the treaty. If I remember rightly the facts brought to the knowledge of the department, it was stated that the boat was about thirty or forty miles from the Pribyloff Islands.

Mr. SLOAN. She was probably nine hundred miles from the Pribyloff islands.

Mr. BRODEUR. They were supposed to be fishing in violation of the Paris Award Treaty.

Mr. SLOAN. That was the charge.

Mr. BRODEUR. Under the dispositions of that treaty a vessel found fishing in contravention of the treaty may be seized by the American authorities and is handed over to the British authorities to be dealt with by the Court of Admiralty. In this case the vessel was handed over by the United States authorities to the commander of the 'Quadra,' who put her in the hands of the customs authorities at Victoria; and I understand the trial is going on as to whether that vessel has been seized legally, or, in other words if there was a violation of the treaty of 1894. This case is taken charge of by the British authorities and the Canadian government has nothing to do with it. The only connection we had with the case was that the vessel was handed over to one of our vessels and was given up to the British authorities to be dealt with in the ordinary course.

Mr. THOMPSON. Might I be permitted to say a few words in reply to the Minister of Finance?

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course it will be only with leave of the House. The only motion before the House is the motion to go into Supply and on that the hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. FIELDING. Go on.

Mr. THOMPSON. I realize that the subject which I brought to the attention of the House is in what might be called the academic stage. The present position of the British empire is the result of evolution. I brought up the discussion, having in view the imperial conference which will again take place in a few years, and having in view also the fact that this evolutionary process is going on. The question having been brought up, may be thought out by men in and out of the House so that at that conference and afterwards, Canada may have her place among the nations of the world as the fathers of confederation intended she should.

Mr. SLOAN. May I be permitted to offer a word of explanation in connection with the seizure of the 'Carlotta G. Fox.'

Mr. SPEAKER. It would have to be in the same way, with the permission of the House.

Mr. SLOAN. The minister stated that this vessel was seized for sealing during the closed months, May, June and July. She was not seized in the act of sealing, she was seized after an inspection of the skins on board her by an American officer, on May 29, the point being that some six of these skins appeared to this officer to be too fresh to have been caught before the commencement of the twenty-nine days which had elapsed since the beginning of the close season, that is that six of the skins seemed to have been caught after the 1st of May.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Minister of Finance intend to do much work to-night?

Mr. FIELDING. I thought my hon. friend came in fresh and was anxious to work.

Mr. FOSTER. He came in, but he did not come fresh.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no desire to sit late, but I thought we might make a moderate amount of progress and then adjourn.

To provide for the maintenance of vessels employed in patrolling the waters in the northern portion of Canada, also for establishing and maintaining police and customs ports on the mainland or islands as may be deemed necessary from time to time, $50,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The discussion on the 'Arctic' will come under this item.

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

Mr. FOSTER. There is a little dispute on the item for the maintenance and repairs to government steamers and ice-breakers, but we may let these items pass, with the exception of the one now called, on the understanding that a general discussion will be allowed on the items later.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The others are passed.

Mr. FOSTER. The resolution is not passed. So far as I am concerned, all I would require is to hold over that item and let the others go through, on the understanding that there should be a general discussion allowed later, and especially with reference to the 'Arctic.'

Mr. BRODEUR. We have been three days on this resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. If the minister wishes he can take three days more, but there is information we ask for, and we cannot allow this item to be passed until we get that information.

Mr. BRODEUR. What is the information?

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to the minister's travelling expenses and the reorganization of the accountant's department. The minister has simply jollied us along promising and promising this information, but his promises have not come to performance.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend has not been here, and he does not know that my travelling expenses have been brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. Which ones?

Mr. BRODEUR. My travelling expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. Three returns were asked for, and one has been brought down and the others have not.

Mr. BRODEUR. The return with reference to the travelling expenses of the different ministers at the Colonial Conference has not been brought down, I understand, but the return as to my travelling expenses has been brought down, and in it are included my expenses at the Colonial Conference. The information with reference to all my expenses is brought down, and it is no reason why these estimates should be held up that the returns with reference to the travelling expenses of other ministers are not brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. Three important returns affecting the minister and his department have been asked for, and only one has been brought down. It could have been brought down in five minutes, but they have been held for nearly two months now.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is mistaken. All the information with reference to my travelling expenses and the travelling expenses of my secretary and of the messenger has been brought down. As far as I am concerned, the hon. gentleman cannot be any better informed if the other returns were brought down.

Mr. SPROULE. There was another reason why I made the request that this item of $50,000 should stand. I said that we had got no information in regard to what the vessel patrolling the northern waters of Canada was doing, what it had done in the past, what it was costing, and what good purpose was being served by it. I know that some of our friends desire to get that information.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am ready to give it. It has not been asked of me, because we are asked not to let one item pass. I want to know whether we are going to proceed in that way. We have been four days in three weeks on this resolution 209, and we have not passed one item yet.

Mr. SPROULE. We have passed a good many items of the resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has not correctly stated the case. What I said was true, that there are three orders by the House, and the minister has brought down the answer to one, but not the answers to the other two. They all refer to himself and to his department. The return with reference to the accounting has been asked for, for two months. He tries to have his estimates passed because he brought down the statement with regard to his travelling expenses for a certain limited period, but not for an entirely different period.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not for a different period. The hon. gentleman's first resolution asked for my expenditures for the last

two or three years, and the statement has been brought down. In addition to that, he has made another motion for the expenses of the ministers who attended the Colonial Conference.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not discussing that to-night at all.

Mr BRODEUR. I know that it is well understood that hon. gentlemen opposite will not let us pass any of these estimates, and I want to put the facts fairly before the House and the country. My hon. friend has been asking for a statement of my travelling expenses in connection with the Colonial Conference. That statement is included in the return which has been brought down. He has probably not read it. He will find there a statement of all the travelling expenses incurred during the last two or three years, in accordance with the motion he made. I do not know what other information he could get so far as I am concerned, if the other return were brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. The other returns include a different period entirely.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Will the minister explain an item in the Auditor General's Report at page P—7: 'R. A. Wiallard, private secretary, advance, to be accounted for, $1,000.' Perhaps the minister will explain the details of that—whether it was for money in France, in England or in Canada.

Mr. BRODEUR. At the Colonial Conference.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Then how is it that that $1,000 is charged to the year ending March 31, 1907? I believe the minister did not leave here until after March 31.

Mr. BRODEUR. The money was advanced during the fiscal year 1906-7, and was charged to that year. We started for the Colonial Conference two or three days after this money was advanced.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I think the minister should explain how that $1,000 was expended, and why it was expended.

Mr. BRODEUR. The money was advanced just before the close of the last fiscal year, and when the Auditor General prepared his report he had to state that it was to be accounted for, because my secretary was then absent.

Mr. FOSTER. I have here the record of the two motions with reference to the expenses. To one of them an answer has been brought down; and to the other no answer has been brought down, and they cover different periods. One is for travelling expenses of the minister and his private secretary to December 31, 1907. To that no answer has been brought down. The other was for travelling expenses of Mr. Wiallard, private secretary, and the messenger Potvin since June 30, 1906. To that an answer has been brought. The second one has been brought down but not the first.

Mr. BRODEUR. I was not then Minister of the Inland Revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to discuss the minister's travelling expenses from the time he began his wild career of expenditure. It is all of one piece and had better all be discussed together. The whole expenditure is what I consider the most extravagant ever made by any minister in this House. We had a force of men imported to prepare an accounting system. We had men imported from New York to do this at enormous expense, and the minister who incurs such expense should put the information before the House before he asks the House to pass his estimates.

Mr. MONK. I am anxious to advance the work of passing the estimates, but to ask the House to vote large sums of money, when we have not the returns ordered long ago, when we have not the return with reference to the manner of accounting and the return with reference to the travelling expenses of the minister, is unfair.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am surprised to see my hon. friend so much exercised. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said a few minutes ago he had asked for the travelling expenses of the minister and they had not been brought down. I was sure they had been. He said he had asked for them long ago and had not yet seen them. Now he finds that the expenditures from 1906 to the 31st December 1907 have been brought down, but he finds he made another motion for two years before that and he wants that return brought down. I was not aware of it. If it is so important that these two years expenses, which do not concern the Inland Revenue Department, should be brought down, I will see that they are brought down at once. As regards the accounting system, my hon. friends have no idea of the amount of work done. The report is ready.

Mr. FOSTER. You told us that two or three weeks ago.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, I said it was being copied, and I found out, when it was brought before me on Saturday, that some of the reports were missing. There were forty-seven reports in all. I asked where the missing ones were and they have been searching for them in the department in order to complete the lot. I will bring those down which are copied, if absolutely necessary, to-morrow.

Mr. MONK. We have had over $40,000 spent in the organizing of this new system of accounting. We ordered the report to show what was done, and we insist on seeing that report before proceeding.

Mr. BRODEUR. But why not pass the items which have absolutely nothing to do with that system of accounting? The reason is because hon. gentlemen opposite do not want to let any items pass.

Mr. MONK. That is not the case so far as I am concerned.

Mr. BENNETT. The following items appear in the Auditor General's Report:

Advance to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself on his departure for the old country, $2,915; paid Nap. Potvin, messenger, $150; paid E. A. Willard, private secretary, $1,000; paid a lump sum of $4,000 to the minister on the occasion of the Colonial Conference; paid cabs, &c., $733; total, $8,798.

Time and again the minister promised to explain this expenditure, of $8,798 but every night we are in the same position and have no information. The minister should give a full account of this whole expenditure.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am ready to do it, and it has been brought down too. My hon. friend will find in the return all the details he requires.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister ought to be reasonable enough and intelligent enough to see this. By his own confession, he declared before the House and the country that his whole department was disorganized and in such a mess, so far as the accounting was concerned, that he had to bring in a force from abroad to get the thing right.

Mr. BRODEUR. I never said that.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what the hon. gentleman did and acts are more emphatic than words. That confession came as a surprise. With our Finance Department, with our old accountants, with our men trained in our methods, it was extraordinary that we had to go to New York and import high priced men and give them a blanket contract, under which they went to work and got third-rate men and paid them first-class prices. It cost about $50,000 to the department, not one cent of which should have been spent. We ought to have men enough in the department to put our books and accounts in the best of shape. In any case we need not have gone to New York for them but could have found them easily in Ottawa. Three weeks ago the minister told us the report was ready to be copied, and now it is in just the same position and we have not got it. The minister's personal expenses are the essence of the whole matter. They furnish a criterion of his whole administration just as the system of accounting is equally an indication of efficient or non-efficient business management and proper administration or the reverse, because it is only by an effective system that we can trace the expenditure of the millions we vote. We would therefore be perfectly right in refusing to pass a single item until we have these two essentials fully explained to us. More than that, according to the information we have—and all the information has not yet been brought down—the minister himself is in the habit of drawing large sums and keeping them in his own pocket for months and months and using them for his own purposes, and then when called to book by the Audit Department making a refund. Why should he carry around the people's money? The very moment he has spent what he needs, he should give back to the treasury what he does not need. In doing what he has done, he is setting a vicious example to every accountant in every branch of the service. He is setting them the example of over drawing and keeping the money and using it for their own purposes and only refunding when compelled to. That sort of thing touches the minister and his department so vitally that we would be perfectly justified in objecting to voting him another dollar until he has cleared it up.

The minister began his extravagant course the moment he got into the saddle—boosted into it by some circumstances unknown to me. And, as Speaker of this House, his expenditure was on a scale of extravagance which had never been equalled by any man who preceded him, and certainly has not been copied by his successor. As head of a department, he has gone on in the same way. We on this side have been careful not to be picayune in discussing minister's expenses. But the thing has reached a pitch at which it must be discussed and this extravagance stopped. It is becoming a scandal. Ministers have been, in effect, adding to their salaries by taking expense money more than they could reasonably require. For a minister is not to live like a nabob. He has to maintain a fair dignity, but not to supplement his salary by extraordinary expenses. It may not have been done, but it looks like it. And we want to see these things and know whether there is a basis for it or not. I think there is a basis for it.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) makes the statement that I have been in the habit of taking money from the public chest and using that money for my own purposes, and have been obliged to refund a part of that money. That is the charge he has made.

Mr. FOSTER. You are pretty close to it.

Mr. BRODEUR. That charge is entirely unfounded, and the hon. gentleman knows it.

Mr. FOSTER. I can prove it, and I will prove it to the House.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a statement that is absolutely incorrect. And the facts before him show conclusively that he is not correct, the insinuation he makes is wholly unworthy of him. When I was to leave for

England, no money had been voted for the colonial conference. But there was another vote upon which I could properly draw for travelling expenses. I drew money from that vote, and when the vote for the colonial conference was given to me. I handed back part of the money which had been drawn from the other appropriation. I was going abroad to represent my country in an important matter. My belief is that, when a minister of the Crown goes abroad on such a mission, he must represent his country in a dignified way. If I were going again, I would do the same thing, for I would not represent my country abroad in such a way as to bring discredit upon her. That may be the policy of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) but it is not mine, and I believe that the country will approve of my policy in this matter.

Mr. BENNETT. Was the $4,000 vote from the conference money made prior to the vote of $2,915 that appears at page P—29 of the Auditor General's Report?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, but long after. The vote for the colonial conference was made several months after we left.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as I am concerned, I propose to stand by what I said, but not by what the minister said I said. I said the minister has been in the habit of drawing on account of expenses, larger sums of money than he needed to use, keeping that money for months and then giving it back into the treasury. What he uses it for, I do not know. But I say that a minister has no right to draw more money than he is going to use for the occasion on account of which he draws it. He has no right to draw $2,000 when he needs only $1,000, and keep the extra $1,000 for months before putting it back in the treasury. And the minister has just told us, in plain English words that he took $4,000 voted by parliament for a different purpose, and then, when he got the money from the right appropriation, he paid it back. Surely he must see into what inextricable confusion it would drag the public accounts if other ministers were to follow his example. Money is voted by parliament for a purpose duly described in the vote, and the minister has no right to take that money for a purpose entirely different. The more the hon. gentleman speaks about it the deeper he gets in the quagmire.

Mr. BRODEUR. Not at all. The money that I took was voted for a purpose in connection with which I had to go to the other side of the Atlantic. So, I had a perfect right to take it. I took $2,000 out of that vote, and, when the other appropriation was given, I reimbursed the first account. So, it was a mere question of bookkeeping.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. BRODEUR. A mere question of bookkeeping, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows it very well. He tries to throw some dirt upon me to discredit me in the country.

Mr. FOSTER. I am trying to brush off what the hon. minister has thrown upon himself.

Mr. BRODEUR. I never used for my own purposes the money of anybody else entrusted to me. The money I took I had a right to take. It was used in the public interest. I did not use it for any illegitimate purpose and I have not been obliged to reimburse any money. My hon. friend wants the country to believe that I have been keeping in my pocket for months money which I did not need. He knows very well that his statement is entirely incorrect. I spent for the public interest all the money which I got.

Mr. FOSTER. The more the minister reasons about it the worse he makes his case. Does he stand up as a minister in parliament and say that if parliament makes a vote of $150,000 for ice breakers, he has a right to take $50,000 of that and devote it to an absolutely different purpose, provided that some time in the future he repays it? Does he say that?

Mr. BRODEUR. What I say is this: There is a sum of money voted for ice-breakers. I have to go to Europe to look after the construction of an ice-breaker, and am I not entitled to get out of that vote a certain sum of money for travelling expenses? I say I have, and that is what I did. When my hon. friend goes so far as to charge me with dishonesty in this connection, he does a most unfair thing, a thing entirely unworthy of himself. Now he insinuates that I have kept some money in my pocket, that I have been using for a speculative purpose or some thing of that kind, money that was put into my hands. If there is anybody who can do that, it is not myself; perhaps my hon. friend knows somebody who can do it.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend puts to me this question: If I have $150,000 voted for ice-breaking and if I have to go to Europe, can I take two or three thousand dollars of that to pay my expenses to the colonial conference?

Mr. GALLIHER. He did not say that.

Mr. FOSTER. He said he had not a vote available for his expenses to the colonial conference, and so he took it out of the $150,000 that was voted, not for expenses to the colonial conference but for ice-breaking, and he tries to justify it because he had got a vote of money for ice-breaking. He had a right to take out of that just as much and no more than he spent on his trip with reference to ice-breaking machinery. But the minister himself stated that he used the money because he had not a vote available for the conference.

Mr. BOLE. Then how otherwise could he go to the conference ?

Mr. FOSTER. He could stay at home. There was a way in which he could get the money, but he did not get it, because he has been used to do that sort of thing.

Mr. BOLE. That is an unfair statement.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) tell me why it is unfair ?

Mr. BOLE. You have been making unfair statements right straight along. You stated that the minister had taken money out of his pocket to do a certain thing, and has used it for his own purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. I never said the minister had taken money out of his pocket and used it for any purpose. I stated that he took it out of another vote and used it for an entirely different matter.

Mr. GALLIHER. What the minister said when he was last on his feet was this, in answer to the charge that he had no right to use any of this money that was voted for ice-breaking. If a sum of money has been voted for ice-breaking, and if in connection with that work I have to go to Europe, am I not justified in taking the expense out of that vote ?

Mr. FOSTER. The minister said that not having any money with which to go to the conference he took it out of this ice-breaking vote. I ask my hon. friend whether he spent on travelling expenses, or intended to spend on travelling expenses for the ice-breaking business, $3,000 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I did not take $3,000, I took $2,000 and I spent $1,500.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I ask the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) if there is not some quibbling in this discussion. My colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, was going to Europe to the conference. He has told us also that apart from the conference he had to look after an ice-breaking patent, a new system. If he had not gone to Europe for one purpose he would have had to go for another purpose. Therefore he had two objects in going to Europe. He had a special vote authorizing him to go as a member of the conference, and he had a general appropriation for ice-breaking. Now my hon. friend the minister is not a millionaire ; he had occasion to go to Europe and he had no money in his pocket. The vote for the conference was not available, and so he took the money out of the vote for ice-breaking. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) objects to that. If the minister had gone to Europe on the ice-breaking business alone, my hon. friend would have had nothing to say.

Mr. FOSTER. Not as to the principle. But if he took $4,000 and only intended to spend $1,000, I think he took too much.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My colleague went to Europe for two purposes. If he had charged for the two purposes so much out of one vote and so much out of the other, he might have been open to criticism. He did not make two trips for the two purposes, he made only one trip, and what did it matter whether he charged the expenses to one appropriation or to the other ? I do not see anything wrong in that. The hon. gentleman may criticise the amount, but as to the manner in which the money was expended, I think my hon. friend from North Toronto is quibbling. If the money had been available when my colleague left Canada for the conference, probably he would have taken his expenses out of that money, but it was not available, and he took it from another source.

Mr. FOSTER. My right hon. friend does not see the point. I do not think there should be any laxness or any elasticity shown by a minister administering a department. He takes an appropriation list as it is made for him by an Act of parliament, and finds $100,000 devoted to the building of a wharf at a certain point, and $50,000 for the building of an armoury. I do not think there can be too much scrupulous care taken by a minister administering a department to see that he does not take one dollar out of the vote for the armoury and subvert the will of parliament by using that money for any other purpose whatever. I think that is proper ground to take. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not seem to see the distinction. He would have a perfect right, if he had a vote of $100,000 for ice-breaking, to take out of that what was necessary for his expenses to Europe in regard to ice-breaking. For the minister to take $2.000 or $3,000 out of the ice-breaking vote and devote it to an entirely different purpose is, to say the least, to introduce a very loose system into the supervision of the expenditure. When he paid his travelling expenses by telling the transportation companies to send in their bills to Ottawa what did he need of $2,000 cash to take him to London ? He did not need it to take him over nor did he need it while he was in England at the conference. The British government paid all bills and treated him like a prince. He talks about his dignity and my lack of dignity. I do not think that a lavish expenditure of money is very much of a fountain of dignity or a proper means of showing dignity. There is no reason for the minister in the months he was the guest of the British government in London having or spending $2,000, and he never spent $2,000 of that on legitimate expenses connected with this country. Why did he need to take so much ? He would not be away from all money centres, he would not be in Central Africa, or even East Africa. He would be right alongside the Bank of Montreal, he could step into the Bank of Montreal any

day and get $50, or $100 or $500. His vote would mature the moment parliament rose and he could check out from the vote the amount he had drawn. There was no excuse for his taking so much or taking it from a different appropriation. I, as a member of the opposition, and the Prime Minister as leader of this House, should stand squarely on the ground that when parliament appropriated money for a certain purpose, that is the only purpose for which the money should be used.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The principles laid down by my hon. friend are right. I agree with him that whenever an appropriation is made for a certain purpose, it should not be diverted from that purpose; but my hon. friend goes so far on that principle that he falls into another error. Not only is he hypercritical but he lays down a doctrine which I believe on reflection he will not be prepared to carry out. He says if the minister wanted money in advance of his vote in London, he could go to the Bank of Montreal and get money. Will my hon. friend tell us that the minister can, in advance of a vote get money from the Bank of Montreal?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that. If the Prime Minister understood me to say that he understood me to say a thing I did not mean. A minister has no more right to get money as a minister than a private party has. What I said was that suppose the minister had reasoned that after having paid all transportation bills, after having landed himself in the heart of London as the guest of the British government for a month or a month and a half or two months with all expenses paid, would it not have been the proper thing for him to have taken say $1,000 out of the ice-breaking vote, which he would probably have to spend making his ice-breaking investigations, and if he did not spend it all he could have refunded the rest. Before the expiry of the two months his own vote would be through and he could then have drawn on that vote in the bank for the conference purposes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am glad my hon. friend did not persist in that statement and that I did not understand him correctly; but when he reads 'Hansard" to-morrow I think he will see that he went perilously near to saying what I understood. I would ask my hon. friend to place himself in the position of my honoured colleague. He was summoned by parliament to go to London for the conference, but if he had not gone for the conference he would have gone in connection with the ice-breakers. He is not blessed with much surplus cash, he wanted money voted by parliament. The money for the conference was not available, but the money for the ice-breaking was. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) says that if he had taken only a portion of this $2,000 from the ice-breaking appropriation and the balance from the conference vote, that might have been right. My hon. friend will see that this is hypercritical. The minister did not want to break the law and therefore took money from an appropriation which he had a perfect right to take at that moment. Therefore if he did it, it does not matter much whether he took $1,000, more or less. The principle that when money is voted for a certain purpose, it should be devoted to that purpose only, is perfectly right, but my hon. friend is carrying his criticism quite beyond the limits of fair and legitimate criticism.

Mr. FOSTER. We will each have his opinion on that point.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly.

Mr. LENNOX. The principle has been clearly defined that the minister can take from the ice-breaking fund whatever amount he can fairly charge to it, and no more. The main purpose of his trip was to attend the conference. From that he went to Germany to investigate ice-breaking and whatever money could be fairly charged to the ice-breaking fund could be so charged and no more, allowing of course a fair margin. He could not honestly take from any vote anything which must necessarily be refunded; he could take what would be enough and ample, but must not take an amount of money that would involve a necessary refund to that particular source.

Mr. FOSTER. What he knew would be a necessary refund.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes. It cannot be said that when we voted $150,000 for ice-breaking we contemplated that the minister would draw from that fund such expenses as we find on page P—29:

Advance to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for trip to England, $2,000; ocean fares of ministers and party, Canada to England, $890; sleepers to St. John, $25.

Will the First Minister say that was contemplated? That is where the quibbling comes in.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is a further sum of $1,150 charged to the same vote for other travelling expenses.

Mr. LENNOX. Can it be said with any degree of common sense that $3,000 could be honestly taken out of this vote to pay the expenses of a trip to England for the minister and his party? Surely it was never contemplated by us when we voted the appropriation for ice-breakers that the money would be applied to any such purpose as that. The Prime Minister will have to look to the Minister of Marine to find the quibble. If the minister said squarely that he had not the legal right to do this we might be disposed to view it more leniently, but we cannot but protest when he seeks to defend it on indefensible ground.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The whole thing seems to me to narrow itself into very technical limits. My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) laid down a principle which the hon. member (Mr. Foster) will agree with me that he cannot maintain when he said the Minister of Marine could not draw one cent more than he needed.

Mr. LENNOX. I expressly took care to say nothing of the kind. I said he should draw what he reasonably contemplated he would spend and if $800 were required he might draw $1,000. but he must not draw what he knew would not be required.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the minister drew too much and did not expend it he would refund it. When a vote of that kind is taken the amount is placed in the hands of the minister and if he spends it all well and good, but if he does not spend it all he refunds the balance. It seems to me that my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) is too hypercritical. As to the manner in which the minister drew the money he endeavoured to obey the law and the only question remaining is as to whether the amount of the expenses should be criticised. I do not pretend to be an authority on financial matters and I have great respect for the opinion of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) on such questions, but it seems to me that he has exceeded the limits of fair criticism in this matter.

Mr. BLAIN. When this money was voted for the ice-breaking service there was not a word said about the proposed trip of the minister to the old country. I do not believe that the minister had any right to take a dollar of that money to be expended on such a trip. It is a dangerous policy and one that will lead to a great deal of criticism in this House and will not be endorsed by the people of the country. To say that the minister can take the expenses of a trip to England out of a half a dozen different appropriations made for other purposes is a dangerous principle, and I do not think it can be found in the history of this parliament that such a thing was done before. It does not come suddenly to a minister that he has to leave Otttawa and go to Europe, and if a minister has to take a trip there to look after the interests of the Dominion the parliament of Canada has a right to vote him a liberal amount so that he may discharge his duties with honour to himself and the country. But no right thinking men will endorse the principle that because he has to discharge duties connected with different branches he should divide up his expenses and take it out of different votes which were never intended for that object. Such a thing should not be tolerated.

Mr. MONK. I am not as old a parliamentarian as many gentlemen who have spoken on this question, but if the principle laid down by the Minister of Marine is adopted I can see that there is not a single vote in the estimates of the department out of which he could not take his expenses for a trip to Europe. This vote was taken for the purchase of ice-breakers and not one word was said when the vote was going through as to the necessity for a trip to Europe.

Mr. GALLIHER. This ice-breaking business is a new thing in this country and surely my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will admit that this fact could be taken into contemplation by the House when the vote was assented to.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister should have explained what he was asking the money for.

Mr. GALLIHER. Surely it might be considered by the House when the vote was taken that whatever was necessary to make the new enterprise a success might be done by the minister. Let me give as an example, a city which is entering upon some municipal work, a new sewer system we will say. A by-law is passed, a certain sum is voted for that purpose, and surely it is in contemplation of the citizens who vote the money that it may be necessary for the mayor and some of the councilmen to go to other cities to obtain information in order that the best possible system may be obtained.

Mr. MONK. Well, it is a matter of appreciation. Although I do not think our administration in Montreal is a model one, it does not send people to visit American cities without special authority. A few dollars are not to be seriously considered; but when we authorize a sufficient amount to purchase an ice-breaker, I do not think that involves a special trip to Europe in connection with it. This is a dangerous principle and one which I would never admit in the case of the present minister. When these estimates are put before the House, they should always be accompanied, as is the case in England, with a short statement of the purposes to which the money is to be devoted. I thoroughly coincide with the contention made this evening that we ought to have full explanations of the large expenditure made in connection with the reform of the accounting of this department. The absence of information regarding the expenses of the minister is to my mind a valid reason for postponing these estimates. Indeed, I think it is a piece of impertinence and cheek for the minister to ask us to vote $50,000 without giving us these reports. Let him give them to us, and he will find me at any rate perfectly willing to go on with the estimates.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I find that the item of $1,000 charged to R. A. Willard, private

secretary, is charged in two places, at page P—7 and page P—29. I think there should be an explanation by the minister why that is charged twice.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not charged twice. At page P—7 the details are given of the charge made at page P—29 ; but it is only one charge.

Mr. TAYLOR. That $1,150 never should have been taken out of the money appropriated for the purchase of the steamer. That is on a par with the money he drew for himself. It is contrary to all the rules of parliament. The item we are discussing is this $50,000 for patrolling the northern waters, which comes under the general item 209 of maintenance and repairs. All the other items under this head have been passed except these two, and these will not be passed until the minister brings down the papers ordered by parliament. These two items are the ones with reference to the minister's travelling expenses and the system of accounting, the return regarding which the minister said was ready a few days ago, but when the latter came before him there was something wrong in it and it had to be revised.

Mr. BRODEUR. Some reports were missing.

Mr. TAYLOR. No doubt it had to be revised and will have to be many times before it meets the approval of the House. The minister has an item in the Auditor General's Report indicating that a gentleman from Montreal, Mr. Kenneth Falconer, expert, is the party who did this work. And he is put down at a remuneration of $40 a day, on page 77 of the Auditor General's Report. The next item is James N. Gunn at $75 per day and W. B. Richards at $75 per day. I have in my hand the firm name of the gentlemen who began this work. They are Gunn, Richards & Company, production engineers and public accountants, First National Bank Building, Chicago. But this item is put in here to show that it was a Montreal man, Mr. Falconer, who did the work. Why, it was done by little bits of boys worth $10 a week, and we are paying $40 a day for these besides travelling expenses and hotel bills. Nearly every one of the staff was allowed travelling expenses from New York to Ottawa and his board bill. The whole thing is a swindle from start to finish. And it is put down in the Auditor General's Report in such a way as to make us believe that a man from Montreal did the work at $40 a day.

Mr. FOSTER. Another example of the middleman getting the rake-off.

Mr. TAYLOR. And they had a boy, who was paid $500 a year, drawing $30 a day from this government for doing the work. I know the boy well and the company well. I know the parties who made the bargain with this minister, and the expenditure is smuggled into the Auditor General's Report as if the work was done by a man from Montreal at $40 a day.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is a reflection on the minister. We should have an investigation.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is a reflection on the department. I do not know whether it was the present minister or his predecessor who began this deal, but there is evidently a rake-off in it for somebody. We want the papers down, and until he complies with the order of the House and produces these papers, we shall not pass the item.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have said that to-morrow I will bring down everything that you need.

Mr. FOSTER. Then let the item stand.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have always been very anxious to produce all the papers in connection with the expert accounting. The circumstances which originated this are these. During the investigation in the Public Accounts Committee in the session of 1906, it was shown that in some cases there were discrepancies in the accounts. I am not sure whether they were mistakes made by the officers of the department or whether they were due to the system of book-keeping, but it was established that the accounts were not properly kept, and I was anxious that the book-keeping system should be as good as possible. Besides that we are manufacturing in Sorel and at Prescott and we have agencies in different parts of the country, some of which are on the British Columbia coast and the Pacific coast and the eastern coast as well. I found that where we were carrying on manufacturing, the accounts were not kept as they are in most business establishments. My hon. friend, who is a manufacturer, knows how important it is to know exactly, not only what is manufactured, but that every piece of machinery should be made as cheaply as possible. It is important not only that we should show the sums we had paid for the running of the establishment and that we had spent so much in the year out of the vote given us, but that we should know exactly that all the work done was done as cheaply as in other places. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) finds that laughable.

Mr. MONK. I find it laughable that it cost $47,000 to enable the minister to find out such a simple thing.

Mr. FOSTER. Merwin was allowed to charge double on the things he sold.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have had no dealings with Merwin.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister is mistaken. Merwin's name is here in the accounts.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, that is one of the charges which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) seems anxious to make against me. And it shows the hon. gentleman's idea of fairness.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, the Auditor General's Report is wrong.

Mr. BRODEUR. The orders were not given when I was in the department.

Mr. FOSTER. But the minister is responsible for the minister.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not shirk any responsibility. In that respect I think I am as proud as anybody can be. It was absolutely necessary for me to know exactly what the expenses of the department were. That is why I had the investigation and this new system of accounting prepared. I believe it will bring good results in showing where expenses are too high. The hon. gentleman says that I made an arrangement with Messrs. Gunn and Richards. He is mistaken.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, I am not.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am sure the hon. gentleman will accept my statement. The only man I knew in connection with this matter was Mr. Falconer, who was recommended to me by persons in Montreal. I learned from Mr. Falconer that he got the advice of outside experts who were doing such work elsewhere.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister (Mr. Brodeur) says that in the Public Accounts Committee it was shown that mistakes had been made in the bookkeeping. Nothing of that kind was shown, but what was shown was that men were getting rake-offs on their sales to the department—Brooks & Co., Merwin & Co. and so on. And the minister wanted this investigation not so much to prepare a new system of bookkeeping as to prepare for him a brief on which he could answer in case of matters being brought up in the Public Accounts Committee or here. I know something about this thing from start to finish, and my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) will hear a great deal more of it before he gets through. Now, we want this correspondence. I put a question on the order paper last year, asking if Gunn and Richards were doing this work, and if he would lay the report on the table. He said he would, but he has not presented this report so far. I want to know where this $47,000 of public money has gone and whether the services of boys whom Gunn-Richards engage at $500 a year are being charged up against this country as expert service at $20 a day with board at $4 and $5 a day and full expenses from New York.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have been asked to bring down a large number of papers and have engaged special clerks to copy them. I have already brought down many returns. In this case, the papers were prepared, but I noticed that some letters and reports were missing, and I called the attention of the deputy to it, as I wanted to have the file as complete as possible. This is one of the things for which I take complete responsibility. I thought it was necessary before I took full charge of the department to find out how the department had been administered. Hon. gentlemen opposite will remember that, two years ago, they were denouncing the department as the most corrupt in the government and the worst administered. I wanted to find out about these things. Perhaps I took too much stock in what these hon. gentlemen said.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister has shifted his ground. In the first place, he said that this work was made necessary because he found 'discrepancies' in the book-keeping. Now, he says that it was because it was charged that the department was a corrupt department. We found out that it was a corrupt department. But the minister still deals with Brooks and Merwin—$70,000 or $80,000 was paid them last year, though it was shown that they were getting a rake-off on every thing they purchased. He says the only person he knows in this matter of accounting was Mr. Falconer. Were not Mr. Gunn and Mr. Richards both in his office consulting him during the time this work was in progress ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not remember having met these gentlemen. I know of one man who came one day with Mr. Falconer. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) seems well informed of what goes on in my department.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know anything from the department but I know something from the gentlemen who were doing this work.

Mr. BRODEUR. How can he know then, that these gentlemen came to my office ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I believe these gentlemen will be prepared to swear to that fact when they come before the Public Accounts Committee. But suppose they did consult with the minister, that is all right. What I am calling attention to is the fact that the minister said he knew nobody in this matter excepting Mr. Falconer in Montreal. Mr. Falconer did not do the work, it was done by Messrs. Gunn and Richards of New York, and they got $75 a day for hire of staff.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Here is what I find in the Auditor General's Report:

Board of experts and staff: 4 men at $5 per day each, 5 men at $4 per day each, 9 men at $3 per day each, for various periods between November, 1906, and March 31, 1907, $4,059; travel of expert and staff: New York to Ottawa, Montreal to Ottawa, &c., 18 men, $1,533.

I do not now where they boarded. I think it is very extravagant for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to import men from New York when we have better men in Canada to do this work, and paying them such enormous accounts for board. I understand they boarded at a hotel which did not charge $2 a day.

Mr. TAYLOR. Two of them boarded in a boarding house in this city where a couple of members of parliament were boarding, and got a good deal of information.

Mr. BENNETT. No volume will be read by the public with greater avidity than the proceedings of the Public Accounts Committee for 1908, when they read the stories told by witnesses under oath who say that there is nothing wrong in stealing from the government. That has been established by two witnesses in the Public Accounts Committee, men who were paid by the people of Canada for doing no work at all, and yet putting the money in their pockets on the ground that when everybody was stealing why should they not steal. The minister places the blame on the unfortunate officials, when he is himself the head and front of all the offending in that department. To-morrow there will be ventilated in the Public Accounts Committee a case in his own department where accounts are certified to that are on their face a palpable theft, certified to by an officer of his own department. Everybody knows that the official of the department does not certify to these accounts of his own free will and accord, but he does it at the dictation of the minister, due to political leverage exerted upon him by hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me give the House a sample of one case that will be ventilated to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Wait until the committee reports.

Mr. BENNETT. If the First Minister will come up to the Public Accounts Committee to-morrow I think he will hear a case of which it can be said ab uno disco omnes, as regards the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. I want to ask the minister if it is a fact that besides paying these experts certain wages per day, he was paying their board in the city of Ottawa?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. Well, I think it is up to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to give some information with regard to their board. Was this government to pay these men a certain sum per day for their board, without regard to what they actually paid themselves?

Mr. BRODEUR. They had to produce vouchers.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. I think we will find that if they produce vouchers from their boarding house keepers they will not correspond with what is in the Auditor General's Report. Three of these men boarded with me last session, and I pledge my position here that they did not pay more than a dollar a day for their board.

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose my hon. friend will be able to give me their names?

Mr. WM. JACKSON. I will give the names when the time comes. When I see the vouchers on which they were paid, I will put in evidence to establish everything I have said.

Mr. BRODEUR. If there has been robbery of the government by these men I am just as anxious as my hon. friend they should be punished. If they have been obtaining money under false pretences, I am not going to stand anything of that kind.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister says he is not going to stand for men obtaining money under false pretences. Was it not proved in the Public Accounts Committee that a man took oath that he drew a couple of hundred dollars on account of doing a certain work, and he was never near the work at all?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Was he not discharged?

Mr. BENNETT. He was discharged, but why was not the money recovered back from him that he had stolen from the country? In the case of the census enumerators for the riding of East Simcoe, was it not proved by me in the House that the men never paid $3 a day for their board, and yet was any attempt ever made to recover the money? The government dare not go after these men because they know too much.

Mr. J. D. REID. In the Merwin case the minister fought the committee tooth and nail. There was an invoice produced by Merwin examined and certified by an official of the department, saying that the prices were fair and just. The minister fought us tooth and nail when we desired to have an investigation, although he knew in the bottom of his heart that Merwin was robbing this country. But when he saw we had the case in such a way that we could expose it, then the minister had to retreat and allow an investigation. We proved that he was making a profit of 187 per cent. Here is another case of men with whom the minister made a personal agreement. He agreed with these men that he would pay some of them $75 a day and their board in the city of Ottawa. The minister knows in the bottom of his heart that there is not a place in the city of Ottawa where they would have to pay $5 a day for their board, yet they came forward with their accounts and he paid these men $5 a day for board. When he paid this account the minister knew in the bottom of his heart that it was false,

and the country has been robbed by these men of what the government paid them over and above what their board cost them. The minister knows that when he was allowing these men $30 a day for their board, they were not paying $2 a day. It is an outrage to pay such an amount. These men were allowed $5 a day for board in Ottawa when there is not a place in the city where they would have to pay it.

Mr. TAYLOR. There are no vouchers; it is simply an account for so much a day certified as fair and just by an officer of the department.

Mr. BRODEUR. No vouchers for the account?

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is the first time I have heard there are no vouchers.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister should not make a statement unless it is correct.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not see how the Auditor General would pay accounts without vouchers.

Mr. TAYLOR. On the certificate of the officers.

Mr. J. D. REID. Merwin was paid in the same way.

Mr. BRODEUR. In that case the Auditor General would pay the account as it was certified fair and just unless he had reason to think the prices were not fair and just.

Mr. J. D. REID. There was no question that there was a rake-off or a robbery of that kind in this case. We have had similar cases in the Marine Department before, but there has been no change either as to the officials or as to the men who sell goods to the department. We have the same officials, the same men.

Mr. FOSTER. And the same rake-off.

Mr. TAYLOR. At the Auditor General's Report, P—95, it will be seen that Brooks & Co. sold $56,000 worth of goods and George Merwin $51,000 worth, over $100,000 without tender and certified by the same men. These men were brought from New York just as Falconer who is the agent for Gunn, Richards & Co.; he is sent to Montreal for the rake-off, but every one of the men is an American. Here are the same scallywags, and they are proved to be scallywags, here are Brooks and Merwin selling $100,000 worth up to the 31st of March. The minister cannot expect us to pass items until he brings down the information in reference to this $40,000.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is nothing before the House except the item of $80,000 for maintenance of vessels, &c.

Mr. FOSTER. The question before us is much more important than the item, it is whether the minister should have anything given to his department at all.

Mr. MONK. I for one am not prepared to give anything until the returns are brought down.

Mr. BRODEUR. Let us understand what returns are to be brought down; about 15 have been asked for and I am having them copied as rapidly as possible. I brought down several in the last few days.

Mr. MONK. I am ready to vote other estimates.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will bring down tomorrow everything that is copied so far.

Mr. MONK. I am willing to take another department.

Mr. BENNETT. Take the Justice Department.

Mr. J. D. REID. We voted these estimates without explanation last year and now we find the money is used for another purpose.

Mr. BENNETT. The government must recognize that the opposition have some rights in this House. Here is the head of one of the largest spending departments in the government, the affairs of which are before the Public Accounts Committee day after day, and will be for the next two or three months if the session lasts, and we are not to have the report on which this expenditure is based, and in connection with which one hon. gentleman has charged open fraud and wants to see the vouchers. Surely the First Minister will see that our contention is right.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I see no reason why we should not on this occasion follow the course which is generally pursued. The opposition want certain information and they are entitled to it and must get it, and in the meantime we can reserve an item so that the question at issue may be fully discussed. The money must be voted and the public service carried on.

Mr. FOSTER. The course suggested by the Prime Minister is followed when it is a mere matter of information that is wanted, but if our contention is correct here grave matters are involved, and the right hon. gentleman will admit that a state of things might arise in the administration of a department by a minister which would justify the refusing of supplies to that minister. We have asked for information which has not been brought down and we have a perfect right to say that we must have that information before we entrust this minister with any more money. If any other minister is ready let him bring his supplies on. The papers when they come down may be so grave that the House might refuse to

grant further supplies to the minister, and therefore it is not fair to say that this discussion can arise on an item which may be reserved.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman cites a very extreme case of the House refusing to vote money to a particular minister ; but the public service must be carried on and the money must be voted, and if the opposition thinks they should not entrust the minister with any more money they can follow the English practice and move on concurrence that the salary of the minister be reduced, thus expressing want of confidence in him. If hon. gentlemen opposite object to the expenditure altogether, that is another matter. But if they say they will not trust the minister, the recourse is open to them which I have pointed out. If we are not prepared to sit here until Doomsday we should make some progress. It is no pleasure for my hon. friend opposite to stay here ; I am in a different position from him, for I live in the city of Ottawa and it does not matter whether I am here or not.

Mr. FOSTER. You have got an unfair advantage in that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But I would like some day to see the blessing of prorogation and to take a breath of fresh air outside the city of Ottawa. Let us make some progress.

Mr. FOSTER. We must be fair as to who is stopping the business of the country. It is not the opposition. Two months ago the House ordered that a certain report should be brought down and the minister is trying to get his estimates through without complying with an order of the House. We think that should not be allowed. Concurrence is all very good, but my right hon. friend knows that when concurrence comes the items are very apt to be forgotten.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend has only to look at the estimates to see that there are a great many items yet to be passed on which discussion could take place. I think we have been three weeks on these estimates, and we have not yet passed a single item.

Mr. FOSTER. Just about three weeks we have been delayed because the minister is behind with his report.

Mr. SPROULE. The first minister says we should vote the items, but in every case we find that there is something radically wrong in the principle of the expenditure or that the money is being dishonestly expended. In the Merwin case the minister and his friends endeavoured in every way to prevent the information being brought out, but it was brought out at last in a round-about way. The result was that we found that parties were buying goods for the department and receiving a rake-off of 150 to 200 per cent on everything they purchased, and they purchased nearly $1,000,000 worth. When that matter was brought to light, we thought the practice would be stopped ; but this year we find that the same firm is purchasing on the same principle as before. Then we come to the furnishing of an ice-breaker for the same department, and we find that ten prices have been paid for the articles furnished. Now, were those prices ever paid ? We know the goods could not have been bought at those prices and been bought honestly, and the minister must have known it. The minister has been reorganizing the book-keeping of his department, and paying men as high as $75 a day and $5 a day for their board. When we inquired into that matter we found that these parties had never paid any such sum for their board. In the face of this condition of affairs in one branch after another of this department, why should we pass a single item of these estimates until we get the fullest information from the minister ?

Mr. BLAIN. I think we have had rather a strange exhibition of the minister to-night in respect to the accounts in his department. He has said on more than one occasion that he had a first class business system in his department. After an expenditure of $42,000 we had reason to expect a greatly improved system. We do not object to a liberal expenditure of money to bring the system up to date. But what do we find ? The minister, in the face of a criticism of his accounts, did not know whether he had a business method of doing business, and his assistant informed him that no vouchers had been put in for these accounts. Would it not appear to the minister himself that this one statement would arouse suspicion on the part of the members of the opposition, and cause them to refuse to vote any more money to this department until all the papers in regard to this and other items should be brought down ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are several resolutions each composed of several items, and if the House would give me the opportunity of explaining these items, I would be willing to leave one item of each resolution for further discussion, so that we might make some progress.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me that the minister is wholly unreasonable. Under ordinary circumstances the proposition of the Prime Minister is one that might be accepted ; but to-night is not the first time the information has been asked for. I must confess that the system of passing items and reserving one is not a very good one. It results in items being passed without full or proper discussion, and generally the reserved item comes up when everybody who wants information is absent. The hon. minister owes this committee an apology for

having kept us several hours to-night when he had ample notice from several members that in order to make progress with his estimates it would be necessary for him to give this information. It is something that concerns himself personally and the system of keeping accounts in his department. We notified him that until we got that we would not go on.

Mr. BRODEUR. The last time my estimates were before the House nothing was passed because the opposition said they wanted some papers in connection with the Interior Department. But there was no question about these reports being absolutely needed.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will read the 'Hansard' he will find that the other day, when I asked for these reports, particularly the accounting one, I told him plainly it was necessary they should be brought down if he wished to pass his estimates.

Mr. MONK. When the hon. minister was told that we want the report giving an explanation of this expenditure of $50,000 in changing the system of bookkeeping in his department, he should have been prepared to take up some other item. But it is a different proposition for him to propose at one o'clock in the morning to pass certain portions of his estimates which need explanation, and that seems to indicate that he does not seem to realize the position we have taken. I would rather sit here right through until to-morrow afternoon than give way on that principle. I am ready to pass any other estimates, but not these.

Mr. J. D. REID. This item of the services of the experts refers to every item of the department. It is absolutely necessary to have it, and the minister is very unfair in asking us to proceed before he brings down these reports which he promised.

Mr. TAYLOR. This item is for the expenditure of the steamer which patrolled the northern waters of Canada. I quoted from a speech made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) not long ago in which he said: Why should any Reformer be ashamed of anything connected with that expenditure, when in 1894-5, the year in which great complaint was made of the expenditure, $105,000 was spent, in 1895-6, $12,830, and in 1896-7, $11,588. That shows how little you can depend on statements made by ministers. I have here the expenditures on that steamer and for nine months they amount to $63,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Which steamer?

Mr. TAYLOR. The 'Arctic.' If you add a third to that it comes to nearly $84,000 for the year, and yet the minister said it was only $11,000. Let me take up the items making this amount. They will be found on page P—34 of the Auditor General's Report:

Remuneration of technical or professional staff—Fabien Vanasse, historian, nine months to March 31, 1907, at $125; arrears for 1905-6, $200. $1,325.

What is the necessity of carrying a historian on the steamer 'Arctic' while patrolling the northern waters? The Minister of Agriculture said in Sherbrooke that the expense was only $11,500, but the Auditor General's Report shows it was $63,000 for nine months. What was the necessity of carrying a historian on that boat?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Do you object to the historian?

Mr. TAYLOR. I think Captain Bernier was sufficient historian.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is there a report of the historian?

Mr. BRODEUR. He is preparing one. We employed a historian because discoveries have been made by the 'Arctic.' Not only discoveries, but she also visited islands which were discovered some years ago. We have to make a research into everything connected with a discovery and have a complete history of those islands.

Mr. FOSTER. Have they archives in each of those places?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are cairns which have been found there, showing the time those islands were visited formerly and the things left there. In most of the cases reported to me, those things they have found correspond entirely with the reports published.

Mr. FOSTER. What did Vanasse do with a cairn when he found it?

Mr. BRODEUR. Everything in connection with the finding of the cairn he investigated.

Mr. FOSTER. When Mr. Vanasse is approaching a cairn what does he do?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether he was always himself in charge of the expedition.

Mr. FOSTER. The vessel stops at certain places and immediately Vanasse goes out to look for cairns. Show us how he approached one, what he did after he found it, and what he did with it when he did find it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose he would look to see what was the nature of that cairn.

Mr. FOSTER. What would it be made of?

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose he would tell us how it was made, in what condition it was and all the facts in connection with it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Toronto 'Star,' which is a government organ that received patronage of $150 yesterday for advertising something about some summer resort, has given a better history of the trip than Mr. Vanasse could do. Here is what the Toronto 'Star,' the government's own organ, said about Captain Bernier's trip. I know it will be interesting to the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to hear it:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let me hear it.

Mr. TAYLOR (reading):

Captain Bernier is back from the Arctic regions. He brings with him a cold in the head and a large number of interviews for the reporters. The real treasures he leaves behind in the frozen seas, properly ticketed so that there will be no mistakes about ownership.

For many years now Captain Bernier has cherished the desire of finding the north pole, but the north pole is obdurate, although the world agrees that if ever the pole were going to reveal itself it would be to the indomitable courage of Captain Bernier. Such was the perseverance of this noble man in high endeavour that, until his efforts were placed on a government footing, hardly a year passed that he did not take up a collection. Undaunted was he by wreck and hunger and darkness and horrid cold. He could not pick up a newspaper without reading disaster, but he looked these terrors gaily in the face, and, humming a merry song the while, passed the hat with undismayed zeal. This went on for years, and every year Captain Bernier brought out a new scheme for reaching the pole, enduring the hardships of the dreadful voyage in the most jocund spirit. Presently his explorations brought him to the House of Commons at Ottawa, and there the captain made a great hit as a vote discoverer. It was a sight for sore eyes to see the brave navigator seated in No. 16, his pipe in his hand and a thrilling sea tale on his lips.

Mr. BENNETT. I rise to make a correction. The captain does not smoke. It is only fair to make that statement.

Mr. TAYLOR. (Reading):

To behold him there, surrounded by the dangers he was prepared to encounter—the Arctic silence, broken only by the seals gargling the long Arctic night, so long that a poker game once started has to last six months, the northern lights with their fierce blinding glare untempered by lamp shades—to behold him thus, girdled with perils, was, we repeat a heroic spectacle. No. 16 melted to this bold spirit. The captain sailed clean through the ice of reserve which besets most governments and secured an appropriation. With the appropriation was bought and stocked the 'Arctic.' The 'Arctic' was brought across the Atlantic under her own steam, the captain handling her as if to the binnacle born, ably assisted by a crew of French journalists. The voyage was a great success. There were four meals a day, and the main brace was spliced every hour. It was felt that the captain had established his right to take his ship anywhere that a man may go on pemmican, pâté-de-foie-gras, truffles, and certain other bare necessaries of life. The pole has not yielded to the captain. It still keeps its secret just as the end of the rainbow still hides its pot of gold.

The captain has not been able to put into effect his ingenious plan of sailing three hundred and fifty miles northwest of the pole, and then drifting back to it. He has never realized his dream of climbing the blamed thing, striking a fine attitude and waving a Union Jack from the top of the world. He has done none of these things, but the Arctic is, nevertheless the wonder of the northern seas. Captain Bernier may not have found the pole, but he can find an island with his eyes shut. Let it disguise itself how it will with wrappings of ice, there is no fooling Captain Bernier. He just scrapes the rind off with his knife, and there's the island underneath, and, sooner than you can say Jack Robinson, swifter than second base can put in on the runner, quicker even than Toronto University can tack an LL.D. on a distinguished visitor, Captain Bernier has the island down on the chart, latitude and longitude noted, and the British flag flying from the highest iceberg on the part of the map. Captain Bernier is the greatest island namer and claimer in the business. With its terrific speed—four knots an hour under forced draught—the 'Arctic' can overhaul any island that was ever made. When the 'Arctic' is seen in the offing, bearing down on an island, the island feels at once that it cannot get away from such a relentless pursuer as Captain Bernier, to say nothing of the fact that islands in those waters are generally weighted down with ice, which interferes even more than barnacles to prevent them showing an enemy a clean pair of heels.

There is an editorial article from the Toronto 'Star'.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) was reading from a Conservative pamphlet.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am reading from a copy of a speech of my own in which this article is reproduced. But I have the 'Star' in my desk containing this article.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) was discussing the salary of Mr. Vanasse, the historian of this expedition.

Mr. TAYLOR. We were discussing the expenses of patrolling the northern waters, and Captain Bernier's salary and the expenses of the expedition of the 'Arctic' come under that. Now, as the minister has explained this payment to Mr. Vanasse—

Mr. FOSTER. No, we want some further information. When did Mr. Vanasse's services commence? How much has he been paid? How much longer is it contemplated that this cairn-seeking and recording shall be continued?

Mr. BRODEUR. The salary of Mr. Vanasse began September 17, 1904, at $1,500 per annum. The amount paid him thus far is $4,808.33.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he still in the employ of the department and if, so, how long is it contemplated that his services shall continue ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, he is now preparing a report in connection with the last expedition.

Mr. FOSTER. Has he prepared a report of the first expedition ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, there is a report in the department.

Mr. FOSTER. I had supposed that this report was of great historical value. Why did the minister not think it worth while either to reprint it in his annual report or bring it down to this House ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I thought it would be well to have the two reports come together.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the minister to bring down Mr. Vanasse's report before this goes through. Now in all seriousness, I ask what historical work of value Mr. Vanasse has done. I asked the hon. minister and he struggled and almost toppled over himself in trying to explain.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) object that we should have this record ? Does he object that we should have more information on this subject ?

Mr. FOSTER. Bless you, no. I do not object to the information ? But does the right hon. gentleman think that the captain and officers keeping a record of every days proceedings, could not put down the record of a cairn being on such a place ? That is all Mr. Vanasse can tell about it. Does it require a high salaried man to give a description of a cairn ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. $1,800 is a great salary.

Mr. FOSTER. Because it is an absolutely unnecessary salary. Now what has Mr. Vanasse done in those three years? How many cairns has he dissected, and what information has he got about them? What has he done to justify his employment for three years, and paying him $4,800 for work that could be done by the officers of the ship, and done just as well?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have the greatest respect for Captain Bernier as a navigator, but I do not think that in wielding the pen he is the equal of Mr. Vanasse. $1,800 is not a very high salary for Mr. Vanasse. My hon. friend implies that it was a political appointment. The hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Vanasse is not a friend of ours, he is a friend of his.

Mr. FOSTER. What else has he done except examining cairns?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Vanasse was appointed as a historian to visit a large number of islands. Those islands have been described previously in other books, and it is essential that we should employ a competent man to examine them and review previous descriptions of the islands, and to state whether such descriptions are correct.

Mr. FOSTER. If you have a historian and he does his work, why don't we have his report? You ask us to vote his salary for another year. Let us have a sample of his work. Do you propose sending him back next year?

Mr. BRODEUR. That was the intention; but in view of the criticism of my hon. friend, I will consider whether we shall retain the services of Mr. Vanasse. He is a gentleman of good education, has been a newspaper man for many years, and has taken a good deal of interest in historical matters.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not criticising Mr. Vanasse, but I am criticising the policy of employing a historian for the purposes stated. Let the minister bring down the historian's report, and we will be able to see whether it is worth anything.

Mr. BUREAU. The criticism which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has made of Mr. Vanasse, might be applied to himself. Mr. Vanasse for many years wrote the history of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec, and wrote it so successfully that the people in that province abandoned that party and voted for the Liberal party. Now he asks for the head of Mr. Vanasse and when the minister suggests his removal, he says : Oh, stand up and fight like a man. It is simply the hon. member's desire to criticise something or nothing.

Mr. BENNETT. I wish to call the attention of the minister to the equipment of the first Arctic expedition as he was not minister at that time, and to ask him if the next expedition will be as thoroughly equipped. Take, for instance, candles. I find the Arctic had 36 pounds of candles. Has the minister there the estimate for candles for this expedition ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not the estimate for candles. In consequence of seeing such highway robbery in connection with the 'Arctic,' it was enough to make one think that there was something of the kind going on in every department.

Mr. BUREAU. Highway robbery is a favourite expression of his.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, it is quite an ordinary thing to hear it in the country in connection with public expenditures.

Mr. BUREAU. The country does not share your views very largely.

Mr. BENNETT. That may be. There are many things that are not shared because

many members draw one indemnity and my hon. friend draws two.

Mr. BUREAU. I deny that. I draw my indemnity according to law.

Mr. BENNETT. As my hon. friend is in the Justice Department his opinion must be taken on a point of law.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are getting away from the item.

Mr. BENNETT. That is on account of the untimely interruption of the Solicitor General.

Mr. BUREAU. It was because of the unfounded accusation you made.

Mr. BENNETT. I see in the accounts for 1906 : Mr. Jacques Bureau, of Three Rivers, 72 days absences, $1,420, and then 96 days absences, $1,030.

Mr. BUREAU. Add these two together and you will see they do not amount to two indemnities nor to one full indemnity.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman was on strike for a very considerable time last session and he was absent, but I must protest against even such a genial gentleman as the Solicitor General drawing me away from this trip of the 'Arctic.' Can the minister say how many photographs were taken by photographer McKeen ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Can he say how many were taken by photographer Lancefield?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr BENNETT. Has the minister seen them?

Mr. BRODEUR. Some of them.

Mr. BENNETT. Will they be published in a book ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Some of them may.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, it is not carried.

Mr. BOYCE. The patrolling of our northern seas is a matter of great expense and of great moment to the country. We have our interests up there to protect and police, but the expense in doing this has been lavish, and in 1907 there was attributable to this account $132,697.52. Would the hon. minister give me the names of the vessels which patrol these waters?

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Arctic' was the only one.

Mr. BOYCE. The 'Arctic' is pretty well known throughout the country and it has given the public considerable information regarding the internal workings of the Marine Department. Might I ask the minister how long the 'Arctic' was engaged on her last cruise?

Mr. BRODEUR. She started on the 27th July, 1906, and came back the 19th of October.

Mr. BOYCE. Were any customs posts established on the mainland or on any of the islands during the last cruise and what mounted police posts were established ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The Minister of Customs would be the proper one to give information about the customs ports.

Mr. BOYCE. How many customs ports were established?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is one now at Fort Churchill.

Mr. BOYCE. As far as we can see, there has been nothing done for all this expenditure. During all the time the 'Arctic' was patrolling the northern waters nothing appears to have been discovered, no patrol work done, no patrol or police posts established and no customs ports. It must be discouraging for the minister to ask another vote, when so far the only result from this patrolling of the 'Arctic' has been the discovery of a few cairns. That is what has been gained by this expenditure of $63,845.

Mr. FOSTER. We have asked the minister for information which it is proper and constitutional we should receive, but, that information has not been furnished. There is no brute force in this chamber that can force a vote through unless that information is furnished. Not one-tenth or one-fiftieth of the questions that have been asked the minister has he been able to answer.

Mr. BRODEUR. When hon. gentlemen are prepared to seriously consider the items, I shall give answers to questions if I have the information here.

Mr. SINCLAIR. In answer to a question I was informed that the printing of 'Hansard' cost $5.43 a column. I have calculated that since the obstruction indulged in by our hon. friends began, we have used up about fifty pages of 'Hansard,' or about two hundred columns, which would cost $1,086. That is the cost of these hon. gentlemen's obstruction and there is no pretense that they are asking seriously for information.

That is the expenditure the hon. gentlemen opposite have indulged in to-night. They are not making any pretense themselves that they are asking any information. One gentleman asks what a canoe is, and another gentleman wants to know what a hot water bag is, and another says he won't agree to pass the item until he knows what customs duty is collected at Fort Churchill. The hon. gentlemen opposite are obstructing the business of the House at a great deal of cost. As one of the quiet members I protest against that. While gentlemen opposite talk about the

prices of one and a half dozen shirts for $16.50 they have spent thousands of dollars in obstructing the business of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) will turn round to the minister in front of him and read him that lesson that will be a proper application of that homily. I put it to the members on both sides whether if the returns were brought down as they ought to have been and as the minister thinks they ought to have been there would not have been this discussion to-night. We want that information before the minister's estimates get into his hands. These are vital points and we emphasise them and we have to judge of what we consider vital points. It is our constitutional right to get the information. If there has been any obstruction it is due to the course of the Minister of Marine.

Mr. FIELDING. The Prime Minister gave a proper answer to that to-night, when he said that the information is proper information and should be furnished, but we are not disposing of the entire estimates of the Marine Department to-night. There will be hundreds of other opportunities of obtaining that information, but it must be remembered that day after day and week after week these estimates have been presented to the House, and while I will not say that there has been obstruction, I can say that we have not made any progress. It is in the public interest that the opposition should exercise its right of criticism but after that the public will expect that this parliament of Canada will do business. Reasonable progress being made with the estimates to-night does not prevent criticism and I appeal to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that he should assist the government in making reasonable progress with the business of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. We cannot admit the principle that the government must choose our time for making our criticism.

Mr. FIELDING. I admit that.

Mr. FOSTER. We have been put off about this information time and time again and when we are told to wait for concurrence, every one knows that no criticism can be made in concurrence. The Minister of Marine has not been diligent in bringing down this information. To tell the truth, what we do think is that he is wanting to get through his estimates before these matters have been brought down and can be thoroughly examined. We cannot stand for that. Bring on any other estimates of any other department and we will help you to make progress, but at this point in these estimates we must have information. We cannot consent to the Minister of Marine getting these items through unless he gives the information he is asked for. I am sorry to have to state that so frankly.

Mr. FIELDING. If we were now dealing with the estimates of the Minister of Marine in a way that would shut out reasonable criticism the position of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) would be well taken. But when we consider that the Minister of Marine has page after page of estimates yet to be discussed and criticised, that puts another face on the matter. It cannot be pretended that the passage of these particular items will restrict the opportunity of inquiry by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. FOSTER. We cannot make an effective protest unless we do it at the time.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend has made his protest.

Mr. FOSTER. The only effective protest is one that brings the desired end. We may be a litle more sensitive than we otherwise would be because there has been an attempt to override the rights of the opposition in the matter of original documents and in other respects. We have had to try to substantiate our position and uphold our rights. If the government wants to make progress, which we are anxious to help them to make consonant with our rights, the Minister of Marine will give us the information or the government will take some other estimates. I protest against this sort of all night warfare if there is any way of avoiding it.

Mr. FIELDING. I agree it is very undesirable.

Mr. BENNETT. No part of the public expenditure will be more bitterly opposed than this $50,000 for the accounts in the Marine Department.

Mr. FIELDING. Does my hon. friend think that by passing this item he interferes in the slightest degree with the opportunity to criticise these estimates.

Mr. BENNETT. Not at all, but the Minister of Marine week after week has tried to evade bringing down the details of these Bills. When a minister deliberately defies the opposition the Minister of Finance knows that the opposition will take the bit in their teeth and make that minister come to time. The Minister of Finance knows what this trial of strength means. We who are here can talk for two or three hours and there are a dozen men in the building who will take their turn later on and there are 20 who are willing to come up at eight o'clock.

Mr. BUREAU. As a matter of information might I ask the hon. gentleman if he will let no estimates go through unless this particular return is brought down ?

Mr. BENNETT. For my part I would insist that not one cent be voted to the Minister of Marine until he does the decent thing by the House. I want to be friendly

with the Minister of Marine but I do say that he defies everything and everybody and treats us all in a cavalier way.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is very unfair to say that I want to defy the opposition. I may tell the hon. gentleman that as soon as these papers were asked for I gave instructions to the department to prepare the report immediately. I have been pressing the officers of the department and since the hon. gentleman has put it on that ground I will have to protect myself because I am not at all responsible. I may say that four days ago I prepared a memorandum to the deputy and I said: I want all these returns brought down. I knew that the hon. member (Mr. Foster) was asking for these returns every day and he was in his right. It is not fair to say that I am responsible. I have never tried to defy the opposition in any way, quite the reverse. I want to throw the responsibility where the responsibility should be thrown. These papers should be brought down. They were sent to me the other day and they were not complete, and I was as anxious as any one else to have the documents brought down. It is not my fault they were not brought down. I have been doing my best. There is someone who is responsible for that and they will suffer the responsibility.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister has been pressed day after day to bring this report down, and when it was intimated to him to-night that it was required why did he not consent to have the other estimates gone on with. The Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General were here and I have not a doubt but that almost all the items of the Justice Department would have been passed. Talk about Horatius on the bridge holding back the whole crowd of them; why any opposition can hold up any government. In the Remedial Bill debate a handful of men kept the House not for two or three days but for weeks and now it is only a question till next Saturday night.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to draw the attention of the committee and the country to the peculiar doctrine which has just been announced by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I do not propose that should pass without being emphasized. The Minister of Marine says he is not responsible for his department as he ordered the return to be prepared and it was not prepared and he is not responsible. The minister is absolutely responsible. The minister who does not take the responsibility for his department and shoulder it in the House is not a brave man. You will find no responsible minister in any responsible governed country that will dare stand by a doctrine like that. He can discipline his department. He has to take the faults of his department along with its virtues. He has got to shoulder the responsibility in this House for his department, and it is a petty thing, it is a cowardly thing for a minister to step out upon his officer and declare that he himself is not responsible.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The word used by the hon. gentleman is unparliamentary.

Mr. FOSTER. I will take back cowardly, and say it is not a manly thing. It is not constitutional. The merest tyro in parliamentary life knows that to have a minister get up and wreak his petty spite on some official because he has failed in his duty to get the information to parliament. If he cannot get the information the minister should hold his estimates. To state to us that we are to be punished for the faults of his department and in that petty way to throw it upon his subordinates is an example which fortunately this parliament has never before seen and I hope never will again.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have several times tried to explain to the hon. gentleman how this occurred, and the hon. gentleman has no right to say that I have shirked any responsibility for my department. Large number of returns have been asked for and some have been brought down and some have not, and I have been told there was no time in the department to prepare them all. And now in face of this declaration of mine the hon. gentleman attacks me and says I am defying the opposition. I repeat that that statement is not correct. I am shirking no responsibility so far as a minister ought to be responsible. However, these lessons will serve me and teach me to protect myself, and as I understand the hon. gentleman it is that I should punish those that are responsible.

Mr. FOSTER. I should not think that a minister would stand up in parliament to boast that he was going to decapitate his subordinate because of his own failings. Why has he not got his office in proper control? If I were a minister I would leave it to the opposition to attack my department. If there is any honour in a man he defends his own department and if there is any trouble inside his department he washes his dirty linen within the department. It is the last resort of a certain kind of man to do as this gentleman has done to-night and I hope such an example will never again be shown by a minister in the Canadian parliament. In all my experience I have never yet heard a minister get up and attack his own department in the House.

Mr. MONK. The action of the opposition to-night is entirely justified. The House was moved into Committee of Supply at 3 o'clock, and the afternoon was largely occupied in a discussion by supporters of the government. The Minister of Marine had stated that he intends cutting out some one

in his department who is responsible for the delay about these documents. It is he himself who is responsible. When at 10 o'clock the House went into Committee of Supply the member for North Toronto stated our position in such a way that a man with ordinary tact would have seen that these estimates of the department should not be proceeded with. The Minister of Marine should have had the information produced long ago, and having failed to do so he says he intends sacking the man who has not had the papers ready.

Mr. BUREAU. He never said that.

Mr. MONK. He said he intended punishing the man.

Mr. BUREAU. He said he would lay the blame where he believed it belongs.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) makes a calculation of dollars and cents that are being spent in this obstruction. As far as I am concerned, I have no scruples in incurring expenditure for the maintenance of a right which is at the very root of this institution, and without which we might as well go home and go back to the old days when estimates were not voted at all. I am ready to pass votes in other departments, but it would be beneath the dignity of the opposition and its sense of duty for us to give way. My right hon. friend suggested that we should practically give in and vote sums of money after the position we took at the very beginning that this item should be reserved. My hon. friends opposite, when they sat on this side, have often had to resort to this means, and would never, under similar circumstances, consent to an adjournment.

Mr. FIELDING. I am sorry to hear the hon. gentleman putting this on the ground of anybody giving in, like two school children having a quarrel. I do not think there need be any question of giving in. These items have been discussed at great length for days and weeks, and I can see no reason why the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should not ask that the remaining item, which has been before the House a long time, should be passed. Every hon. gentleman opposite knows that he has a thousand opportunities of continuing his criticism of the department. Several weeks have elapsed since my hon. colleague submitted his estimates, and all we ask the House is to pass the item and reserve the fullest opportunity of discussing the expenditure of the department on the many items which will still come up. We ought to give some assurance to the country that we are trying to do business, and we can do that without in the slightest degree minimizing or diminishing the right of the opposition to the fullest criticism. Let us pass this item, which has been hanging so long a time, and let the minister hold up his other estimates until he has brought down this return which hon. gentlemen say they regard as essential.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman admits that, he admits the whole thing. One little item does not make the least difference.

Mr. FIELDING. This is the remaining item of a group, which has been before the committee for weeks.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend ought not to forget either that if this minister has been days and days without getting any of his estimates through, he has been the same number of days without giving us the information we are entitled to.

Mr. FIELDING. He answered a great many questions and gave a lot of information.

Mr. FOSTER. The very things we wanted, he did not bring down.

Mr. FIELDING. What he did bring down you wanted, but you want more.

Mr. FOSTER. Not very much more.

Mr. BRODEUR. Neither I nor my colleagues will be able to pass the estimates this session if each item must wait until every return is brought down. There are some ten to fifteen returns which I have not yet brought down but which are being copied. The hon. gentleman said to-night that the last time he brought this matter up, he said that if the return was not brought down, my estimates would not go through. I have been looking through 'Hansard' and I do not find that.

Mr. FOSTER. I said that not once but many times.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then it is not reported in 'Hansard.'

Mr. FOSTER. I certainly said it several times.

Mr. BRODEUR. Just to show there is something behind this obstruction, the hon. gentleman wanted the other day some returns concerning my travelling expenses. By what he has read to-night, there were two motions made—one for my expenses from 1906 to date, since I have been Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the other not only for the expenses from 1904 to 1906, but also for my expenses from 1906 to date, thus asking twice for the same information. I brought down the information he wanted in one case, but he said he wanted the other two and if not brought down, my estimates would not proceed. That is not fair.

Mr. FOSTER. Why not?

Mr. BRODEUR. Because most of the information the hon. gentleman wanted was brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. Most of the information is never the information. How does my hon. friend know that the most important information is brought down ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Why then did the hon. gentleman duplicate his request ?

Mr. FOSTER. If it is duplicated, that is done over and over again. No minister is bound to duplicate a return which he has already furnished. He need not give in the second return what he gave in the first. But the information from 1904 to 1906 is just as important to me as the information from 1906 to 1907, and it would not have taken my hon. friend fifteen minutes to have got it.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have not got it in the department. We would have to go to some other department.

Mr. FOSTER. How long would it take to walk over to the other department and find out the state of the cheques ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It might not take very long but the information the hon. gentleman wanted was already before the House. If he will consult the Auditor General's Report for 1904-5, he will there find the information.

Mr. FOSTER. I can go through the Auditor General's Report if I choose to wade through it but it is just as easy for some employee of the minister to do that. There is scarcely a return we ask for which we could not make up ourselves in the same way, but that is not the theory of the practice. Besides you cannot get all I ask for in the Auditor General's Report because I want the history of the minister's refunds.

Mr. BRODEUR. Everything appears in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. FOSTER. If the minister wants to chop straws, he can do it. I am not going to wade through the report. The House granted the motion for the return and we should have it.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman was asking for a report, which he did not ask for until the House sat to-day. These returns were asked for long ago. The other report is a very substantial one, and I made every effort possible to get it.

Mr. MONK. If this were merely a little question of criticism, what the Finance Minister says is perfectly right; but I lay down the principle that if we are to get through the estimates when two returns are ordered having reference to his department and the serious phase of the administration of that department, and when we say that we will not continue voting money for that department until the order of the House has been complied with, the duty of the minister is to comply with that order. The demand is a perfectly reasonable one. Under ordinary circumstances, we should reserve the right of criticism as the minister suggests, but the case here is altogether different.

Mr. J. D. REID. This very item we have before the Public Accounts Committee. The papers are there and we are going to have an investigation there. We want the result of that investigation before we can discuss this item properly. I do not think it is fair to press an item like that through the House before we have an opportunity of investigating it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Why not have said at once that you do not want to proceed with my estimates until the Public Accounts Committee has finished its investigation?

Mr. J. D. REID. This is the reason why I think the item should stand. We have the papers before the Public Accounts Committee for the 'Arctic' expenditure and that is the reason why we should allow this item to stand. As far as I am personally concerned, I would have no objection to our going right on with other departments. But it is not fair for the government to try and press through the estimates of the Department of Marine which is being investigated a great deal in the Public Accounts Committee. There are other departments, such as the Department of Finance concerning which there is not the same investigation going on. Why are not the estimates of the Department of the Interior brought down instead of taking up a department which is being investigated ? We shall be glad to help with the estimates if the government will take up some other department. The Finance Minister should take the situation into consideration and let this stand.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend must not forget that this House has now been sitting nearly three months and it is rather late to say now that we will stop the estimates until we have an investigation by the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. J. D. REID. There are other departments.

Mr. FIELDING. The passing of these estimates will not stop investigation. It is a question whether the expenditure has been wise or extravagant.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is a question whether we shall vote the amount.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman knows that this estimate is put in to be voted. He may say that in his judgment it is extravagant, but he cannot say that the House will not vote the money.

Mr. J. D. REID. We might take a vote.

Mr. FIELDING. You have that right on concurrence. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) smiles. No doubt he

is thinking of the days when he pleaded for concurrence and then slipped things along. I quite agree that there are times when the members are not here on concurrence, but when there is a grave and serious question to be voted, no one would lose the opportunity of putting himself on record, and we cannot deny the opposition the opportunity to criticise and vote and put themselves on record. But I do believe we should make some progress with the estimates.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. These estimates should not pass unless we are assured of the correctness of every item. Take for instance the item of turnips, which is a small one if you like, but it illustrates my point. They are charged at $3 a barrel in the Auditor General's Report. When any one in Canada can buy them for at least 35 cents to 50 cents a barrel.

Mr. FIELDING. I would despise not small things, but does my hon. friend imagine that if we pass this item he will not have an opportunity a hundred times before the session is over of waxing eloquent on the turnip question ?

Mr. BOYCE. Here we have an item of $50,000 concerning which the minister is asked very cogent and relevant questions. For instance, he was asked if he had established any customs ports out of this expenditure and was unable to answer. He referred me to the Minister of Customs for that information. Then I asked him what was the classification of the crew and he said he would bring that information down before the vote passed.

Mr. BRODEUR. If I had thought for one minute that my hon. friend was serious, I would have referred him to the Auditor General's Report where he will find the names of the crew—page P—34.

Mr. BOYCE. When I asked him for particulars as to where these mounted police posts were established, the reply I got was that he was not going to answer such silly questions.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to call the attention of the minister to some of the occasions on which I inquired for these returns. On February 11, I asked :

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), and in his absence of the right hon. the First Minister, to the fact that the hon. gentleman has not brought down a single return asked for, by myself at least, during the whole session, and has pleaded on several occasions that he was hard up for time and clerks. On December 8, and December 18, and later on certain papers—not very important, many of them—were called for and the returns ordered, but I have not yet received a single one. Among these were papers with reference to travelling expenses which could be got up in fifteen minutes. The estimates of Marine and Fisheries are to be on this afternoon, and I will urge the hon. minister to have more expedition used in his department.

Later the Minister of Marine and Fisheries entered the chamber and said :

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has inquired whether the return concerning the accounting of the books of the Department of Marine and Fisheries has yet been brought down. I have had inquiries made again, and find that it has been written and a comparison is now being made. It is a very voluminous report, but it will be ready immediately.

Mr. BRODEUR. If you read on you will see.

Mr. FOSTER (reading).

Mr. FOSTER. There are three or four others which are not voluminous.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have one here.

Mr. DANIEL. There is no desire on the part of any one on this side of the House to engage in obstruction, but we do and must protest against the extravagant manner in which the 'Arctic' expedition was fitted out. Goods were bought without any request for tenders; they were bought at excessive prices, and the receipt of goods was taken in such a slovenly manner that the officers whose duty it was to see that the goods were there were not in a position to say whether the goods were delivered or not. That is not the way in which a ship owner or a ship outfitter does his business; he must look closer into his business arrangements than that or else he would have no ships and no means of living. It is wrong that the money of the people of the country should be wasted in such a manner when there are so many legitimate ways in which that money could be spent to advantage. In looking over the crew of the 'Arctic,' I find Fabien Vanasse, historian, had $125 a month. I do not know what are his qualifications, but if he is acquainted with the peculiarities of the country and knew what to look for and what he should record, I think he would be very cheap indeed at that price. As my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. McLean) suggests, if this historian went into particulars and gave us a history of what really took place, we would have one of the most interesting books probably issued since the time of Jules Vernes.

Mr. CARON. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the historian engaged on the 'Arctic' was an unjustifiable expense ?

Mr. DANIEL. It is impossible to answer that question, because no one has ever read any history he has yet written. We have no report as to what he has done.

Mr. CARON. If the hon. gentleman had listened to the remarks of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, he would know that

the report of Mr. Vanasse is now being produced and will probably be in print by the end of the session or next session.

Mr. DANIEL. I am very glad to know that in a year or two at least we shall get that report.

Mr. CARON. I said that he was writing his work.

Mr. DANIEL. Then it is utterly impossible for us to judge its value.

Mr. CARON. But my hon. friend should wait until the report is produced before passing any judgment.

Mr. DANIEL. I shall look forward to receiving a copy of the report with a great deal of interest, because if we take the cruise of the 'Neptune' every one must admit that that is a very interesting and instructive little book. If Mr. Vanasse is able to give us a history as interesting and valuable as that, I am quite sure no one will find fault with his having been made one of the crew of the 'Arctic.'

Mr. LANCTOT. The hon. gentleman will admit he is a very intelligent man and worth the price we pay him, because he belongs to the hon. gentleman's party.

Mr. DANIEL. I think that that is a point in his favour, although I would not take that as any special reason why he was employed by this government. If, when Mr. Vanasse's report comes in, it is at all equal in value to the report of the cruise of the 'Neptune,' I shall be very well satisfied that the money has been very well expended. I would not consider at all that $125 a month was anything more, to say the least, than he was entitled to. The next gentleman on the list, I notice, is J. P. Pepin, physician. He only gets $100 a month.

Mr. LEONARD. He has no diploma.

Mr. DANIEL. I was going to find fault with the Marine Department for paying so small a salary, but I understand he is not a qualified man.

Mr. CARON. Does the hon. gentleman say that the salary ought to be increased?

Mr. DANIEL. I do not know that it will be necessary to increase them all, but in the case of a professional man, I think that if qualified he is entitled to a larger amount.

Mr. LANCTOT. I know Mr. Pepin. He comes from my county, and he is perfectly satisfied with his salary. I may add the government is well disposed to Mr. Vanasse if his own party do not make too much trouble.

Mr. DANIEL. If Mr. Pepin is satisfied, I think probably he is getting enough. With regard to the other men, no doubt their wages are such as are paid under ordinary circumstances. Then there is the question of the new system of bookkeeping in the Marine Department. That cost us $50,000. That seems a large amount to pay for a new set of books and we should have the fullest particulars. The idea of paying an accountant $75 a day, another $50, another $30, and so on down to $15. I do not think you will find in any other department of the government any such extravagant prices paid accountants. We have had no explanation why such large salaries were paid. Was any arrangement made with these gentlemen as to the amount they should receive for their services, or were they employed and then allowed to make any charge they pleased? Were these accountants paid individually by cheque or in what way were the payments made? The only information we have had so far is that there are no vouchers in the department for these payments at all.

Mr. BRODEUR. The accountant is out just now. If my hon. friend will ask me some questions pertinent to the item under discussion, I will give him the information.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. minister will look at page P—35 of the Auditor General's report he will find that Captain Bernier drew besides his wages travelling and small outlays, $113.66. Where did he go and what was the outlay?

Mr. BRODEUR. Capt. Bernier does not remember exactly.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then the hon. gentleman should allow the item to stand. The Captain is here and we want to know where that money was spent. Right alongside this item is an item of hotel expenses, April, May and June, $691. At what hotels did the Captain stay and how much a day did he pay?

Mr. BRODEUR. As far as I can remember that was in Ottawa here.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is a charge for storage batteries, $234.60, where did the Captain purchase that?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was got for a motor boat. He does not remember the name, but those accounts are before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. FIELDING. I would suggest as it is now almost seven o'clock that we should make progress with some other item in Marine and Fisheries and if my hon. friends are so anxious to have this particular item stand we will allow it to stand. The facilities of the House for refreshment are not good at this early hour in the morning, although they are good later in the day.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not another item in Marine and Fisheries. Let us take an item in Northwest Mounted Police; we will ask

very little information in regard to Northwest Mounted Police.

Mr. FIELDING. But the Prime Minister is not here and we have not the information. The officials of the Marine and Fisheries Department have been here all night.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see that he has not made any progress. He has been very brusque with the members of the opposition. I hope that some person will learn a lesson.

Mr. J. EMILE LEONARD (Laval), (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I think I would be lacking in courtesy if I did not endeavour to meet the wishes of the hon. gentlemen on your right who several times have called upon the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) to speak French, in the course of the eloquent remarks he has just addressed to the House.

Mr. J. B. T. CARON (Ottawa), (Translation.) The hon. member may rest assured that we have perfectly understood what was said by the hon. member for St. John.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) The hon. member for St. John read the report of an investigation made by a committee of this House in connection with the 'Arctic.' It was a minority report.

Mr. CARON. (Translation.) What was the date of that report?

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) 1906. I understand that the hon. member for Ottawa is not aware of what occurred here in 1906. I notice the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not in his seat; I shall await his return, as I have a few questions I would like him to answer.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska), (Translation.) May I draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he has not as yet made any inquiries?

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) No, I shall await the return of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. CARON. (Translation.) The hon. Minister of Finance is in his seat and will answer all questions which the hon. member may put.

Hon. J. BUREAU (Solicitor General). (Translation.) If the hon. member will put his questions, we are in a position to answer them.

Mr. A. LANCTOT (Richelieu). (Translation.) If the hon. member will put his question, the hon. Solicitor General may be in a position to give him an answer.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) As the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not here just now, and as I notice the hon. member for Richelieu in his seat, will he kindly state who are those men that a Mr. Chapdelaine engaged at Sorel, as shown at page P—35 of the Auditor General's Report?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) They belong to the crew of the 'Arctic.'

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) When the hon. minister left the room a few minutes ago, I was about to refer to the report of the minority, which I alluded to above; it was for the benefit of the young member for Ottawa (Mr. Caron). That report is to be found at page 6678 of 'Hansard' for 1906. (And the hon. member for Laval read numerous quotations from said report.)

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We ought to have some information to show what the country has gained by this expedition of the steamer 'Arctic.' What is the number of fishing licenses issued and what is the amount collected?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have issued ten whaling licenses. We thought it necessary to insist on licenses being paid by those who want to fish. Otherwise these people, if left alone for many years, would consider themselves the proprietors of these islands and ignore Canada entirely. I do not know if the hon. gentleman objects to that, but we consider it is one of the duties of this country to look after our own territory and have every part of it visited and surveyed. Would my hon. friend let the Americans, for example, take advantage of our supineness and take possession of that country; if so, I am not of his opinion, and I think I would be supported by the House when I ask for the necessary amount of money to show that Canada has jurisdiction there.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am sure that everyone on this side is anxious that we should maintain our jurisdiction over these islands, but we are entitled to know what is being done in return for the large amount of money we are expending by sending this boat out there. The hon. minister tells us that only ten fishing licenses were issued last year, which is all that the expedition has accomplished. The House is entitled to know the amount collected from the licensees and the names of the men who took out fishing licenses.

Mr. BRODEUR. The amount of money collected last year for licenses was $1,500. The names of the men are Miles, Mackay, Adams, and Motche, and the charge for each license is $50.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Are they British subjects?

Mr. BRODEUR. I could not say. They might be American citizens.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Surely you do not charge Canadians the same as Americans.

Mr. BRODEUR. The law does not make any difference, and my hon. friend is equally responsible with myself because he supported the government which passed the law.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. What privilege does the license give?

Mr. BRODEUR. The privileges granted by the law concerning whaling fisheries.

Mr. BLAIN. When this subject was up for discussion last year, the revelations of government extravagance that were brought out created a great deal of interest in the country. We thought that surely the minister, after last year's experience, would be more economical and pay greater attention this year, but I was very much surprised to be told by some people who are suppliers of pemmican, that an excessive price was paid last year to the concerns supplying that article for the crew of the 'Arctic.' An expert connected with the William Davis Company, of Toronto, made the startling statement in a letter over his own signature that the pemmican so-called furnished the 'Arctic' expedition could be furnished by his firm at 35 cents per pound freight prepaid. One would have thought that this would have been a lesson to the minister. Surely the new system of accounting, introduced in the department at a cost of $42,000, ought to have enabled the minister to look more closely after the expenditure of his department and prevented his paying these ridiculously extravagant prices. One would have thought also that the loss to the government which resulted from its system of sending out circular letters to a few of its friends instead of giving business people generally an opportunity of tendering would have induced him to change that system, but we find it still followed, and followed no doubt for party gain. Three weeks ago the minister had his attention drawn to the fact that the report in respect of the examination of the accountant system would be laid on the table, and I am surprised that the minister has failed to bring down that report and practically tells the House that he will only give it what information he thinks proper.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How many police stations have been established ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman was here when I have already answered that question.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Excuse me, you did nothing of the kind.

Mr. BRODEUR. The question was asked by my hon. friend from Lambton, a few moments ago, and I answered it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He asked about the customs ports.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does the hon. gentleman say on his responsibility as a member, that he was not present when I gave the answer ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I object to such an impertinent question being put to me by any man. I am not here to be catechized by a gentleman of his record. What the member for Lambton asked, was regarding to customs ports, and I am asking about police posts, and I want the minister to answer my question.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have given that information at least twenty times since last night. I appeal to the sense of fair play of the members, if it is right that the same question should be asked by the opposition dozens and dozens of times ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is their business.

Mr. BRODEUR. If we are going to have time wasted, hon. gentlemen opposite might waste it by putting same questions. I do not think I am obliged to answer the same question over and over again. If my hon. friend thinks I am too weak to stay here, I can tell him he is mistaken. I don't care about the bravadoes of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes).

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Even suppose I was present in the House, I have the right to ask the question again.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think hon. gentlemen have the right to ask a minister to repeat the same answer half a dozen times. If the minister has answered all these questions again and again, I do not think it is his duty to reply.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am told the minister has not answered the question yet.

Mr. TAYLOR. When the minister makes a statement from his place it ought be a statement of fact. The Minister of Marine says he has answered the question 20 times during the night, and I say that is not so. I have been here all night, except from four o'clock until six o'clock, and the minister did not answer.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend has not been here the whole night, but will he, occupying the important position of chief whip of the opposition and being now leader of the opposition temporarily, will he state that I have not several times answered that there were police posts at Fort Churchill and Fullerton ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have been here almost the entire night and believe the statement is not true that the minister has answered the question 20 times.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am sorry to see the acting leader of the opposition making such a statement. I will not undertake to judge

him; I leave him to be judged by himself.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will not allow the minister to lecture me while I am able to stand on my feet. What I say is, not that the question was not answered, but that it was not answered twenty times.

Mr. BRODEUR. I leave the hon. gentleman to be the sole judge of his conduct in making that assertion.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have a standing in this House just as good as that of my hon. friend.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Don't compare yourself with him.

Mr. TAYLOR. Whenever I speak I make a statement in accordance with facts, but the minister can't make a reply but what he makes a wrong statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR. I withdraw that. The minister told us last night he paid the board of these accountants on vouchers, and I told him it was not a fact, and he had to admit he made a wrong statement.

Mr. BRODEUR. Whenever I do make an incorrect statement to the House I am always very glad to correct it when I acquire the knowledge as to the facts.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. When you are caught.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is a nice way for a member of this House to conduct himself.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister said he answered the question twenty times and that is not so.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have answered the question several times, and if the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) says I did not then I leave him to be a judge of his own position.

Mr. TAYLOR. My position is a good deal better than yours.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We had instances in the Public Accounts Committee in reference to the 'Arctic' of the colossal nerve of a gentleman at the head of a department to fit out the ship without calling for tenders. The story goes that they kept the trucks running on to the steamer and right over the ship and dumped them into tugs belonging to their friends on the other side who carted them away. Then the hon. minister comes to this House and he has the colossal nerve to say he answered this question once, and he will not answer it again. The rights of the opposition are to get information and the minister is obstructing the business of the House. If the minister gives the information as other ministers do he will be treated in a proper way. I want to tell the minister that his name and the name of his department ring from one end of the country to the other in connection with the furnishings of the 'Arctic,' and that it will lead to the removal of that minister, who has already been too long in power.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have stated that these accounts were produced before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. I say these accounts are not before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am blamed for not having produced before the House some of the returns which have been asked from me since the opening of the session. I promised last night that I would see that those returns were brought down to-day, at least those in a position to be brought down. Since the opening of the session I suppose thirty or forty returns have been asked from my department. We have a certain number of clerks engaged in preparing those returns. Some of those returns I believe are useful, while some are not, and when brought down I am sure will not be read by those who have asked for them. The votes and proceedings will show that every week, almost every two or three days, I have brought down returns. Just to show the committee the quantity of work that we have been doing, I have here a great pile of returns in addition to the fifteen or twenty which have been brought down since the opening of the session. I want to lay the responsibility where the responsibility belongs, and if I am in any way guilty I am ready to take the responsibility of that guilt. I have nothing to conceal, so far as my department is concerned; quite the reverse. I ask my hon. friends opposite to make all the investigation they like of my department. I understand that they are going to keep us here for many months. It is rumoured, indeed, that they will not let the government have a cent of money and thereby prevent affairs of this country being carried on after the 1st of April next.

Mr. BLAIN. What member of the opposition stated that the government would not be allowed any supply?

Mr. BRODEUR. I say it is rumoured everywhere—in the House, in the corridors, and outside of the House—that the opposition will not allow us to have any supplies. That is so far true that we have been already four weeks on my estimates; at every opportunity I brought them up to be discussed; we have been on this resolution 209 now for four long days, and it has not yet been adopted. I have given all the information in my possession in regard to these items, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite say there is a return which has not been brought down. The other day we were told by the hon. member for North Toronto that it was easier to get into supply than to get

supply. We spent the whole of that day in discussing the 'Montcalm,' and the opposition asked for information, not only in regard to last year, but in regard to every year since that ship was bought by the Canadian government. Was it fair to call on the minister to give all that information ? I say it was not. However, I gave all that information, and finally hon. gentlemen had to admit that they had no more questions to ask or information to get from the department on that matter. I have been trying to be respectful and pleasant to every member of this House; in the face of all the attacks and insinuations made against me, I think I have preserved my temper in such a way that nobody can complain. Of course no charges have been made, because hon. gentlemen opposite are not in a position to make any charges. But insinuations have been made. No hon. gentleman on the other side of the House has the courage to get up and state that anything dishonest has been done in my department for which I am responsible ; but they have been keeping us here all night and obstructing the public business. I am standing here for the rights of the people to have the necessary money voted to carry on the affairs of this country. To show how unfairly I have been treated by some hon. members, the hon. member for North Toronto has been asking for a return showing my travelling expenses from 1906 to the 1st of September, 1908. This return has been brought down. I was told, however, last night that another return has been requested, showing my expenses from 1904 to 1908, most of which period was covered by the return already brought down. The other portion I had nothing to do with, because it pertained to the Department of Inland Revenue over which I have now no control. I think it is my duty to protest against such conduct and to state before the country that the opposition are trying to prevent the affairs of the country being carried on, and I leave with them the responsibility.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister has made a defence of himself, and has placed a lot of returns before us. I do not know whether these are old or new, the ones we require or not.

Mr. BRODEUR. They are a portion of the returns asked for. For instance, here is a return with regard to the bookkeeping. It is not yet completed. It was brought down, but I found that there were some reports not yet copied, and I gave instructions to have them copied. I have no objection to lay on the table the return as it is.

Mr. MONK. For my part, I am not going to allow the statement made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to go unchallenged, because I consider it untrue, incorrect and unfounded.

Mr. GAUVREAU. It is true all the same.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. MONK. It is not true. I have spent the night here, and I am sure that I have made no unjust obstruction. I have stood up for the rights of the people more than the hon. minister. Before we entered into supply yesterday my hon. friend was warned by the hon. member for North Toronto that we would require before we proceeded with his estimates three important returns; two of these had been ordered by the House some time ago, and they concerned the head of the department in a delicate matter, his own travelling expenses. The third was with regard to the reorganization of the books of the department. The government was warned that, though we were ready to make progress with the estimates of any other department, we would not vote the supplies for this department without the returns we had asked for. I believe that what the hon. minister lacks is tact and judicious consideration for the committee. I do not believe there is one of his colleagues who would have put himself in the position in which the hon. gentleman has placed himself. Why does my hon. friend make a statement calculated to mislead the country as to our attitude? Last night the ground taken by my hon. friend was that the information we had asked for was before the House. He did not then urge that his employees did not have time to prepare the returns or that we had demanded more than they could do. That is where I find my hon. friend insincere this morning; when he thinks his statement can reach the public, he invokes a totally different excuse from that which he gave last night. It is important that the opposition should not budge from the position we have taken. The demand we made last night was a fair one; we gave the hon. minister fair warning; and had he been less dogged, less obstinate, we would have gone into supply and advanced the public business. My hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) supported by some of the younger members of the House, my hon. friend from Richelieu (Mr. Lanctot) among them—hon. members who are quite in earnest no doubt—have been interrupting and protesting—I do not blame the hon. gentleman ; he is new to the House, and unacquainted with the methods of the House, and consequently unaware of the means to which an opposition must have recourse to maintain its rights. But because these youthful members surround my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) he persists in his course. But it has been said—and truly—that investigation is blocked, not alone in this House, but elsewhere, in a manner which would revolt any member of the British parliament. If we are to advance the business of the House and vote the supply needful for the government, there must be no unwillingness to give information. The facts must come out whatever the consequence. Since the minister

has shifted his ground, I think it is only right that our own view should be placed before the public.

Mr. A. LANCTOT (Richelieu.) (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, the few remarks I have to make will not keep the committee much longer, but I want to say, as has been stated already, that what is going on lacks seriousness, and is not what it should be. That is the reason why I do not wish to prolong this debate, but I just want to state that if one wants to see honest and honourable citizens, they can be found in the counties of Richelieu and Rouville. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has not spent the whole night here; he has not listened to what has been said, or he would not have made the statement we have just heard.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I have stated that I remained in the House till five o'clock this morning.

Mr. LANCTOT. (Translation.) If the hon. gentleman had been here after five o'clock, he would know that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has answered every question that has been put to him, not only once, but ten and twenty times, and I cannot help thinking that many of those who were putting these questions had no other object in view but to make obstruction.

I might not be very conversant with the rules of this House, being a new member, and I am not aware of all that has been said, but I know that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been charged with dishonesty by the hon. member for North Toronto. He has been charged by the hon. member of having appropriated the people's money to his own use, with having kept that money in his pocket for months and months. Now, Mr. Chairman, speaking not only for myself, but for the people of the province of Quebec, I am in a position to state without fear of contradiction that there is not the least foundation in these insinuations. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries enjoys the respect and confidence of the large majority of the citizens of that province; the insinuations or the accusations of the hon. member for North Toronto will not lessen in the least that respect and that confidence.

Let the hon. gentlemen opposite go on with their speeches, let them send all over the country their campaign literature as they have already begun to do; they will not succeed in their campaign of misrepresentation and falsehood. In spite of these unjust onslaughts, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will still enjoy the full confidence of his friends and the respect of the people of the province of Quebec, for not a single scandal can be successfully charged against him, nor can it be proved that he has taken a single cent from the public treasury as has been insinuated.

When gentlemen like some of those I see on the other side dare hurl accusations in the face of a man of the hon. minister's standing, I say that those who are supposed to be the champions of the French speaking element of this country should be ashamed of such conduct and should enter a protest against it. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier, whose pupil I used to be, and of whom I have always been proud, does not play to-day the part of a true French Canadian, of a professor of Laval University who has given to this country so many worthy citizens.

Does the hon. gentlemen opposite know that in insulting the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries they insult the province of Quebec?

I do not want to be harsh on anybody, but when it comes down to the point that you have to defend a man who is held in such high esteem and respect as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the most lenient is exposed to lose his temper.

Hon. gentlemen opposite complain of extravagance in connection with the Arctic expedition. They do not seem to know what they are talking about, and they are not acting the part of good citizens, for every true Canadian should rejoice in having the boundary of his country expanded. Moreover, there is nothing new in this policy; it has been inaugurated years ago, and has been continued by the present government.

If ever that same question comes before the House I will be ready to stand by the government and to prove that all those scandals exist only in the imagination of the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. E. PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, like many other hon. gentlemen, I regret having been kept here all night, and my intention is not to make a speech, but I think it my duty to offer a few remarks on this question.

I strongly object to some of the remarks uttered by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lanctot). As a French Canadian, I think that we have not to be ashamed of the position taken by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I am sure that on further reflection, the hon. member for Richelieu, will regret his exaggerated statements concerning the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier.

Mr. LANCTOT. (Translation.) I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I did not say that the French Canadians should be ashamed of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, but that they would have been pleased had he taken another position on this occasion.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) I accept the statement of my hon. friend for Riche-

lieu. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has maintained the traditions of the Conservative party, and I might add, that if I have persisted in my allegiance to that party, it is due to the straightforward policy of my hon. friend. Nevertheless, I must strongly protest against this protracted debate as detrimental to the Conservative party, and to the interests of the country, and with all due respect to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, I think that the discussion should not have been kept on as it has been.

I have no desire to vindicate the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), but as I have said the other day, I recognize what has been done to improve our seaports and the St. Lawrence route, and I am ready to give the hon. minister all the credit that is due to him for the part he has taken in the works done in that respect during the last ten years.

I do not know what the people will think of this discussion, but for my part, I decline to share the least part of responsibility for it. I am sincerely convinced that if the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) had been in the House, this discussion would have been closed long ago, and that we would be ready to begin a new sitting and to go to work with perhaps, more open minds and more dignity than we can do at this moment.

I will not say more. I hope that this discussion will close, and that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will come to an understanding with the leaders of the opposition so that we may set to work in a regular way, for the best interests of both parties and of the country.

Mr. F. D. MONK. (Translation.) I was greatly pleased, I must admit, with the speech of my hon. friend for Richelieu, and if the hon. member for L'Islet, like myself, had been in the House during that all-night sitting, I am sure he would have found out very good reasons for the position taken by the opposition on this question.

At the risk of looking as candid as my hon. friend for Richelieu, I would like very much to go back to those younger days of which we are reminded by his speech. It cannot be denied that he is possessed of a fine long-range voice and an ample and manly action. He is also endowed with that easy elocution which was already apparent at the time he has alluded to when he was still a student at Laval University.

If, perchance, I had had the advantage of hearing that speech of his, about two o'clock in the morning, I think I would have remained here instead of going home.

I regret very much that I have disappointed him, and that he should be under the impression that the province of Quebec ought to be ashamed of the position I took to-day. I have occupied a seat in this House for the last twelve years, and I can conscientiously give my hon. friend the assurance that I have never done anything or given a single vote without thinking more particularly of the interests of the province which is so near to his heart. When my young friend will be in a position to give a similar account of himself, I am sure he will have nothing to be ashamed of.

Mr. LANCTOT. (Translation.) I do not think that I said that the province of Quebec ought to be ashamed of the hon. gentleman. I said that the French Canadians would have been more pleased if he had taken another stand.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) My hon. friend is too able a speaker to say so in so many words, but from what he said, I must understand that if, up to this day, the province of Quebec had no reason to be ashamed of the member for Jacques Cartier, it will go otherwise hereafter.

What is going on to-day reminds me of an incident that occurred at the court house. I was arguing a case before a judge in Montreal and I was explaining that the other party was pleading for delay. I do not see anything wrong in that, said the judge, for circumstances might happen when a party has to plead for delay.

I think that the remark of the learned judge very well applies to the present situation. If my hon. friend has been scandalized by what has been done or said during this discussion, by some remarks not quite pertinent to the question, what would his impression have been, had he been here during the first session of 1896, when members belonging to his party used to get up in this House with a Bible in their hand and read it for hours and hours.

Why have I taken the position that has so offended the hon. member for Richelieu? Allow me Mr. Chairman, to repeat in French the reasons which, to my mind, justify the position I have taken.

For several days, this House which is the supreme power—my hon. friend will not contradict me, since his own party has fought so gallantly for representative government, and the establishment of that supreme authority—for several days the opposition had been urging the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to bring down certain reports of his department of a delicate nature, as they concerned his personal honesty as head of the department. Another report ordered by this House concerned the expenditure of large sums of the people's money. We wanted those papers to know the details of the expenditure of nearly fifty thousand dollars in connection with the reorganization of the book-keeping of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It will be hard to convince the country that this sum has been legitimately expended. We have an established system of book-

keeping in all the departments; we have all what is wanted to change or reorganize that system, and still, in one single department, nearly $50,000 have been expended merely to open a new set of books.

The two reports ordered by the House in connection with the personal expenses of the minister and the one I have just mentioned in connection with the reorganization of the book-keeping in the department, such are the three reports we ask to be brought down before the estimates of the department are acted upon. We gave the minister fair warning that not one item of his estimates would be voted unless those reports were brought down, that is to say, unless he conforms himself to these orders of the House.

The hon. minister does not even deny that the reports have not been brought down, for he says he has given to the committee all the information contained in those reports. So, the hon. minister had no ground for getting excited or losing his temper when he saw that the opposition was obstructing his estimates with the only object of getting the information ordered by the House.

Moreover, what happened at the beginning of the sitting? Just after the motion to go into supply, the hon. member for Comox and Atlin (Mr. Sloan), got up and started a discussion that lasted four hours, on a motion that implied a want of confidence in the cabinet. Who was making obstruction then? Is not the man with a grievance that presses it on the House for hours, the real obstructionist? The obstructionist is the member who stops the business of the House. Well, the hon. member for Comox and Atlin, who started that debate is a Liberal member of the House.

After that, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) took the floor, and with the greatest calmness, without the least acrimony, he repeated to the hon. minister the warning he had given him in the name of the opposition, namely, that he could not expect to pass a single item of his estimates before the reports in question were brought down. My hon. friend added that we were ready to take up the estimates of any other department, and to proceed with the business, but that not a dollar would be voted for the department at fault.

How could my hon. friend find fault with such a reasonable demand? Our attitude was so reasonable, that the hon. minister did not dare to contradict it, but instead, went on to explain that we had what was equivalent to the papers asked for.

I might be called cynical, but for my part, I say that I entirely approve of that position, that manœuvre. I approved of it last night and I remained here under the conviction that I was doing my duty to the country and that I was true to the traditions of my province where, for more than 90 years, we have fought for responsible government.

I consider that under the circumstances, my position, our position is just and justifiable. It has been resorted to more than once by our gallant friends opposite, when they were in opposition.

Mr. TALBOT. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has let slip from his mouth a word that is worth by itself a whole speech. He used the word 'manœuvre' to characterize the attitude of the opposition on this question.

My hon. friend who is a very able lawyer is apt to see clearly the distinction between working for one's country and working for one's party.

To put the responsibility where it should rest, let us see first, what is the subject matter of the debate. The opposition want certain information from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. They say: 'You have expended $50,000 to reorganize the bookkeeping in your department.' If there is something wrong in that what is the use of talking about it any further and of always putting the same questions over again? Let the hon. leader of the opposition call for a division and let us see the end of it.

If the hon. gentlemen opposite imagine for an instant that by their speeches or by the pamphlets that will be sent broadcast from one end of the country to the other, they will succeed in discrediting the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, they are labouring under a strange illusion.

All those who know the hon. minister of Marine and Fisheries are absolutely convinced that if there has been something wrong in his department, he cannot be held personally responsible; the fault is with those about him. The responsibility must rest upon the guilty parties. The opposition can keep us here for weeks on this question, but I can assure them that there is one thing that they will not be allowed to do, namely to discredit the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, allow me, first of all, to congratulate the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Paquet) for the position he has just taken. The county he represents is next to mine, and I heard with a good deal of pleasure his protest against the action of the opposition during the present sitting of the House.

The former speeches of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier were not characterized by the conciliatory note that is to be found in the one he has just made in answer to the remarks of the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Lanctot). If he had spoken in that note from the first, he would have had no occasion to complain of the remarks of my hon. friend. Being such a master of the

French language, the tongue par excellence of sweetness and harmony, it would have been the easiest thing for him to restrain from using certain passionate expressions and certain uncalled for insinuations which, for my part, I consider should have been left unsaid.

The hon. gentleman said something about the 'manœuvres' of the political parties. If he had not left the House about five o'clock this morning, if he had been here from last night till this hour, he would have witnessed a fine display of the manœuvres of his party. He would have heard the heinous insinuations made against the character and standing of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, insinuations that we scout in the most emphatic manner. We have remained here all night, and we have heard all along the hon. gentlemen on the other side putting one after the other, the same useless questions to the hon. minister. The hon. minister was ever ready to answer each and every one of these questions. These constantly repeated insinuations might constitute a manœuvre, but they are certainly not to the credit of the hon. gentlemen opposite and will not bring discredit upon the high character of the hon. minister, whose character amongst his fellow-countrymen, stands as high as that of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

If you allow me, Mr. Chairman, I can say that the hon. member for L'Islet is not the only member on the other side of the House who disapproves of this manœuvre. Even amongst those who have spoken, several hon. gentlemen have been whispering in our ears in the lobby that they disapproved of such tactics, that they were mere child's play, but that they had to obey the orders received.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are prone to complain that it has been said by a member of the government that the minority in this House have no other rights than those that are conceded them by the majority. From what we see at the present moment, one could imagine that it is the majority that have no other rights than those that are conceded them by the minority.

I want my hon. friends to know that we will remain here to see that those estimates are voted upon, and it is my inner conviction that the manœuvres approved of by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and in which he has taken a hand will not help the Conservative party in the province of Quebec, nor in the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. We have had, I am sure, a very interesting speech from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lapointe), but whether it was on metaphysics, or consitutional law, or dealt with matters in the department of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), or the Minister of Finance, I could not be sure. But evidently it could not have related to the department of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) because that hon. gentleman is not now in the House, and arguments relating to the affairs of that department would be merely wasted. As it seems impossible to get the information we desire from the head of the department, and since that hon. gentleman has abandoned the House entirely, it seems only right and wise that a motion should be made that this committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. And that motion I now make.

Mr. BLAIN. In the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I assume that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) will speak for him. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries told us of a report brought down which was incomplete. Can the Minister of Agriculture tell us which one that was ?

Mr. FISHER. I know that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has prepared returns as complete as possible. One of these was sent to my hon. friend (Mr. Blain), and I think that possibly this is the one referred to.

Mr. BLAIN. That answer is sufficient to show that full information is not before the committee, and so it is impossible to discuss these items fairly. Now, how can the government justify itself in insisting that this discussion should go on ? We stated that we were prepared to take up any other department of the government. That offer was made last night at nine o'clock.

Mr. TALBOT. Did not the government offer to allow this item to stand and go on with others ?

Mr. BLAIN. With others relating to this department. We were prepared to leave this department altogether until the information asked by the House had been furnished. We were prepared—and I am sure we are prepared now—to take up any other department. But the government, while admitting that they have not supplied the information, insisted that this item should be gone on with, trusting to the power of its majority.

Mr. TALBOT. Did not the leader of the government offer to let that item stand if the opposition were ready to go on with others?

Mr. BLAIN. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Talbot) must have been sleeping during part of the discussion. Though the government has been unable to supply the information desired, they decided that no other item should be discussed except this. Had there been other items, the opposition were willing that they should be passed, but, unfortunately, the other items had been passed and therefore we were unwilling to comply with even that with which we were willing to comply at the outset. It was generally

agreed upon the other night that any item in this vote of ocean and river service should be open to discussion until the whole vote was passed. We passed a number of these items.

Mr. J. D. REID. Some of them went through without discussion.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes, and some of them went through without discussion and without the information which the government should have provided.

I am glad to see that the hon. minister (Mr. Brodeur) has returned. I would like to ask him if the return he was good enough to send me is the return that was incomplete.

Mr. BRODEUR. I explained that, when this return had been prepared, I found, on reading it over that some documents which should have been included were absent. I asked the deputy to make sure that all these documents were included in the return, otherwise I might be criticised. But the deputy minister was obliged to leave for Quebec, and the return is not yet complete. I am ready to lay on the table the return as it is.

Mr. BLAIN. We are not complaining of the information brought down, but of the information that is not brought down. We have it from the hon. minister himself that certain letters are absent from this fyle. Is that not enough to arouse our suspicion?

Mr. BRODEUR. Quite the reverse. I explained that I took the trouble to read this return myself, and gave special instruction that the documents missing from it should be included.

Mr. BLAIN. But the hon. minister acknowledges that information called for by the House unanimously is not ready, and yet in the face of that he says we must remain here until this item concerning which information should be given is passed. For instance, here is a letter from Mr. Falconer, this New York accountant, who was imported into Canada to take care of our accounts. It is dated July 16, 1907, and is addressed to Mr. Gourdeau, deputy minister. It acknowledges receipt of a letter of July 6, but that letter is not included in this return.

Mr. BRODEUR. Precisely what I have been——

Mr. BLAIN. I understand fully. The hon. minister made the matter quite plain to me——

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) is in earnest or not——

Mr. BLAIN. Quite.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am afraid, perhaps, he is not so much in earnest as I am. I have stated that I found there were in this return answers to letters which letters were not included. I asked the deputy how it was, and told him I could not lay the return before the House without having it complete.

Mr. BLAIN. That is a fair statement, and in the face of that statement is it not a fact that the minister is pressing the committee to pass this item without this report being complete ?

Mr. BRODEUR. That information has nothing to do with the item under discussion. I have already explained that I have been asked by this House to bring down 35 returns, of which 15 have already been brought down. We had to hire special typewriters in order to copy these other returns. When they are brought down, a large number of them will never be read.

Mr. BLAIN. I find here three letters written by Mr. Falconer to the department, to which there is no reply. I notice in this correspondence a letter by this New York accountant, which states that the condition of the accounts at the office in the city of Halifax is so bad that it is impossible for him to prepare an honest statement of the assets and liabilities of that office.

Mr. WM. ROCHE. Would the hon. gentleman kindly tell me who is the agent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Halifax, and who is his deputy ?

Mr. BLAIN. I have not that information. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give the information.

Mr. WM. ROCHE. A couple of good Tories.

Mr. BLAIN. So here is a business government employing an expert, sending him down to the city of Halifax, paying him and his staff $42,000 to correct wrongs, and I ask my hon. friends opposite what they think about it. This expert writes a letter to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself, dated August 9, 1907, in which he says :

> Herewith I hand you in duplicate a report entitled a statemtnt of estimated assets and apparent liabilities in connection with the Halifax agency. The only thing possible in the present state of the agency's books is an estimate of the assets, and it is also not possible to prepare a reliable statement of liabilities. For these reasons I have used the words 'estimated assest and apparent liabilities.' It is not the intention to reflect upon any person, but rather to show the condition of affairs that have been allowed to remain.

No answer at all was made to this letter. Before these items pass we want all this information. Now that condition of affairs having gone on under this government for

nine years, surely we should have the correspondence down before we are asked to pass these items. Letters have been going back and forth between the department and this accountant, some of which are included in the return. The return is incomplete, and it is not unfair that the opposition should ask that the return be completed, after which we are prepared to go on with any other department.

I noticed in the explanation of the report that was given to the department that Mr. Falconer gives a detailed statement of the bringing into operation of a new system of accounting he has presented, and for which the government has paid $42,000. He says that there should be vouchers for all accounts. During this discussion, and speaking to my hon. friend from Leeds, the minister said: There are vouchers in the department for the accounts you are discussing under the new system of accounting which has been adopted ; but on reflection the minister afterwards said : I was mistaken about that, because the deputy says there are no vouchers for these accounts. Therefore, my hon. friend is placed in this unhappy position that after having paid $42,000 for expert accountants to go over the books and put the affairs of the department under a new system of bookkeeping, one of the important points being that there shall be vouchers for all accounts, he is obliged to say that on examination there are no vouchers at all. May I ask the hon. gentleman where the deputy minister is and on what business ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Quebec.

Mr. BLAIN. On public business?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Anything more important than completing this return ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a matter of public business.

Mr. BLAIN. It does seem to me that that gentleman should remain at home and produce these missing letters. However, I have nothing to say about it as the minister has the deputy under his control. I am willing to assist the government in every possible way to take up the estimates of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), who is always so ready——

Mr. FISHER. That is a great temptation.

Mr. BLAIN. I propose that we allow the Minister of Marine and Fisheries an opportunity to change his position, and that therefore we take up the items of the Minister of Agriculture. We will give him all assistance. It will not do for the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to go out and say that the opposition are wasting the time of the House because they are confronted with the statement that they are asking the House to pass this item in the face of a return which is put on the table and which is incomplete.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend (Mr. Blain) has appealed to me, and I am afraid that he has got very near the bounds of corruption in holding out to me such a tempting proposition as that if I will take up my estimates they will all go through very easily.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I will remind the hon. minister that my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) was only speaking for himself.

Mr. FISHER. He is an important member of the opposition, and perhaps the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) will be willing to follow his older colleague the hon. member for Peel, in such a thing as this. But my virtue is proof against it and I will not be led away from what I conceive to be my duty in that manner. My hon. friend has insisted that the opposition are quite willing to proceed with the business if this item is allowed to stand, and hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to create the impression that this proposition has been refused by the government and by my hon. colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I take issue distinctly with them. I have not been in the House during the whole night, but I have been informed by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance that he did offer distinctly and clearly to the opposition to let this item stand, provided they would pass a non-contentious item or two of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BLAIN. That is correct.

Mr. FISHER. Is the whole of this ineffective and futile keeping the House all night until nearly noon of the next day because there is an insistence that a non-contentious item of the Department of Marine and Fisheries must not be passed while contentious and important items in another department may be passed ? We are quite willing to allow this item to stand but in justice to my colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, after the vicious attack which was made upon him last night before I left the House, we felt that it was due to him that a non-contentious item of his department should be passed.

Mr. BLAIN. What member of the opposition made a personal attack upon the Minieter of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) last night, before I left the House, made one of the most vicious personal attacks upon my hon. colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that I ever heard in this House, although I have been here for a longer time, with one exception, than any of the members present. I remember when I was in the opposition,

and I remember that in my inexperienced days I was just as foolish as hon. gentlemen opposite are. I can remember that the opposition kept the government sitting here day in and day out for half a week, and I can remember that at the end we had not advanced one step in political warfare any more than we had progressed one step with the public business.

Mr. BLAIN. Then we have a precedent for the course which we are now pursuing?

Mr. FISHER. You have the precedent of folly. If hon. gentlemen want to gain credit in the country they had better not follow the precedent of the Liberal party in the days when we did that. In those days we made no progress in the country; we simply put a stumbling block in the way of the success of the Liberal part just as hon. gentlemen opposite are putting a stumbling block in the way of the success of the Conservative party. If I had party leanings or wished to speak upon this matter from a party political standpoint I would chuckle at the way the opposition are acting.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. You are looking a little serious over it.

Mr. FISHER. Not a bit. I confess I am a little older than I was in those days, and that I am not quite so foolish as to want to stay up all night. The impression created by hon. gentlemen opposite that the government are unreasonable, that they are insisting upon pressing this particular item through without giving the information necessary to pass it is not correct and is not a fair statement of the situation.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. gentleman state to the House what difference it would make to the government if they took up the minister's own department?

Mr. FISHER. The opposition has deliberately insulted my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and we are going to stand by him.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is not the business of the country, but it is a supposed insult you are talking about.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the Minister of Agriculture admit that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is wrong and that it is only a question of dignity?

Mr. FISHER. Most certainly not.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to ask the chairman if it is parliamentary to say that the opposition have deliberately insulted the Minister of Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. FISHER. I will withdraw that and say that the opposition have deliberately used language which might be considered an insult by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) seemed to think that public business must stop because of this difference of opinion between the two sides of the House.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. minister understands me. What I asked was, is he keeping up this fight because of a supposed insult to the hon. minister or because he insists on the opposition voting supplies without the information they desire.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member contends that items which are non-contentious should not be passed because he wants information which does not relate to them, but to other items.

Mr. LANCASTER. We cannot tell whether it relates to them until we see it.

Mr. FISHER. Items 212, 213 and 214 of the Department of Marine and Fisheries contain no contentious matter whatever.

Mr. BLAIN. Did not the expert accountant supervise any of those branches?

Mr. FISHER. I have no doubt he did. Hon. gentlemen opposite will have all the opportunities possible of discussing that matter and everything connected with it or any item of the department. Therefore there is not the slightest objection on that ground to passing an item or two, and relieving the tension on public business unless hon. gentlemen opposite wish to obstruct the passage of any item. We are willing to take up any non-contentious item and let the item under consideration stand, and on this or any other item to give the fullest possible information.

Mr. SPROULE. I contend that there is not a single item relating to this department which is not under the circumstances contentious, because so far as that department is concerned we have found that parliamentary government has become a farce and a travesty. Public money voted for one purpose has been misapplied to an entirely different purpose. We claim that that department is absolutely rotten, and what has already been brought out justifies that statement. It has spent money without the authority of parliament. We have the hon. minister's own admission that the department was run so badly that he had to bring experts from a foreign country at a cost of over $47,000 to reorganize its methods. Why are the returns withheld that have been ordered by the House? We know too well the history of papers that have been withheld in the Immigration Department and other departments, and afterwards burned to cover up things which could not afford to appear to the light of day. How do we know that that is not the case with the papers of this department?

Mr. MILLER. Will the hon. gentleman say what papers are burned that he refers to.

Mr. BENNETT. Read Mr. Smart's evidence.

Mr. SPROULE. I gave that information to the hon. member for South Grey long ago, and if he is so dense that he cannot understand it, I see no justification in attempting to enlighten him again.

When the department, for instance, paid for breakfast cups and saucers $1.04 each to add to the furnishings of an icebreaker, is it not plain that the merchant never got the profit on that transaction Who got the money? So, I could go on with other items by the dozen. But when we seek for information, we are thwarted in every way. Look at the expenditure under this minister when he was speaker of this House. During three years there was an expenditure of $4,580 for furnishing a couple or three rooms.

Mr. TALBOT. Is not that furniture there?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know. A great deal of it disappears and has to be replaced. For instance, $52 a piece was paid for table cloths. Even if the table cloths were worth $52 a piece, there is no justification to pay such money for the Speaker's room. The expenditure under this hon. gentleman when Speaker was higher than that of any other Speaker in the history of Canada for the same length of time. What became of that furniture? Was it given away as perquisites, or as souvenirs of his regime there. Take the——

Mr. BRODEUR. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) to charge me with having stolen furniture from the Speaker's rooms? If that is what he means, if he has the courage to make a specific charge, pledging his seat to make it good, he shall have every opportunity to prove it. We will see whether he has the courage to act as a man.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has a lot of courage, but it appears to be oozing out at his finger tips. I stand by the statement I made, and I am not called upon to stand by any statement that he may represent me as having made.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will the hon. gentleman have the courage to state that I have taken anything from the Speaker's apartments?

Mr. SPROULE. I say that the expenditure under the hon. gentleman as Speaker was ridiculous and indefensible. I said I did not know where the furniture went to, but I was creditibly informed that somehow it disappeared.

Mr. BRODEUR. I appeal to the hon. gentleman's sense of fairness. Suppose I should make such an insinuation against him, he would feel offended, and with good reason. I am just as honest and just as respectable as the hon. gentleman. I have been insulted since last night in the most shameful way. Yet, I have been willing to concede everything that could reasonably be asked of me. I do not want to cause the House to spend time for nothing. But I have been insulted since last night and during this morning by the hon. gentleman and his friends. They are very careful of their words, however. They will not make a charge against me, but only insinuation. I do not say they lack courage—I leave that to the public to judge. I have been in public life for many years, and God knows I have done nothing of which I should be ashamed.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) says we make insinuations, and not charges against him. We declare that he has mismanaged his department, that he has paid money without appropriate vouchers, that he has paid money for which the country got no return—and the fact that $700 was given back at one time is surely a proof that there is good ground for that charge. If I understand what charges are, these are charges and not insinuations. When the hon. minister was protesting his innocence, I was reminded of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) who told us the other day that he was above temptation. I felt like asking the hon. gentleman then if he had the Governor General's consent to make that statement, for I fear that otherwise it could hardy be regarded as authoritative. In the same way I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) should have the Governor General's consent before calling upon us to accept these protests.

Mr. FISHER. The charges to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) now refers are entirely different from the insinuations made with regard to the purchases for the Speakers' chamber. These are insinuations reflecting upon the honesty of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and not charges at all.

Mr. SPROULE. They are not insinuations, but direct charges.

Mr. FISHER. What are they?

Mr. SPROULE. We have these items of expenditure, and I am told that the things purchased are not there.

Mr. FISHER. Will the hon. gentleman make the charge that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has taken these things away?

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) told us that many years ago he was young and innocent and fool-

ish. Twenty years hence, he tells us he has got better sense, that his conduct of that time as a young and innocent and foolish man induced him to what was wrong, as he now admits his conduct of twenty years ago to have been. He has become very virtuous lately, but he admitted that he was not virtuous before. From his past conduct we may reasonably expect that in future he will not be able to approve of what he is doing to-day. I started to say, in answer to the request of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) why not give us some noncontentious items to consider? There are none such in this Department of Marine and Fisheries, for we have not the information we require concerning the management of that department. Take any other department, and we are willing to let the items go through on reasonable information being furnished. But in view of the disorganization of this department and of what has been revealed by the facts that we have been able to learn, we are justified in not voting a dollar until full information is given. We are refused the opportunity to gain information in the Public Accounts Committee, and when the matter is brought to this House we find ourselves blocked here at once. We are justified then in withholding supplies because that is the only way an opposition can check the government.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister of Agriculture raises the point that an offer has been made to let this item stand and take up a non-contentious one. That proposition was made in the presence of the Premier, when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was leading the opposition. The member for North Toronto gave his reasons why he moved for three returns, and only one of them had been brought down. The hon. minister explained that this return was complete, but there were some papers that he wanted to revise, after which it would be brought down to-day. After this proposition had been made two or three times, the member for North Toronto said, take another department and we will give you supply, but until these papers come down, I demand my right to have this information before we go on with this department. This morning the hon. minister comes down with an armful of reports. Some of them have been laid on the table already.

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where are the reports ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They have been sent back to the department to be completed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then we do not know what these reports were. But he brings down one that any typewriter could have prepared in two days.

Mr. BRODEUR. What about the 15 reports already brought down ?

Mr. TAYLOR. We give the hon. gentleman money enough to prepare all the reports the next day after they are ordered. In this return there is not a word of instruction, there is not a word of correspondence between the hon. minister and this expert accountant. But we do find some rather funny correspondence. On June 25th Mr. Falconer writes for money. On July 3rd he writes to the Hon. Mr. Templeman, acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries. On July 5th he writes to Colonel Gourdeau asking for $2,500, one-half his account from the department. There is an answer on the 6th of July, but is not signed by anybody. On the 12th of July, Mr. Falconer writes again asking for more money. Now here are letters asking for money, and no reply is made to them. This file is not complete, everywhere we find missing letters. We cannot get any information from this file. Yet the hon. minister persists in asking us to give him supply. It is the right of the opposition to demand this information.

Mr. BRODEUR. I was willing to be conciliatory, but in view of the insinuations made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), there must be some limit.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not think the hon. member for East Grey made any insinuations. When the hon. minister was speaker of this House he was extravagant, and he is more extravagant in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. He has not given us the information we are entitled to. When these papers came down, the opposition were ready to say, he has complied with our request and we will let him go on. But we find that he has not complied with the demands of the opposition, none of us can see the papers he did bring in, and we do not know what they amount to.

Mr. J. D. REID. Last year we moved for the amounts expended on the Arctic for the year, and they were all produced in the Public Accounts Committee. We intended going on with the examination, but owing to the arrangement that was made by which the Public Accounts Committee was closed, we could not proceed with the investigation. But it is intended to go on this year.

Mr. CONMEE. I think the hon. minister was quite justified in his course. I think the hon. member for North Toronto did make insinuations, I do not know that they can be called charges. But he made statements which he should be prepared to back up in a different way. The hon. minister has explained that the transaction in which he was accused of taking money and refunding it again, was merely a matter of bookkeeping. That has been magnified into some wrong on the part of the hon. minister, of taking public money for his own purposes.

Mr. LANCASTER. The member for North Toronto stated facts.

Mr. CONMEE. I say he did not state facts. If his so-called facts are true, the hon. gentleman ought to have the courage of his convictions, and instead of bantering the government hour after hour, he ought to put his statement in writing, put his name to it and make a charge.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who has disputed the facts that the member for North Toronto stated ?

Mr. CONMEE. They have been disputed right along. The whole charge is more or less a misrepresentation. Now I want to ask hon. gentlemen what good purpose is being served by the course they are pursuing ? Are they advancing the public interest, are they doing the business for which they were sent to this House. I do not think so. The opposition have a right to criticize and investigate, but I submit this is not criticism, it is factious opposition. While the minority has its rights, yet the business of the country must go on, and it would be a curious majority who would submit to being dictated to, I might use the word bulldozed. That cannot be done. Now there are certain letters and answers to letters which are missing in the return brought down, but which the hon. minister says had nothing at all to do with the item before the chair.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was the hon. gentleman here during the night ?

Mr. CONMEE. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then he did not hear the offer made from this side, that we were willing to take up any other department and give them good progress. Is not that fair ?

Mr. CONMEE. I do not think it is fair, because you say to the department : We will not allow an item to go through because we want further information which is not contained in the return—although the hon. minister states that this information has nothing whatever to do with the item before the chair.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have given last night what I consider a good reason why that item should not be passed.

I said that we had before the Public Accounts Committee the papers of this very steamer 'Arctic' that we were going to investigate and we did not want this item to pass until we had investigated them. That was another reason, but that was not accepted as a reason. Does the hon. gentleman think that we should pass an item when we are going to have the papers in connection with it investigated ?

Mr. CONMEE. Does not my hon. friend admit that this is not the last opportunity.

Mr. J. D. REID. We have been fooled that way too often.

Mr. CONMEE. This item has to come up in concurrence ; you have lots of opportunities. You did not press your claims last year before the Public Accounts Committee. I do not say it was your fault.

Mr. J. D. REID. It was the fault of the Prime Minister.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Never.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Prime Minister asked us that we should not proceed with these accounts.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentleman can put the blame wherever he pleases ; I would advise him not to put it on his own shoulders, but to get out of it if possible. Here we are in another year and I think it is about time that hon. gentlemen opposite should allow the business of the House to go on.

Mr. DEVLIN. A very fair proposition has been made to hon. gentlemen opposite and my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculter has repeated that offer. He said that he would allow this item to stand and that some other item might be taken up. That proposition was not accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite, but they wish to put the country to enormous expense and to stop all public works——

Mr. BENNETT. Give us the Public Works estimates and we will go right on now.

Mr. DEVLIN. At present the Marine estimates are before the House and there is absolutely no reason why the Marine estimates should not be proceeded with. I was astounded by some of the language that was used in reference to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I heard the hon. member for East Grey ask the question : Where has the furniture of the Speaker's apartments gone ; has the furniture been given away as presents ? Does the hon. gentleman insinuate that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whilst Speaker of this House, was guilty of having taken away any of the furniture of the Speaker's apartments ? I ask him to give me a reply to that question.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not listening to the funeral ode of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DEVLIN. Does the hon. gentleman accuse the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of having been a party in any way to the disappearance of the furniture of the Speaker's apartments ?

Mr. SPROULE. Apparently the hon. gentleman has one object in view and that is to waste time. He can read 'Hansard' to-morrow and know exactly what I said.

Mr. DEVLIN. Does the hon. gentleman say that the Minister of Marine and Fish-

eries was a party to taking away furniture from the Speaker's apartments, and if he refuses to give me an answer I shall ask him to withdraw his words.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DEVLIN. It is well to see the courage displayed by the hon. member for East Grey. When he speaks about some funeral oration does he think the country will be satisfied with such an answer? I heard the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) say that the country was reeking with the name of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I challenge the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton and the hon. member for East Grey to come into the province of Quebec and repeat these words upon any platform. I defy the hon. gentleman to call in question the integrity or honour of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In questioning a man's integrity I appeal to facts.

Mr. DEVLIN. I will make this offer to these hon. gentlemen: I will resign my seat in the county of Wright, let these hon. gentlemen do the same, and I will appeal to the electors of that county upon the honesty or integrity, or honour of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Will these hon. gentlemen take up the invitation?

Mr. BENNETT. How would you like to take a turn in Carleton?

Mr. DEVLIN. A short time ago I had the honour of addressing a very large audience in Carleton and I was very cordially received. I am ready to meet the hon. gentleman for East Somcoe (Mr. Bennett) in Carleton or any other county now or at any other time. I was sorry to hear the language which was used by the hon. members for Victoria and Haliburton and East Grey in reference to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I heard the speech of the hon. member for L'Islet in defence of the hon. minister. I am sure that if the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) had been in their seats they would not have taken the responsibility of the language used by the hon. gentlemen to whom I have referred. All I have to say is that if that question comes before the electors of the province of Quebec, or if these hon. gentlemen will come and repeat their insinuations, they will be met in a fair and open manner, but they will receive their answer to such allegations.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am sure that the House and the country will appreciate the fact that the opposition feel perfectly justified in insisting that the government shall bring down these documents before this item shall pass. I believe it is not only the duty but the right of the opposition to investigate all public documents and public measures. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave us to understand that we were taking an unpatriotic position in regard to the vote which is before us at the present time. The opposition have taken the very opposite position. It is true patriotism not to neglect the duty of making a thorough investigation into these matters. The Conservative party have been the patriotic party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to ask what hon. gentlemen opposite can say with regard to the position which some of the prominent men of their own party took on certain patriotic questions in this country. Let them examine into the records of some of these gentlemen and they will find out that instead of being patriotic they took a position exactly the reverse.

Mr. LANCTOT. (Translation.) What documents do you wish to have ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. (Translation.) I do not understand you.

The hon. gentleman knows that I am not thoroughly acquainted with the French language. I am spending hours and days in studying the hon. gentleman's language at the present time and instead of him trying to belittle me by asking me a question, thinking that I would not understand his language, he should have been taking the very opposite position.

I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite that the opposition are prepared to remain here until their rights in this House are vindicated, and until they investigate the accounts of this department. This government has been shown to be not only a blundering government, but a plundering government, constantly allowing middlemen—

Mr. BENNETT—Highwaymen.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—and highwaymen, as my hon. friend suggests, to take advantage of the public chest. I would be very sorry to see the opposition take any other position than the one they have taken in this matter, and I hope they will stand to that position until the Minister of Marine and Fisheries realizes that these estimates should be left over and those of some other department taken up instead.

Mr. MILLER. I realize that the members of the opposition feel chargrined and disappointed because of the tactical blunder which they made last night; but notwithstanding their chargin, they should be a little more fair in debate than some of them have been this morning. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who is perhaps more addicted to interrupting and asking questions than any other man in this House, should not be so touchy when a

question is asked of himself. When he spoke of someone having burned papers which would have afforded evidence to which this House was entitled, I asked him to whom he referred. He said that he had made the reply before. I had hoped, for the reputation of the hon. member, that it was not the papers of Mr. Smart, the late deputy minister of the Interior, to which he referred; and when I asked to whom he referred, another hon. member said, 'Read Mr. Smart's evidence.' I have a very slight acquaintance with Mr. Smart, but from what inquiry I have made into his life and character, I have no reason to believe that he is not as honourable a man as any man who occupies a seat in this House. If the hon. member for East Grey will read Mr. Smart's evidence to the House instead of stating exactly the opposite of what—under oath—Mr. Smart really did say, it will be more honourable and manly.

Mr. SPROULE. I have read the evidence, and he spoke of having burned his letter books and a great quantity of papers which showed that he had while deputy head of that department, carried on a private correspondence to that extent.

Mr. MILLER. My memory of Mr. Smart's evidence was that he was removing from Ottawa to make his home in Montreal, and that in packing his household goods he had burned several letters which he swore were private correspondence with certain gentlemen in Europe, and no reference to public matters, and were not the property of this country.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. gentleman say that the correspondence had no reference whatever to the North Atlantic Trading Company?

Mr. MILLER. After he left the department he entered into the employ of the North Atlantic Trading Company, and I will admit that the correspondence had something to do with that company, but Mr. Smart swore that it was absolutely private.

Mr. BLAIN. The objection taken in the Public Accountes Committee was that while Mr. Smart was engaged as Deputy Minister of the Interior, while in England and for some time after his return, he carried on correspondence with the North Atlantic Trading Company, which resulted in his leaving the employ of the department and entering the employ of that company—that he was in the pay of the government while this correspondence was going on, that it related to his appointment, and that it should therefore be brought before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This discussion is entirely irrelevant.

Mr. MILLER. Let me simply say that Mr. Smart swore that the letters had no reference to public business, and we have a right to believe him.

Now, I wish to refer to an accusation—or rather an insinuation—made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur). The hon. gentleman will correct me if I misunderstood him. He stated that when the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries was Speaker of this House, certain furniture was bought for the Speaker's apartments, that some of that furniture vanished and that nobody knows where it has gone to. If he did not mean to insinuate something of dishonesty against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I would like to know what in the world he did mean.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say that nobody knew where it had gone to. I said it was bought and put there, but I am credibly informed it is not there now. The question is what became of it? Who gave it away? Was it given away as souvenirs, or what became of it? There was no personal insinuation beyond the fact that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries was then Speaker of the House and is the only person whom we can hold responsible.

Mr. MILLER. Do I understand the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) to say that he makes no insinuation and has no reason to believe there was any act of wrong doing.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not saying anything of the kind.

Mr. MILLER. Then, he allows the insinuation to remain.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman was not here all night——

Mr. MILLER. Yes, and I am going to make a reference to what was said during the night.

Mr. BENNETT. Oh, you are obstructing the estimates.

Mr. MILLER. These hon. gentlemen are anxious to make it clear that they are not obstructionists. But they will have a task greater than they are likely to accomplish in attempting to prove that. The item we took up last night was one of $50,000 to provide for the maintenance of vessels employed in patrolling the northern waters of Canada. These hon. gentlemen objected that certain expenditures for the 'Arctic' were under discussion in the Public Accounts Committee, and said they did not wish to proceed with the item. Also, they wanted certain facts which were not covered by the returns before the House. Now, what was the case? They asked for a return of the personal expenditures of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries from 1906 to 1908 and also from 1904 to 1906. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries brought down that for 1906-8 and explained that he was having the other prepared as quickly as pos-

sible, and that if some items were passed he would bring down the returns to-day.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated to-day that this return related to the Department of Inland Revenue of which he was the head during the time these expenditures were made.

Mr. MILLER. I made a mistake to that extent. This return must come from the Department of Inland Revenue of which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) is not now in control. Last night, about eleven o'clock, the hon. member who was leading the opposition said that if the estimates of the Department of Marine and Fisheries were left and those of some other department taken up, they would allow the estimates to go on. But he knew that no other minister could go on with his estimates then.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. member think that midnight is a proper time to ask us to go into Supply anyhow ?

Mr. MILLER. If the members of the opposition persist in frittering away the hours of daylight, then the work must be done at night.

Mr. TAYLOR. The time yesterday was taken up by a supporter of the government, and an independent supporter of the government, and the members of the opposition did not say a word.

Mr. MILLER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) chief whip of the opposition, read out of the party the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Thompson) whom we on this side have regarded as a very honourable, respectable, independent Conservative ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not saying anything against him. He claims to be an independent.

Mr. MILLER. Does he claim to be an independent supporter of the government ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. How can he be an independent supporter of this government ? Ask a sensible question.

Mr. MILLER. I have not said he was, but the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has said so. As I was saying, at eleven o'clock, no other minister could go on with his estimates. Their officials were not here and the records of their departments not available. But the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) reasonable as he always is, after battling with the members of the opposition, said : If you do not want to pass this item, perhaps we could go on with some other item less contentious. And what was the next item proposed by him ? It was item 214 as follows :

Shipwrecked and distressed seamen, $3,000.

Now, what can the returns which the hon. gentleman wanted have to do with next year's expenditure for shipwrecked and distressed seamen ?

Mr. BLAIN. If the hon. gentleman wants an answer I will give it to him. The department had employed New York accountants to go over its financial records, including this item. We asked for the information of that service, and the minister has brought down a return which is incomplete.

Mr. MILLER. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) knows that even that return could not affect next year's expenditures for shipwrecked and distressed seamen. But here is the explanation : The hon. member who was then leading the opposition, the chief whip of the party (Mr. Taylor) replied to the Minister of Finance by saying : We have driven down the stake and are prepared to stay here until Sunday morning.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member (Mr. Miller) is mistaken. The gentleman then leading the opposition was the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster).

Mr. MILLER. I heard it remarked that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) was the leader and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was the sub. Perhaps I was doing the hon. member for Leeds more honour than he is entitled to, but, at least, he does not deny the language I attribute to him.

Mr. TAYLOR. They have carried it out, haven't they ?

Mr. MILLER. So far, very well. With such language from the chief whip of the party and with the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) expressing his willingness to remain in this House until he was as small as a pipe stem what else can we conclude ? what else can the country conclude, than that it is the fixed policy of the opposition to waste time and obstruct business in every way possible ? I think they realize that they have made a mistake. I believe that if there is any way by which they can gracefully retrace their steps, it will be taken.

Mr. BENNETT. The committee hardly knows what question is before it. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) was here through the long watches of the night and has got mixed up. The point was this : Some months ago a return was moved for in this House relating to an expenditure of about $50,000 made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for expert book-keepers. Time and again the minister promised to bring down that return and let us know the inside workings of his department in this matter. Furthermore, among the bills that make up the $50,000, there are charges of $5 per day for board for certain men, and an hon. gentleman on this side of the House

stated that he knew these men, that he lived in the same house with them, and instead of paying $5 a day for their board, they only paid $1 a day, if not less. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) knew that that statement was made last night, and yet he says we are wrong when we ask that this whole swindle should be exposed.

Mr. MILLER. Is there anything this government has ever done or is ever likely to do, that the hon. gentleman will not suspect and find fault with ?

Mr. BENNETT. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, there will be very few things this government ever do that I will not suspect or anything that the hon. gentleman ever does that I will not suspect. A few weeks ago the whole country demanded an investigation into the Interior Department, they wanted the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) to be placed under oath, and there was not a man from the whole province of Ontario dared to raised his voice against an investigation except the hon. member for South Grey. Why does he do it ? Because the hon. member for East Assiniboia and the hon. member for Humbolt (Mr. Adamson) are stockholders in the Saskatchewan Land Company and this hon. gentleman had a pretty block of land that he purchased from that Saskatchewan Land Company. Will the hon. gentleman deny that ?

Mr. MILLER. I certainly deny that I own any land that I ever bought from the Saskatchewan Land Company.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the hon. member deny that he, with some other gentlemen from the county of Grey, had a quantity of land last summer acquired from the Saskatchewan Land Company, lands that the company had and sold to them ?

Mr. MILLER. I think the hon. gentleman likely is referring to some land I bought in conjunction with some other gentlemen belonging to the Canadian Northern Land Company, and if they had any connection whatever with the Saskatchewan Land Company I am not aware of it. The lands were bought from the local land agent in the town of Owen Sound, who was selling land for that company, and that is all I had to do with the transaction.

Mr. BENNETT. That is exactly the point. The Saskatchewan Land Company bought two large parcels which were directly under the charge of the Saskatchewan Land Company and the hon. gentleman knows it.

Mr. MILLER. The hon. gentleman insinuates that I had some reason for defending the hon. member for East Assiniboia because of that particular land purchase, in which purchase I was associated with Dr. Jamieson, the Conservative local member for South Grey. Now I would like in all fairness to myself that the hon. member for East Simcoe should if he can, show that the purchase of land made from the Canadian Northern Land Company through the local agency in Owen Sound, had any connection whatever with my defence of the hon. member for East Assiniboia.

Mr. BENNETT. Now we are getting close to the question. I happened to hear of this matter in the most casual way. One of the gentlemen who was concerned in this, said that the hon. member for South Grey had induced him to go into a land deal and that it was some of the Saskatchewan Land Company's lands. I take the word of that gentleman, who is well known to members of this House.

Mr. MILLER. I rise to a question of privilege. I would like again that the hon. member for East Simcoe should in any way show evidence to connect my name with the purchase of lands from the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, or in any way connect my name with the purchase of a quarter of an acre of land with which the hon. member for East Assiniboia ever had anything to do in which he had any interest to the extent of a five cent piece. I deny that I purchased any lands, or at any time had any interest in lands from the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company ; it was from the Canadian Northern Land Company that I purchased. I do not know that the one has any connection with the other. I have stated that I purchased land from the local land agent in the town of Owen Sound, not knowing and not now believing that the member for East Assiniboia or any other member of this House had anything to do with the ownership of the lands and certainly not with the transaction. I think the hon. member for East Simcoe is bound to accept the statement I have made, and I challenge him to prove anything to the contrary. If he would like to do so. I will show him the agreements and thus afford him every facility.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman will hear about this in South Grey in the approaching election.

Mr. GERVAIS. I think I am in order in calling attention to the following statements which were made in the Senate, on the 27th of February, 1908 by the hon. the Secretary of State. I consider these statements are a libel upon the citizens as well as the administration of the city of Montreal, and I feel it my duty to protest against them, because they are simply outrageously libellous. I think that the Secretary of State before speaking in the way he did should have consulted the members from Montreal, or if he does not care to speak to them, to those who know all about the police admin-

istration and the morals of my fellow citizens of that city.

Mr. FISHER. I rise to a point of order. I do not think the hon. gentleman is in order in interjecting into a discussion of supply in committee extraneous matter concerning proceedings that have taken place in another House.

Mr. GERVAIS. I think I am in order, and I beg leave to read this statement.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. GERVAIS. I move that the committee rise, for the purpose of raising a question of privilege.

Mr. FISHER. I raise the point that the hon. gentleman cannot discuss a matter which is entirely extraneous to the question before the committee, even if he were in order in discussing a proceeding in the other chamber, which he cannot do.

Mr. GERVAIS. I wish to speak on the motion of adjournment which is now before the chair in reference to my question of privilege.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend is not taking a sound position. He cannot bring up anything he desires on a motion that the committee rise. That is totally different from a motion that the House adjourn. On a motion to adjourn the House the hon. member can bring up any question he chooses. But the House is now in Committee of Supply, and the hon. gentleman cannot bring up a totally extraneous matter.

Mr. LENNOX. I presume the hon. member for St. James, Montreal (Mr. Gervais) wants to show the reason why we should not proceed with any more Supply until something that is wrong has been remedied.

Mr. GERVAIS. Here is what was said by the hon. Secretary of State.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McColl). I must rule that the hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then we will appeal to the Speaker.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman rises to a question of privilege he is perfectly in order.

Mr. FISHER. He cannot rise to a question of privilege at any time in this House. There is only a certain time when a personal explanation can be made, but not in the middle of a debate.

Mr. SPROULE. He may do so at any time when there is no member on his feet.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend says that the hon. member for Montreal, St. James, should explain what he was going to deal with. He did, I understood him to say that he was discussing a question which involves a reflection upon the city of Montreal.

Mr. MONK. I understood him to say that he rises to a question of privilege.

Mr. FISHER. He was asked to state what discussion he was going to take up. The answer was that he was going to discuss a statement of a member of the government in another place, which statement, he contended, reflected upon the city of Montreal. In the first place, it is not a question of privilege in regard to the hon. member himself, and in the second place it is entirely irrelevant to the question before the chair or to the motion that the committee rise and report progress. Furthermore he is out of order because it is a discussion of what took place in the other House.

Mr. MONK. On the question of order, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) is wrong as to the fact. I understand the hon. gentleman from Montreal, St. James, to rise as a citizen of Montreal to a question of privilege.

Mr. GERVAIS. Surely.

Mr. MONK. If he does not claim that privilege I desire to claim it for myself. If it is a question of privilege I submit that it is perfectly in order to claim the privilege at any time. The rule suffers no exception; a question of privilege can be claimed at any time and the hon. member must state his question of privilege. It will be for the chairman to decide after he has stated it if it is a question of privilege or not and he should not be handicapped in stating it. I am in the same position under this serious contumely which has been put upon the ciy of Monreal and if the privilege is not granted to my hon. friend I will claim it for myself.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to quote the authority which will justify what I have said that a question of privilege can be raised at any time except when a member is on his feet. Rule 38 says:

> Questions of privilege can be always considered in either House——

And

> —it shall be taken into consideration immediately.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It must be a question of privilege.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member (Mr. Gervais) was not allowed to go far enough to enable you, Mr. Chairman, to judge as to whether it was a question of privilege or not, but, when he arose to explain the question of privilege he was quite within his rights so long as there was no one else on his feet at the time.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr.

Fisher) who is leading the House, to the fact that it is the rule that all committees rise at one o'clock. It is just one o'clock and we have before us the motion that the committee rise and report progress.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am sorry that the minister of the department under discussion is not here at present because some time ago he said that he was prepared to ask the committee to rise if it were not for certain reflections made upon him by the hon. member for East Grey. Since then the hon. member for East Grey said that he intended no insinuation against the integrity of the minister himself.

Mr. FISHER. Did the hon. member for East Grey say that?

Mr. TALBOT. Did he take back what he said?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He does not take back anything.

Mr. TAYLOR. He said that he intended no personal reflection upon the minister. I think that, it being one o'clock and the minister not being in, the committee should report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is already a motion to that effect by the hon. member for East Grey which has not been disposed of. Do I understand the hon. member for Montreal, St. James (Mr. Gervais), to rise to a question of privilege?

Mr. GERVAIS. Yes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It must be a question of privilege.

Mr. GERVAIS. Let me explain the question of privilege, because it has been adjudicated upon before I have had a chance to put the facts before the House. As part of my statement I must quote something which was said in the Senate yesterday.

Mr. FISHER. May I interrupt for one moment? I understood the hon. member to make the statement that he wished to discuss the utterances of a certain member of the government in another place and that there was a reflection upon the city of Montreal. I contend that that is not a question of personal privilege.

Mr. MONK. I rise to a question of order. The hon. member (Mr. Gervais) has the floor, he is stating his question of privilege and he is not to be interrupted.

Mr. PATERSON. Surely the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) will admit that to rise to a question of privilege in committee it is necessary for the hon. mem ber to show that it is a matter personal to himself which constitutes the privilege.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. He must state the privilege.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. MONK. Nobody could stop him from stating the facts.

Mr. PATERSON. If there has been nothing charged against him, or if there have been any remarks made in a speech which are not personal to himself, then surely the hon. gentleman cannot claim a question of privilege.

Mr. GERVAIS. Here is what I want to call to the attention of the committee with your permission, Mr. Chairman:

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The Italians have not come here at the invitation of the government. They come and go in all countries freely, and I know of no reason why we should interdict them here. We have Italians in the city of Ottawa who are law-abiding and industrious and give us no trouble, because we put our laws in force. There are Italians in all the cities of Canada. The reason why they are considered a dangerous element in Montreal is plain. It is because the police officers are absolutely indifferent in their duty and because Montreal abounds with drinking houses, both legal and illegal—more than any other place in Canada.

That is purely and simply an outrageous libel.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is not a question of privilege.

Mr. GERVAIS. No, but I will go farther:

Some time ago I called the attention of the House to the sad commentary that Montreal had more drunken men in proportion to population than any other place in Canada, owing to the abundance of taverns in the city. The police have made no attempt to stem the tide of criminality as they should have done. I saw a month or two ago that some fifty men had been hauled up for selling liquor. Were they punished? No.

Mr. FISHER. I think the hon. member ought to show in what way this applies to him personally.

Mr. GERVAIS. I am going to do it.

Mr. SPROULE. He has a right to read it.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am trusting to the hon. member's knowledge of parliamentary procedure to enable him to judge as to what constitutes a question of privilege. A question of privilege must, of course, be personal to the hon. member.

Mr. GERVAIS. In a minute I will show how I am directly connected with it.

The chief officer asked them each to contribute $5 to a fund, and they were all let off. That is the condition in Montreal, and this is the consequence of it. Had the police done their duty in Montreal, those murders would not have been committed, and had they closed up a number of the drinking houses that would have put a stop to it. What is the

opinion of the Italian priest in Montreal, who has charge of that parish? He says:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is not a question of privilege. I cannot allow you to read a whole essay and then be obliged to conclude that it was not a question of privilege at all. The hon. gentleman will have to come directly to the personal question himself.

Mr. GERVAIS. Before I come to it directly I must quote the facts which I want to state to the chair. I want to show my connection with it.

The police and the magistrates——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will have to show his connection with it immediately, or else he cannot proceed.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is my ruling.

Mr. SPROULE. Then your ruling is not consistent with parliamentary practice.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is not a word to justify the question of privilege.

Mr. GERVAIS. There will be some words to justify a question of privilege.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It will be just as well to show what the question of privilege is now.

Mr. GERVAIS. It will be just as well to ventilate the grievance now. It will have to come later on, surely.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have no objection to ventilating the case if it is in order.

Mr. GERVAIS. I say it is perfectly in order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is not in order so far.

Mr. GERVAIS. I must be allowed to quote all the facts in connection with the case before it can be determined whether it is in order or not. If you want to pass judgment before I have done, of course it is open to you to do so. It is in your province or your power to close my mouth.

Mr. FISHER. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is a motion that the committee rise.

Mr. MONK. Have you given your ruling?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is no question of privilege before me.

Mr. GERVAIS. There is a question of privilege, but I am not allowed to state it.

Mr. LENNOX. Is he not to be allowed to read that which will show his connection with it?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. It seems to me that an hon. member has a perfect right to put a question of privilege before the chair, that the chair will take the word of the hon. member that it is a question of privilege, and if it is found that the facts stated by the hon. member do not constitute a question of privilege, the chair can then rule against him. But I think it is going against the privileges of a member to prevent him putting a question of privilege before the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have asked the hon. member to state his personal connection with the matter. If he wishes to do so he may, but I cannot allow the reading of a whole speech delivered in the Senate.

Mr. GERVAIS. Is it the wish of the chair that I shall begin my speech at the conclusion? Quintilian and other Roman authors, and those versed in French or English literature, say that we must not begin our speech at the conclusion. Such is the opinion of those who know.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question is that the committee rise.

Mr. MONK. If you rule that a question of privilege raised by a member cannot be fully stated, I for one would be disposed to appeal from your decision.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. My ruling is that he has not submitted any question of privilege.

Mr. BENNETT. It has not developed yet; it is coming along nicely.

Mr. MONK. Privilege is a very precious matter, and I cannot accept your ruling in that respect.

Mr. J. D. REID. We will appeal to the Speaker.

And the Speaker having resumed the chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. What is the ruling which is appealed from?

Mr. MONK. I desire to appeal from the ruling of the chairman. I move that the ruling of the chairman of the committee be not sustained. The reason is that the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Gervais) raised a question of privilege and was not allowed to state the question of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER. There can be no discussion on the appeal.

Mr. MONK. The hon. member who raised the question of privilege had, I maintain, the right to fully state it before the chairman was called on to rule.

Mr. SPEAKER. The practice is for the chairman of the committee to report in

writing the point of order which he has decided and which is appealed from. The statement placed in my hands by the chairman of the committee is as follows:

Mr. Gervais, the member for St. James division, raised a question on the ground of privilege. which the chairman decided was not a question of privilege, and the hon. member proceeded to read an article which had no reference to the hon. member.

The question then is, shall the decision of the chairman be confirmed?

Mr. GERVAIS. Mr. Speaker, for divers reasons I beg leave to withdraw the question of privilege.

Mr. MONK. I do not think my hon. friend has a right to do that. I have just seen the hon. member for St. James conferring with hon. gentlemen opposite and he seems to have suddenly come to the conclusion that a question of privilege, such as he has raised, should be abandoned.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have ruled on the question.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit your decision to the House. I beg, therefore, to move:-That the decision of the hon. the Speaker be not sustained. I do so on the ground that any member who raises a question of privilege should be allowed to state it fully.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question must be submitted to the House without discussion. Is it the pleasure of the House that the decision of the chairman of the committee be confirmed?

House divided on the question.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Aylesworth,	Law,
Beland,	Macdonald,
Black,	McColl,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	McCraney,
Boyer,	McIntyre (Perth),
Brodeur,	McKenzie,
Brown,	McLean (York, C.),
Caldwell,	Marcile (Bagot),
Calvert,	Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Carney,	Meigs,
Cash,	Miller,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Oliver,
Clarke,	Pardee,
Conmee,	Paterson,
Copp,	Ratz,
Crawford,	Roche (Halifax),
Devlin,	Ross (Cape Breton),
Fielding,	Savoie,
Fisher,	Sifton,
Fortier,	Sloan,
Gauvreau,	Smith (Oxford),
Gervais,	Stewart,
Greenway,	Talbot,
Harty,	Templeman,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),	Turcotte,
	Turriff,
	Verville,
Jackson (Selkirk),	Walsh (Montreal, St. Anne),
Johnston,	Wright (Renfrew),
Lachance,	Zimmerman.—59.
Lanctot (Richelieu),	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Barker,	Maclean (York, S.),
Bennett,	Martin (Queens, P.E.I.),
Blain,	Monk,
Chisholm (Huron),	Morin,
Cockshutt,	Owen,
Hughes (Victoria),	Paquet,
Jackson (Elgin),	Pringle,
Lalor,	Reid (Grenville),
Lancaster,	Roche (Marquette),
Lavergne (Montmagny),	Sproule,
Lennox,	Taylor.—23.
Lewis,	

Mr. SPEAKER. I declare the ruling of the chairman confirmed by the House.

Mr. MONK. Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to place in your hands a motion for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that no motion at this point is permissible. The only reason I am in the chair is to lay before the House the report of the chairman on his ruling. The moment that is disposed of, the House resumes in Committee of Supply.

House resumed in Committee of Supply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Mr. Sproule has moved that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) flatly contradicted the statement of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) as to the evidence of Mr. Smart concerning the burning of certain letters and letterbooks. The hon. member (Mr. Miller) flourished a clipping from a newspaper, leading the House to suppose that he would give authoritative evidence as to what Mr. Smart had said. But he took care to sit down without reading it. Now, I propose to read from the public documents just what Mr. Smart did say.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) think it has any bearing on this vote of $50,000 for patrolling the waters of Hudson bay?

Mr. BARKER. It has the same bearing that the hon. member for South Grey——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I allowed a passing allusion to it, but it will be awkward to allow a full discussion of this item.

Mr. BARKER. I appeal to fair-play.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If I were to apply the rules of the House, such a discussion would be clearly out of order. But I have allowed great latitude, perhaps unfortunately; but my reason was that it has been customary in this House to allow great latitude. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) will see that it is not in order to under-

take a discussion of the Department of the Interior on an item relating to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BARKER. I always yield to the chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A passing allusion might be allowed.

Mr. BARKER. Then, I may say that the hon. member for South Grey has misstated the evidence. Mr. Smart stated directly and unequivocally, upon his oath, that he had received and answered letters from a member of the North Atlantic Trading syndicate relating to immigration while he was Deputy Minister of the Interior, and that those letters and the letter books containing copies of the replies he had burned.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) tell us out of what vote Mr. Falconer, this New York accountant, was paid?

Mr. BRODEUR. Out of money voted for the purpose by parliament. I think also, some money was paid from the appropriation for the works in Sorel and possibly some other similar special appropriations.

Mr. BLAIN. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not better informed concerning the affairs of his department. Here is a letter dated February 26, addressed to the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries and calling his attention to the fact that a payment of $9,445.25 to K. Falconer in two cheques was against the vote for maintenance of lights. Can he explain that?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are several extensive reports made by Mr. Falconer—who, I may say, is not an American, but a Canadian living in Montreal—in connection with the lighthouse depot in Prescott. Mr. Falconer's services covered this as well as other branches of the department. The lighthouse depot at Prescott is included in the maintenance of lights service.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister tells us that though a certain amount was voted by parliament at his request to pay this service of Mr. Falconer, still he defends the policy of paying Mr. Falconer partly out of the vote for the maintenance of lights. Surely, on reflection, he will not support that policy. If this method were followed, where would it land us?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have explained that this sum was paid out of the maintenance of lights appropriation because that vote covered the lighthouse depot at Prescott, concerning which, reports were made by Mr. Falconer. The same was true with regard to the works at Sorel.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, we understand that the services for this special bookkeeping were paid out of these funds?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, what was done with the special vote given by parliament for the purpose of this expert bookkeeping?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was used for that purpose too.

Mr. BLAIN. How much was that?

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) has under his hand the report which I sent him. I would be glad to give him the information by reading the report.

Mr. BLAIN. I will read it soon. Now, continuing this letter to which I have referred, it says this includes the services of nineteen persons for various periods and at rates of pay varying from $75 to $3.50 per diem. Were the services of the expert accountant sanctioned by order in council?

Mr. BRODEUR. I could not say.

Mr. BLAIN. Was the expenditure of this money sanctioned by the hon. gentleman's colleagues?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. BLAIN. Then are we to understand that his colleagues approved of the principle of paying these accountants out of money that was voted for another purpose? Now, it appears from this correspondence that Mr. Falconer's staff was furnished details of transportation and living expenses in accordance with the order in council, but the Auditor General's Report states that that part of the order was not fulfilled.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am sure it is not my fault. I stated previously that I thought this part of the order had been complied with, and I was surprised to hear that some payments had been made without vouchers being furnished.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the hon. gentleman able to present to this committee now the vouchers that he said were in the department before these accounts were paid?

Mr. BRODEUR. I was under the impression yesterday when I made the statement that the vouchers had been produced when payments were made. I have just been informed by the officer of that branch of the service that the amounts paid were simply advances on account. There is a balance still due for which vouchers have been asked for.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the minister to say that this account had been closed. How much is still due these men?

Mr. BRODEUR. They claim a balance of $6,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Was any portion of this $6,000 unsettled accounts for board by these men when they were living in Ottawa?

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand they have been requested to supply vouchers for that

part of the expenditure, and the officers of the department have decided not to pay any more until these vouchers have been produced.

Mr. BLAIN. Was this request to Mr. Falconer for vouchers made by letter from the minister or his deputy?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was made by letter.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. gentleman produce a copy of that letter?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. He might do it this afternoon. For the time being I am willing to accept his statement. At what dates were these men paid on account of board?

Mr. BRODEUR. The dates of payment are not included in the return.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it not a fact that all these accounts for board have been settled and that the cheques are in one of the departments at the present time?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think anything has been permanently settled.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there been any correspondence between the department and Mr. Falconer showing that there was a dispute in respect to the board allowance?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, Mr. Falconer has been requested to supply the vouchers.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there been any correspondence between the department and these officers in respect to overcharges for board?

Mr. BRODEUR. The accountant who is here is looking into that matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want the minister to be sure of the statement he has made just now that these moneys were advanced to these gentlemen on account. Is that statement correct?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, that is the statement which was put into my hand.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman send up to the Public Accounts Committee and get the accounts that have been brought down, that were rendered in each case weekly or monthly and which were settled for? If he finds that to be the case, how will he account for the statement he has just made?

Mr. BRODEUR. The information I have from the department now is that some advances have been made on account and that there has been correspondence with Mr. Falconer asking him to supply the department with the necessary vouchers.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister must have a copy of these accounts as they ran on monthly.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that there has always been a balance due, even if the account has been paid in full.

Mr. TAYLOR. There are accounts rendered and settled for, and there is no question about them. The minister stated last night that he would bring down certain papers to-day. It is now to-day, because it is 2 o'clock. I asked at 1 o'clock that this committee rise and the minister watching the House was prepared to agree if it had not been for some statements made by the hon. member for East Grey. The hon. member for East Grey said that in the remarks he made he had no personal reference to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I think that in view of that fact and that the minister promised to bring down these papers he should move that the committee rise.

Mr. BRODEUR. What about the hon. member for North Toronto?

Mr. TAYLOR. What the hon. member for North Toronto said applied not personally to the minister but to any minister. The minister has not been able to bring down all the papers that he promised last night to place before the House to-day and in view of that the minister should accept what has been said and ask the committee to rise.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I understand that the minister has made an effort to bring these papers down. He felt that he should have been allowed to proceed upon the understanding that they should be brought down. Through no fault of his own he has been unable to get them. Therefore I think the minister would be absolutely justified in asking the committee to rise.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would be the last man to ask the House to sit unduly, but it is no fault of mine if the matter has reached its present situation. Last night when my estimates were reached a most vicious attack was made upon me by the hon. member for North Toronto.

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, a most vicious attack in which it was said that I had some money from the department that there was no justification at all for, that I used that money for months and months and returned it afterwards to the department. The hon. member for North Toronto knows absolutely that this was an incorrect statement and he wanted to create the impression that I had used the money of the department without any justification. I resented this imputation very strongly because I knew that the hon. gentleman knew too much about the administration of the departments to unwittingly make such an attack upon a colleague in the House. I was extremely sorry later on to hear the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) make some insinuations against me in re-

gard to my administration when I was Speaker of the House. I may have my failings, I know very well that I have not got all the qualities that might appertain to a man but I resent personal attacks.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the minister insist on forcing these estimates through ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I would like to have these attacks withdrawn. I think that in view of these attacks we should pass an item before we adjourn.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister promised to have these papers to-day. It is to-day now. If the papers which were brought down this morning had been the papers promised there would have been an item passed.

Mr. BRODEUR. I said last night that these papers concerning the accounts of the experts were brought down before me and I found they were not complete. I gave instructions to have them completed. We searched for them last night. Nobody could find them. The Deputy Minister was absent in Quebec. This morning, at half past seven or eight, I sent some one to see the secretary of the Deputy Minister to find where these papers were and to have them brought down. All the papers which were being copied were brought down. Amongst them were the ones in question. I saw myself that there were some missing documents and I gave instructions to have them included with the rest. The fact that these papers are not there is due to no fault or negligence of my own. In view of that and in view of the vicious attacks which have been made against me would it not be well that something should be done from the opposition side of the House, that hon. gentlemen recognize that I have done my best in connection with the production of these papers and that in order to show that there is no ill-feeling we will simply pass an item and everything will be forgotten.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister was not in the House when my hon. friend from East Grey said a little while ago that he intended to make no insinuation personally against the minister. It is the same as far as my hon. friend from North Toronto is concerned. In view of the fact that the minister promised to bring these papers down and that they have not been brought down, through no fault of his own, I think he should ask the committee to rise.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister, with no loss of dignity or prestige, having failed to produce the papers and accounts, might now ask the committee to rise.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have produced everything I have here. That is evidence of my good will. I have been trying to do my best. I understand that the opposition was under the impression that there was something to hide in connection with the employment of these experts. There is absolutely nothing to hide. Everything has been above board.

Mr. TAYLOR. At eleven o'clock last night this same proposition was made to the hon. member for North Toronto who, to show his willingness and that of the opposition to go on, made the proposition to take up the estimates of any other department until the Minister of Marine and Fisheries could get these papers. He did not want to proceed with the estimates of this department without them. The minister did proceed and he promised the House that these papers would be brought down in the morning. We waited for them and he says this morning that he cannot fulfil his promise of yesterday.

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) said a minute ago that he was sorry that the minister was not in the House when the hon. member for East Grey said that he had made no insinuation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Against the minister.

Mr. TALBOT. Made no insinuation. It was within the hearing of every member who was in the House at the time that the hon. member for East Grey positively stated that furniture had been bought by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he was Speaker of the House of Commons and that that furniture had disappeared. He asked whether it was done away with, or given as presents, or stolen, as he was informed. He positively stated these things and now the hon. member stands up and says he did not mean anything by it.

Mr. SPROULE. I never made any such statement.

Mr. TALBOT. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He followed up his argument by stating that they had every reason to believe that the then Speaker of the House was extravagant, that he had continued to be extravagant and that they would not allow the item to pass. These were the positive statements of the hon. member for East Grey and now it was very bad form and very bad grace on his part to try and get out of it.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not trying to get out of it one iota, and I do not wish to change one word I said. I will repeat it all over again if it is of any advantage to the hon. member for Bellechasse.

Mr. BENNETT. We are here to stay.

Mr. SPROULE. I simply said that furniture and other things bought by the hon. minister when he was Speaker, I was credibly informed, had disappeared. I asked where they had gone, who had taken them away, I said that we did not know and that we had no person to hold responsible for them except the man who was managing that department for the time be-

ing, therefore, we held him responsible. That is the constitutional and the only way we can do. To say that I am trying to get out of it—not at all.

Mr. TALBOT. Will the hon. gentleman mention any pieces of furniture that were removed or disappeared that were bought by the Speaker of the House at that time? If he is the man I think he is, will he state it positively?

Mr. SAM HUGHES. A little while ago the hon. Minister of Agriculture proclaimed his virtue before the House. He told us that he had become virtuous and that he could not accept the proposal of the opposition to pass some of his items, instead of the items of the Minister of Marine. I regret that the conduct of the Minister of Marine is not in conformity with the principles of responsible government. We cannot be expected to desert the functions of an opposition and allow a minister to come down and say that this must pass or we will sit here day and night. I remember that when the hon. gentlemen were in opposition we were unable to pass a legitimate and proper item for the building of the Farnham post office and we were held up for days because it did not please these hon. gentlemen to see a post office built in that town. Then there was no principle at stake. To-day there is a vital principle at stake. In the face of the fact that these papers have not been brought down and the Minister of Finance thinks that the opposition will tamely sit down and pass these estimates.

I say that the Finance Minister is responsible for this deadlock in attempting to force through this House the estimates of this minister in the face of his refusal to bring down the necessary information. The opposition have offered everything that is fair and square in this matter. We are standing by a principle. Whenever the ministers have shown a desire to meet us fairly and squarely, it is on record that we have always been disposed to help them through with their estimates; but when we are treated as if we had no rights in this House, it is our duty to vindicate our rights as an opposition. When our good friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) criticises the expenditure and gives reasons why we cannot take the word of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) rises and tells him that he is pronouncing a funeral oration. The hon. member for Wright will find that when the freemen of this country hear the facts of this case, they will pronounce the funeral oration of a good many hon. gentlemen opposite. He made the magnanimous offer that I should meet him in the county of Wright and discuss the popularity of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I have faith in the intelligence of the good people of Wright; but when the hon. member for Wright addresses this House as he has done to-day, what would he do in the back townships where the people are beyond the reach of newspapers? I do not know that it is necessary for me to accept his challenge and meet him in the county of Wright. I might as well ask him to meet me in the county of Carleton. But I have faith in the intelligence of the people of Wright that when the facts of this case are presented to them and they learn that their money has been squandered in the manner in which it is shown to be by this minister, it will require a much more glib tongue than that of the hon. member to prove to them that he is the man for Galway.

Mr. TAYLOR. A few moments ago I asked the minister to refer to the accounts, which would prove that he was again misleading the House. Now, I have the accounts, and here is the first one on file.

Mr. BLAIN. No vouchers?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, no vouchers. The first is dated the 30th of November, 1906, and is as follows: 256 days' services, $7,638.89; 83 days' board at $5 a day, $415; 124½ days at $4, $498; 55 days at $3, $165; making a total for board of $1,078; transportation, $599.35; stenographer, 8⅓ weeks at $9.50, $79.16; telegrams, $42.49; stationery, $17.35; making a total of $9,445.24. This is the account rendered by Mr. Falconer, and it is marked on the face: 'Pay subject to minister's approval, H. G.' There is credited on that a cheque for $25,000, and on the 21st December a payment of $6,235, so that that account is closed; and not a voucher there. It is the same with all the other accounts rendered in this way to the amount of $31,235. This is the way the minister has been giving correct information on nearly every question submitted by this side of the House. He said that these advances were only made on account, and yet the accounts are closed right through. No court of law would allow the government or anybody else to deal with these accounts in that way.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the name of the man who charged $5 a day for board and only paid $1?

Mr. TAYLOR. The names are W. B. Richards, W. F. Russell, G. E. Fawcett and K. Falconer at $5 a day; R. L. Acton, F. H. Leland, Geo. Pare, M. L. Cooley and H. A. Marvin, at $4 a day; S. Kettridge, A. H. Moorman, J. J. Murray and L. Cone, at $3 a day.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to know if any of these men whose names have been read and whose board is charged at from $3 to $5 per day were in the house from which my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Jackson) was staying, and where the charge for board is about $1 per day.

Mr. W. JACKSON. The names of those I had referred to are found at page P—78, Marvin, Hipwell and Ellis.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the face of these accounts being settled, what about these advances ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I explained that the department has in hand a sufficient sum of money to recoup itself if there is anything wrong in these vouchers. The department has requested Mr. Falconer to produce these vouchers. He has been urging for money since September last, but we have declined to pay until the vouchers are produced.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the deputy minister says 'with the approval of the minister.' And the accounts are closed.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, I have not initialled one of them.

Mr. LALOR. What amount has been paid these auditors, what amount is still due them ?

Mr. BRODEUR. About $36,000 has been paid, and they make a claim of about $6,000 which we have refused to pay until they produce the vouchers for the charge for board mentioned there.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has entered the House, and I would like to submit a question to him. It appears that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has paid these experts bills amounting to $9,445.25 out of the money voted by this House for the maintenance of lights. I would like to know if that is just to this House and if it is a proper principle for a minister to adopt in his department ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think it would be more desirable, in a matter of this kind, to have a special vote to cover the service. But if the audit dealt with the service of the maintenance of lights, there would be nothing wrong in taking a portion of the expense out of the money for that service. As a matter of procedure, I would rather do it the other way.

Mr. BLAIN. This money was paid out of this appropriation for the maintenance of lights after an appropriation had been made by the House for this specific purpose. And the Auditor General drew the attention of the department to the fact that it was not in accordance with the order in council. Yet the Minister of Marine and Fisheries justifies this procedure. I suppose that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be taken to task at the next meeting of the Council. Now, the Minister of Finance has been called out of the House again, so I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if it will be the policy of his department in the future to apply the principle which he has applied in this case ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am sure that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) does not wish the country and the House to understand that we have been taking money which should have been used for the maintenance of lights and applying it to bookkeeping as a different service. I may not have made myself clear. The lighthouse depot of Prescott is a large organization and covers manufacturing processes. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) say that work done for the improvement of the system in that lighthouse depot was not a fair charge against that service ?

Mr. BLAIN. Not in the face of the fact that the House had voted a specific amount for the work.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was not voted then. The vote was in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. minister tell us when these cheques were given ?

Mr. BRODEUR. One cheque, for $5,000, was on November 29, 1906. At that time, no money was voted.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that, before any amount was voted, the hon. gentleman had appointed the New York accountants to take charge of his accounts, that these New York accountants had commenced work and had run up an account of $9,000 against the department before this House had voted a dollar for the service ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I did not appoint New York accountants. I have stated that before and am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman repeat his statements.

Mr. BARR. There was a time when the ministers were all powerful. There was a time, before that, when the King was all powerful. But at length we came to the days of responsible government when the laws were not the expression of the will of the King or the King's ministers, but the expression of the will of the people themselves. Under responsible government, an opposition is necessary to criticise and check the acts of the government. For the first time in my short political career, I heard here recently from the lips of the Minister of Finance a plain statement of the doctrine that the opposition in this House had no inherent rights, but that what powers they enjoyed were conceded to them by the government. I want to tell that hon. gentleman that if we have not the numbers in this House, we have the country behind us, and the country will demand that our position be recognized. We are responsible for every item of expenditure authorized by this House. If we do not demand the information necessary to judge rightly of that expenditure, we do not perform that duty. The other item of $4,445 was paid in the month of December.

Mr. BENNETT. Who was the party with whom the minister dealt as to hiring, and the arrangement for board ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Falconer is the man with whom the arrangements were made, by myself personally.

Mr. BENNETT. Was the arrangement with Mr. Falconer that he and his party were to have each a per diem allowance for board ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Here is Mr. Falconer's first account, to the 30th of November : services, 256 days, $7,678.89. Now the per diem allowance for subsistence : 83 days at $5 a day, $415; 124½ days at $4, $498; 55 days at $3 per day, $165 ; or a total of $1,078 up to that date. Now the House will see that there was an explicit arrangement with the minister that Mr. Falconer was to be allowed $5 per day for board of certain classes of his staff, $4 per day for certain other classes, and $3 per day for certain others. Was that the arrangement with regard to board?

Mr. BRODEUR. My recollection with regard to board is that there was no understanding that we should pay a specific sum.

Mr. BENNETT. The account placed here by Mr. Falconer goes to prove that there was an explicit arrangement with the minister for a per diem allowance at three separate rates. On that basis a bill amounting to over $4,000 has been paid to Mr. Falconer. If the minister is correct that they were only to be allowed what they paid, we have here a case of petty stealing and theft. We find here one man, H. A. Mervin, who is allowed $4 a day, another man, H. Hipwell, who is allowed $3 a day, and another man named Ellis is allowed $4 a day. Now the hon. member for West Elgin has stated that these men Mervin, Ellis and Hipwell were all boarding in the same House with him, and that the prices paid there were not more than $1 a day if as much.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was well understood that these men should be paid the actual amount of money which they expended. Now they have made a claim against the department for work done and for board, and this claim has been rejected until Mr. Falconer produces vouchers for the amount which was paid for board.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister the contract that he made with Mr. Falconer ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, it was a verbal arrangement.

Mr. FOSTER. An expenditure of $50,000, and nothing but a verbal contract.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was a verbal arrangement to begin with.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, it is a very fortunate thing that the hon. member for West Elgin was able to expose this case of petty thieving. Now what proof is there that all these other men have not been paid swindling rates as well ? If he has swindled the country on the board of Hipwell to the tune of $2 a day, why has he not swindled the country on the whole board bill? Now the fault must be either the minister's or Mr. Falconer's and the minister seems to be in fault, because there was evidently an agreement that Falconer and his staff were to be allowed boarding rates at $5, $4 and $3 a day. I must say that if the minister was in a court of law the court would be forced to believe Mr. Falconer and not the minister. The minister received an account of $9,445 from this man, and he will not deny that he never saw that account.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think I ever saw it. I do not see any of the accounts in the department, they all pass through the accountant's branch.

Mr. BENNETT. Now we find in this bill one item ' Paid subject to the minister's approval.' Did the minister tell the deputy that it was right to pay that bill ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, I am sure I did not approve of this bill because it did not contain my initials, showing that it was not brought before me.

Mr. BENNETT. The deputy certifies here to the accountant to pay it, because the minister has told him to do it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I did not see it, and I did not approve it. When accounts contain the words ' subject to the minister's approval,' if they do not bear my initials it is evident that I have not seen them.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister says he made a bargain with Falconer that the latter was only to be allowed for board for himself and his staff on the production of vouchers.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. I may quote from a letter which was sent to that gentleman :

Accounts and vouchers must always be rendered by you as well as the accountants for board and living expenses in Ottawa, from the parties with whom they live.

That is dated on the 19th of December, 1907.

Mr. BENNETT. That is after this account had been placed before the department and paid ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There was always a balance sufficient to cover anything which was not correct.

Mr. BENNETT. That seems to be a practice in the hon. gentleman's department. There is a case that will be reviewed in the Public Accounts Committee where a man named Birnie, of the Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, by approval of the minister, is allowed $5 per day for hotel bills. The minister will not deny that.

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Birnie who is not a regular officer of the department, did not keep his accounts but he was instructed that in future he would have to keep them. In the meantime he was paid $3 a day.

Mr. BENNETT. When the minister was paying Birnie $5 a day for hotel expenses he had right under his eye a bill of $2 a day for the stenographer who accompanied him. Here is Birnie exerting political leverage to force the minister to allow him $5 per day for travelling around country hotels when the minister has the bill of the stenographer who acompanied him and who charged $2 a day.

Mr. BRODEUR. The situation of Birnie was different from the situation of the shorthand writer.

Mr. BENNETT. I know it was nothing of the kind. Birnie stayed in the same hotel as the stenographer. That strengthens my belief that there was a bargain between the minister and Falconer. I am inclined to that opinion but I will withhold my judgment until I hear Falconer's statement. I do not wonder that the minister did not bring down this reeking mass of corrupt thieving. This goes right through the minister's department in which political leverage is sufficient to allow a man to charge $5 a day when another man pays $2. It is like the dredging contract men, both of whom swore the other day that they did not see anything wrong in swindling the government, that that was an accepted custom in their part of the country. It is not done to the tune of a few thousands of dollars but to the tune of hundreds of thousands. Is the minister going to say that this man is swindling the country when he puts his bill in in that way ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have stated my explanation of it.

Mr. BENNETT. This man stands as a confessed swinder and thief on what the minister says.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not in the habit of branding people as robbers and swindlers. I am simply stating the facts and I will leave the people to draw their own conclusions.

Mr. BENNETT. When a man is told that he is only to be allowed so much per day and when he puts in a bill for $5 a day when he actually paid out $1 or $2 he is a thief and every man will brand him as a thief.

Mr. BRODEUR. I cannot agree with my hon. friend. These are words that I am not in the habit of using.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman could apply the term to any man on this side of the House or if he could accuse them of such swindling work as that it would come very quickly from him.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not been brought up in that way at all.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, it may be that the hon. gentleman has not been brought up in that way, but he has consorted with that class of people and probably he has grown hardened to it.

Mr. W. JACKSON. We are here trying to see that the affairs of our country are managed honestly and fairly. We are here representing the people and as such we have a right to know everything connected with the public administration. If we have not a proper system of bookkeeping I for one believe that it should be changed. In any municipality in this country there must be a voucher for every account and the auditor will refuse to pay an account until the voucher is forthcoming. I do not believe in obstructing and I am not obstructing in fighting for the rights and privileges that belong to me as a representative of the people. We look to parliament hill to guide us in what we should do in our smaller corporations. We expect to find there a high standard but what would be said of the officer of any municipal or private corporation who took money from one fund entrusted to his care and used it for some other purpose ? We find that in many of our moneyed institutions officials have been tempted in that way thinking that it was no harm to take money from a fund with the intention of placing it back again, but how many times do we find that unfortunately the money is not put back, that in the end defalcation results. These people will say that it is all right because they do it in Ottawa. That is the condition that we find to-day. We find a minister of the Crown taking money voted for one purpose and using it for another. It is no excuse whatever to say that he will put it back. It is just as much a crime to divert that money from the purpose for which it is voted even if you intend to put it back as if it were never put back. You are entering the thin end of the wedge of corruption and the example is being handed down to our smaller municipalities.

Now, I have one or two words to say in reference to the making of this special audit. If you are going to pay men $50 a day for their services, let them board themselves, where they like and how they like. But if they were to have payment of their actual living expenses while in Ottawa, before one of them was paid a dollar on that account, he should have placed a receipted voucher in the hands of the department. Nothing could be more contemptible, ridiculous and unbusinesslike than the manner of dealing with these men. You will not find anything like it, even in the smallest municipality in the country. Our system of bookkeeping on parliament hill badly needs fixing. Surely the cardinal principle of

good bookkeeping is to keep a check on all your disbursements, so that at a moment's notice you can tell where every five cents of your money has gone to. Speaking from the farmer's standpoint, I do not think the average farmer in the Dominion of Canada will be found to have his books in such bad shape as those of this department.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. A little while ago the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries objected to the tenor of the language of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett); but I remember an occasion in 1892, when the present minister was in opposition, and he took a very active part in obstructing a little estimate concerning the Farnham post office. The obstruction was continued all one afternoon, all one night and the following day until nearly noon, when the then opposition saw their error, and withdrew. In 'Hansard' of 1892, at page 2902, will be found the speech of the hon. minister in which he used language quite as strong as that used by the hon. member for East Simcoe to-day.

So we find the hon. gentleman's chickens are coming home to roost. It comes with an ill grace from him to criticise the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) when that hon. gentleman calls him to account for his mismanagement of his department. Now, it is late for breakfast time, and I think the minister should see his way clear to have the committee rise and report progress. What does he say about it?

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall be very glad to report progress when progress has been made.

Mr. OWEN. The leader of the House, in the absence of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), I take it, is the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I would like to ask that hon. gentleman how long this farce is to continue?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OWEN. That it is a farce none will deny. We have been here three months, and what have we done for the people of Canada? Let me read what the people of this country think of this parliament. Here is the opinion of a weekly newspaper that I received this morning:

> Of all the public expenditures of Canada at the present time, there is none that calls more loudly for investigation than that of parliament itself. We would commend to the Public Accounts Committee an analysis of the reckless waste involved in a three months' session of the Dominion parliament which has scarcely given us, after all this expenditure of time, breath and money, a single item of important legislation. The present session met on November 27, and is therefore in the third month of its duration. Its cost to the country to date has been in round figures half a million.

That is the opinion of the country concerning this parliament. Now, I cannot understand why hon. gentlemen opposite continue to obstruct——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OWEN—for obstructing they are. The trouble seems to be in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I do not want the minister to think that I have any suspicion of him doing wrong intentionally, but there is evidently something wrong in his department. He has been asked time and again to bring down papers and has promised to do so, but the papers have not been brought down. That is the real trouble; that is the obstruction; that is how these gentlemen obstruct the business of the country in this House; that is why we have done nothing in the three months we have been in session. It is a disgrace to Canada, this parliament. The difficulty all seems to hinge on the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Evidently a house cleaning is needed in that department. There must be something radically wrong there, or so many lines of suspicion would not point to the department. The minister brought from New York—I learned for the first time last night—a carload of expert book-keepers to remodel the accounting system of the department. That job cost the country about $52,000. The minister told us he had vouchers for everything, and now it appears he has not vouchers for anything. We have had scandal after scandal here piling up against hon. gentlemen opposite. I was sorry to hear the Minister of Finance say here the other day that the opposition had no rights in this House. I do not know what the people would do if we were not here. They would have no country at all in six months if we were not here—the whole thing would go into the pockets of a few favoured individuals. But we have rights here. The people have sent us to investigate the doings of the government, and that work we have a right to do and are bound to do. I shall not take up time. I understood from last night's debate that the 'Arctic' expedition is going to be investigated in a short time, and I may have something to say about that. I simply rose to protest against the way the government is obstructing business in this House. We cannot get the papers to which we have a right, and without these papers we cannot carry on our investigations. I do not want the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to think that I am suspicious that he has done anything wrong, but he must see that unless the papers are laid before us we cannot help thinking that there is something wrong in his department. I should think that, for his own sake, for his own reputation, he would be glad to give us all the information we require. He should bring down these papers and allow us to go on with the business of the country, that we may no longer be like a parcel of schoolboys as we have been for three months in this House.

Mr. J. D. REID. The fact that certain names appear again in the Auditor General's Report, though we know that the men thus named have been guilty of great wrongs in this department, must justify severe criticism. The fact that papers are not brought down is another cause of suspicion. There is a fault in the papers laid before the Public Accounts Committee by the minister even to-day. About two weeks ago we moved for certain papers. And when they were sent over the most important letter of all was missing, that was a letter in the case of the purchase of the 'Catharine C.' We wanted to go on with that investigation. I telephoned the department two or three days ago about this letter, and asked them to look it up. But they have to get the authority of the minister before they will bring these letters over.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not remember the case to which the hon. member (Mr. J. D. Reid) refers.

Mr. J. D. REID. I may be mistaken as to the department. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) tells me that this has to do with the Department of Public Works, so I take it back so far as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is concerned.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have given positive instructions to prepare all returns that have been asked for. We are loaded with requests. I think the Public Accounts Committee has sent for a large number of returns.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then I take another case. Two or three weeks ago we moved in the Public Accounts Committee for the papers respecting the fishery leases.

Mr. BRODEUR. I told the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that all the leases were brought down last year.

Mr. J. D. REID. I want to look into these leases and I want to see the originals.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman can see the originals also.

Mr. J. D. REID. When the papers are brought down in the House I think the department should let the secretary of the Public Accounts Committee know where they are so that we can see them.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does my hon. friend think that when the papers have been brought down another motion should be made in the Public Accounts Committee to have new copies made?

Mr. J. D. REID. Certainly not, but we want to know where we can get them. I made a motion for the original documents to be produced in the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no objection to that.

Mr. J. D. REID. They were ordered two weeks ago, and I have telephoned to his department several times asking if it was not possible to send a man over with them. The minister can see where we have reason to feel that he is not treating us fairly. Certainly he gave me the impression that he did not want us to see them.

Mr. BRODEUR. They are before the House now.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister knows that there is an awful difference between copies and originals, because the copies that are sent to the Public Accounts Committee in almost every case are not exact copies.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is a strong statement.

Mr. J. D. REID. I could name a case where, within 48 hours, I have examined the papers in the Public Accounts Committee that were sent over by a certain department and they certainly show a pretty bad state of affairs. I telephoned over to the department and got the originals, and they show that the government were all right, but the copyists have left out certain parts that made it look bad for the government. Now, as far as that man Merwin is concerned, I want to tell the minister I have no confidence in him. I think he did everything he possibly could to rob this country. In the Auditor General's Report the department have bought $50,000 worth from Merwin direct and some $50,000 in the name of F. L. Brooks. Now, Merwin has made a great rake-off on that.

Mr. BRODEUR. The goods were ordered before I took office.

Mr. J. D. REID. Suppose they were, does the minister consider the prices he charged were honest?

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say with regard to Merwin that he sold to the department, if I remember aright, some goods for a very large amount. There were some few items among the whole in which he charged a large profit, but the items on which he charged this large profit did not amount to more than five per cent of all the goods that were sold to the department.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would ask the minister if he considers this invoice of Merwin's was a straight and honest invoice? For one engine for which he charged $1,250 he made a profit of $250. For a Sturdevant engine costing $335 Merwin charged the government $960, making a profit of 18 per cent. He got $625 profit or 187 per cent on a $335 purchase. Does the minister think that is honest?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not putting the case fairly before the country. Here is a

man selling $200,000 worth of goods to the department.

Mr. J. D. REID. He sold over half a million dollars worth.

Mr. BRODEUR. The books will show that. There was some machinery which was sold for the lighthouse depot at Prescott on which the profit did seem to be large, but this was only a very small percentage of the whole transaction.

Mr. J. D. REID. I agree that these items in so far as machinery is concerned represent a very small percentage, but at the same time the minister knows that it was impossible, on account of the shortness of the time, to investigate all of Merwin's accounts. After it was proven that Merwin was a scoundrel the minister purchased from Merwin $50,000 worth of goods saying that it was contracted for before and he allowed him to sell through F. L. Brooks & Co., $50,000 worth. This $100,000 worth of goods was purchased from Merwin by the minister after the whole affair had been exposed to him and Merwin probably made from $20,000 to $40,000 profit out of it. That surely justifies the opposition in criticising the minister.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not complain of that at all.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minster said last evening that we were making a special attack upon his department. The minister did wrong to continue to do business with this man when he knew the kind of man he was dealing with.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend has no evidence that we continued to do business.

Mr. J. D. REID. Well, the goods were still ordered.

Mr. BRODEUR. If they were contracted for before would not my hon. friend admit that the department is liable for the payment of these goods?

Mr. J. D. REID. Does not the minister believe that he would have been justified in immediately cancelling the contract if he knew the man was defrauding the department.

Mr. BRODEUR. Once a contract has been made it has to be carried out.

Mr. J. D. REID. This is a case in which we feel that we should criticise the minister very severely. He bought goods from this man and allowed him to supply goods to the department through the firm of F. L. Brooks & Co.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, that is not the case. The hon. gentleman knows very well that this machinery was bought and the accounts certified by Mr. J. F. Fraser.

Mr. J. D. REID. They are not all certified by J. F. Fraser.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. BRODEUR. Most of them. The hon. gentleman knows Mr. Fraser. He was the officer who was responsible for seeing that the accounts were properly certified and that no unfair profits were made. He knows Mr. Fraser better than I do. He was not an appointment of mine as he knows. He was in the service when the government came into power. Will he undertake to state that he would not believe that Mr. Fraser was honest in certifying the accounts as he has done in regard to Merwin?

Mr. J. D. REID. I know Mr. Fraser and I believe he is an honest, upright man. I am not saying anything about that, but the difficulty with regard to these officials is that it never has been proved that they were the ones who made the contract. The position they were in was this; if they wanted a boiler or any other piece of machinery they were told to go to Merwin to get it and let him send in the invoice, and if they do not certify to it something might happen to them.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think that is fair in regard to Mr. Fraser. Mr. Fraser was examined in that case and he said that he may have made a mistake but he thought the charges then made were fair and just. If Mr. Fraser is the upright man that we believe he is, there is no reason to believe that he has been trying to deceive the department.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then I look at the Auditor General's Report and I see that the minister has been paying $75 a day to this accountant and that he has been paying $5 a day for board in the city of Ottawa. That was all done by the minister personally. There is no other minister who can be held responsible for that. We must come to the conclusion that it looks rather fishy to say the least of it. We know that there is no place in the city of Ottawa where any man is charged $5 a day for board. He paid one man $75 a day, another $40, and so on.

Mr. BRODEUR. What do they charge in the Russell?

Mr. J. D. REID. You can live for $3 a day at the Russell, but it has come out since that these gentlemen were not staying at the Russell at all. When it was understood that they were only to be paid what their actual board cost and when they produced accounts in his department for $5, or $4 a day, as the case might be, I think the minister will agree that he should at once have looked into the matter and that it was a really unfair charge.

Mr. BRODEUR. These accounts were never brought before me.

Mr. J. D. REID. We only know that now, and that is the reason why we have to criticise the minister very closely. When the 'Arctic' investigation came on two or three

years ago, we got an order to bring the accounts down in connection with that steamer. We supposed that they had all been brought down, but the accounts of next year showed several items that should have been in the original return. If these accounts had been brought down they would have shown that there should have been a larger quantity of supplies on the 'Arctic' than there was. The minister proved to us that the 'Arctic' had purchased enough goods of every kind to make a three year trip and he tried to prove there was a two years' supply still. Now we find that $40,000 more has been spent for supplies for that steamer. When things of that kind appear in the Auditor General's Report, the minister should not try to force these estimates through until they are explained. Last night, when it was shown that he had not brought these papers down, we were willing to let a number of other items go through if he would let this item stand, but he absolutely refused, and insisted on passing this item or nothing. We are not in a position without these papers to properly investigate these estimates. Therefore, I think the minister should reconsider the matter, and not place us in such an unfair and unjust position.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to ask the hon. minister a question in regard to the Merwin account.

Mr BRODEUR. The Merwin account falls under another item entirely. The hon. gentleman should confine himself to the item under discussion.

Mr. BLAIN. I merely want to ask one or two questions.

Mr. BRODEUR. Unfortunately, I cannot give the information, because the officer in charge of that branch of the service is not here.

Mr. BLAIN. This is so apparent that I am sure the hon. minister will be able to answer without the officer. The complaint against the department is that when they required an engine, instead of sending an officer of the department to buy it direct from the manufacturer, they employed Mr. Merwin, who has no manufacturing establishment, whatever and no business connection except that of a middleman, to buy it for the government. He went to Mr. Wilson, of Montreal, and bought an engine for $335 and sold it to the government for $960, Making a profit of $625 for himself in the transaction. I want to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he approves of that policy?

Mr. FISHER. That is too broad a question to answer off-hand.

Mr. BLAIN. I am sorry that my hon. friend is too narrow to answer the question. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries continues to employ Mr. Merwin. This man bought $11,830.70 worth of goods from the manufacturer and sold them to the department for $18,012.50, putting $6,173.80 into his pocket as profits. I want to ask my hon. friend whether that is a proper policy for him to adopt, and whether he intends to continue that policy ?

Mr. BRODEUR. As that question is not at all connected with this item, I do not think it fair to ask me to answer it. When the proper item comes for discussion, I will answer my hon. friend. This money for the 'Arctic' which we are discussing will not be given in any shape or form to Mr. Merwin.

Mr. BLAIN. Will there be a middleman employed to purchase goods for her ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the goods be bought by tender ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. At page 709 of the Debates of the House of Commons for 1906 I read the following questions and answers :

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Did the government or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries employ a company of American expert auditors or accountants, examining the books and accounts or investigating the purchases made by the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the aids to navigation, or other supplies?

2. If so, what is the firm name of the said auditors or accountants, and is its headquarters in New York, United States, or in Chicago, Illinois?

3. If so, how many men have been so employed on said work, and for what length of time have they been so employed?

4. If so, how much has the work cost, if completed, and if not completed, how much, if any, has been paid on account of said work?

5. If so, has a report of their work been made, and will it be laid on the table of the House?

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

1. Mr. Kenneth Falconer, of Montreal, and staff are making an audit of the accountant's branch of the Department of Marine with a view to remodelling work of same on most improved and up-to-date system of book-keeping.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Six. The work was put in hand towards the end of July last, and, after preliminary arrangements and details were settled, has since been in progress.

4. The work is not yet completed. An advance of $5,000 on account has been made.

5. No report has yet been made but as soon as it will be made I will lay it on the table if it is asked for.

Has a report in connection with this new system of book-keeping been submitted to the House ?

Mr. FIELDING. I presume that my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) put that question to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Bro-

deur) some time during the last twenty-four hours and that the minister answered it. I cannot answer it.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not at any time during the last twenty-four hours, except within the last ten minutes, ask that question. And is it not a fair question to ask in view of the case itself and of what the minister has said ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think it would be a most excellent and a perfectly fair question to have addressed to the minister at an earlier time. I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not put it at a more convenient moment.

Mr. BLAIN. It appears, then, I cannot get an answer to that question. Now, the minister was asked whether this firm of accountants had its headquarters in New York or in Illinois, and the answer was : This accountant is a resident of the city of Montreal. Now, the minister had the information at hand as to the headquarters of this auditing firm. And we have the fact here that the people of this country have been called upon to pay the travelling expenses of Mr. Falconer between Ottawa and New York. Shall I say this was a dishonest answer ? I will not say that, but I will say it was a misleading answer. Now, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) knows all about the city of Montreal. May I ask him whether Mr. Falconer is a resident of Montreal or of New York ?

Mr. FISHER. I am told that Mr. Falconer resides in Montreal generally.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, why does this government pay his expenses between New York and Ottawa ?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Falconer, I understand is a member of the firm in New York, and may have been in New York when called upon.

Mr. BLAIN. That is the honest answer, and the answer given by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) was not a fair answer. Mr. Falconer is a member of a firm with headquarters in New York. That is what I wish to call attention to.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Falconer being a Canadian, and residing generally in Montreal.

Mr. BLAIN. When this question was asked, we knew nothing about Mr. Falconer. The question was asked whether this government had entered into a contract with an American house to remodel the accounts of the department, and we were told that the contract was with a Montreal firm. Now, the Minister of Agriculture tells us it was with a firm in the city of New York. There is one other thing I would like to know. Prior to December 10, 1906, when $5,000 was paid to this firm, had an appropriation for this service been voted by this House? If not, out of what appropriation was this $5,000 paid.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. FISHER. I think that information has already been given to the House.

Mr. BLAIN. No.

Mr. FISHER. Not this year, but when the estimates were going through last year.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. minister recollect what the information was ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not, but I am pretty sure it was given.

Mr. BLAIN. I am sorry we have not the information we are entitled to. I cannot go on with what I had intended to say, owing to the absence of the minister and the lack of information to which we are entitled.

Mr. BARR. This is not the first time I have seen a conflict between a government and an opposition, and in nearly every case it has been the fault of the government. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has taken the wrong course in attempting to force his estimates through this House. I may say here that of all the departments of this government, the one of which we are the most suspicious is the Department of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Evidently the minister has lost his head if he thinks that he can force the opposition to pass these items without affording us the necessary information to enable us to judge whether they should be accepted or not. This government have become overbearing and haughty, because they are able to carry the by-elections. But the fact that a government can carry a by-election, when it can concentrate all its powers of corruption on a single constituency, is no proof that it possesses public confidence. We remember that the late Liberal government of Ontario, one of the most corrupt that ever disgraced this country, carried nearly every by-election, but when the general election came on they were swept from power by a great majority. This discussion has taken a very wide range, and the interest which the House is taking in it is shown by the fact that so many members are sleeping soundly in their chairs.

I would strongly urge hon. gentlemen opposite to accept the liberal terms which were offered by the opposition and allow this House to adjourn. Last night the hon. minister insisted on passing several items but the fight was kept up through the night and between eight and nine o'clock to-day he agreed to bring down the papers. He brought down some papers but he only brought down enough to condemn himself and his department. In connection with the auditing of the books we find there was no written agreement but that there was a verbal agreement that the gentlemen employed on this work were to have a certain amount and were to be paid their board. What was their board ? My hon. friend

from West Elgin (Mr. Jackson) happened to be boarding at the house where a number of Mr. Falconer's staff were boarding. Mr. Falconer and his assistant were to get $5 a day, the second class were to get $4 and the third class $3 as an allowance for board. I have been here for years and I do not know a single boarding place where they charge any one remaining for a length of time $5 a day. I do not believe that there is such a place and yet these men were paid $5 a day. Where is the rake-off ? The rake-off was more than was actually paid for the board of these men and I think we are perfectly justified in discussing these items. This shows the way in which business is conducted in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It shows that there is need of a complete house cleaning and we should be in a position when these returns are brought down to examine every item. In this case we have reason to be suspicious, and we have reason to demand a fair investigation at the hands of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller), in discussing the burning by Mr. Smart, the late deputy Minister of the Interior, of certain letters connected with the North Atlantic Trading Company, undertook to defend that transaction. Mr. Smart admitted during the investigation that he had burned letters which must have been connected with the official business that he was transacting as deputy minister. In his dealings with the North Atlantic Trading Company he was associated with Mr. Preston and Mr. Leopold, and we have reason to believe that the letters which were burned had reference to the North Atlantic Trading Company and that they should have been produced before the Public Accounts Committee. While he says that he burned the letters in large quantities, I venture to say that he kept enough to establish the bargain he made with Messrs. Preston and Leopold and the unknown who threatened to commit suicide. I do not think the hon. member for South Grey strengthened the cause of the government very much by bringing in that matter. Although the opposition has been charged with obstructing the public business, it would be easy to show that we have good reason for the position we take in this discussion. There never has been an opposition in the Dominion of Canada whose skirts are as clear as those of the present opposition or who have been tried so much in their efforts to perform their duties as we are by the present government. Under these circumstances the government must take the responsibility for obstruction. I can hardly imagine that the First Minister, if he were here, would sanction the course taken by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. In connection with the 'Arctic' expedition we have for the last two sessions had to struggle to obtain the most meagre information. The country was astounded when the figures of the expenditure in connection with that matter came out.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, there are certain times in the day when men are better natured and better pleased with the world than at other times. After a splendid dinner we should feel that we are at ease, and under these circumstances I think that I might submit to our genial and usually good-natured friend the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) that it would remove the difficulties that exist at the present time if he would suggest to one of his colleagues that we take up some other estimates and let the work of the House go on. The tension will then be removed, and I have no doubt that when these papers are brought down everything will go on smoothly again. However, if the minister will not accept that proposition, we will have to go on with our consideration of the matter which is now before the committee. Before dinner I was discussing the 'Arctic' and showing what it had cost the country. I venture to say that when the free and independent electorate read in the papers tomorrow or, if they are allowed to do so, in the 'Hansard,' the facts of the case they will say that the opposition on this question alone had sufficient ground for holding up the minister until he had given the fullest information on every item before the committee. I pointed out that the steamer 'Arctic' was manned by forty-seven good and true men and that she was stocked with such an enormous amount of supplies that it is difficult to know how she could hold them all. Amongst these were clothing, $10,379.75 ; cigars, $450 ; cigarettes, $50 ; and tobacco and pipes, $595. I do not believe that there are many here who imagine that all the material that was paid for could be placed on that little boat. I do not think that it is possible that that amount was purchased ; we do know that it was paid for, but who got the rake-off we do not know. We have not been able to find out. However, we have done our duty, and we leave it to the country to decide. With these revelations, I am not surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite are endeavouring to shut off inquiry into original papers. The country is becoming alarmed at the state of affairs.

The independent papers that formerly supported hon. gentlemen opposite are today on the side of the opposition, and they reflect the public opinion of the country more truly than the old-line papers. In proof of that, I will read an extract from 'United Canada' of Ottawa :

Has a member of parliament the right to see original public documents? 'United Canada' believes that the electors think he has. As a rule, however, most governments—especially old governments—expect the opposition and the public as well to close their eyes, open their mouths and accept a dash of anything that is offered.

The Ottawa 'Journal' heads its article 'Premier's downfall,' and the Hamilton 'Herald' (both independent) declares that this refusal will 'cause Canadians to wonder whether our system of government is, after all, representative, democratic government.'

The theory of all monarchical forms of government, if we have read correctly, is that all law and favours are handed down to the people from the Crown, while the republican doctrine and theory is that all laws and enactments are handed up as their wish and will from the people.

In the 'United Canada's' humble opinion the people of this country have been doing the handing up—millions in taxes—for many years, and now a 'holding up' policy seems to be in sight.

The last deputy minister of that same Interior Department, Mr. James A. Smart, is said to have taken no chances, in the matter of being called upon to show original state correspondence, but burned them all before he left the department and the country.

This same James A. Smart, like his divine master, Clifford Sifton, became suddenly rich. Both affected to be very religious men in 1896. Smart would preach the gospel on Sunday evening, and sing himself quite hoarse, or roll his eyes heavenward in prayer. The bible he carried to church was as large as a city directory. He had the Ten Commandments hung in front of his desk. 'Thou shall not steal' was there, but 'successful' politicians in Canada never see that commandment. 'United Canada' hopes that this band of psalm-singing pirates will yet be hunted down, and their allies driven from place and power.

This is from a paper which is an ornament to the city of Ottawa. Now, I hope the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see his way clear to accept the offer made on this side of the House, so that we shall not have to slumber in our seats again to-night, but proceed with the country's business.

Mr. BLAIN. As my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is in his place again, I am quite sure he will favour the committee with an answer to one or two questions which I submitted to the government before six o'clock, and which have not yet been answered. I ask him of what appropriation voted by this House was the first $5,000 paid to Mr. Falconer, the New York expert accountant who was working in his department

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Is that question relevant to the item under discussion ?

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose the minister will be able to answer that question.

Mr. BRODEUR. It certainly is not relevant to the item under discussion, and I do not think I am bound to answer it.

Mr. BARR.

Mr. BLAIN. I think that the minister on reflecting will conclude that in making that statement he has not done himself or his government justice. When the minister was asked some time ago what accountants he was employing or had employed in his department, what did he say ? He said, a firm of accountants having their head office in the city of Montreal. My hon. friend knew full well when he gave that answer that it was an incorrect answer; he knew full well that the head office of those accountants was in the city of New York. I am going to read the question and the hon. gentleman's answer:

Did the government or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries employ a company of American expert auditors or accountants to examine the books and accounts or to investigate the purchases made by the Department of Marine and Fisheries for aids to navigation or other supplies? If so, what is the firm name of said auditors and accountants, and is its headquarters in New York, in the United States?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I rise to a point of order. If this House is going to make any progress, surely hon. gentlemen should confine themselves to the discussion of the item before the committee, which has reference to the maintenance of vessels in northern waters. I ask your ruling on that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLAIN. I will answer my hon. friend's point of order by stating that when this item 209 was under discussion the other night, there was a distinct understanding with a member of the government that under this item every item could be fully discussed.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. That arrangement was purely a matter of courtesy, and when hon. gentlemen opposite do not treat the government with courtesy and respect, surely we ought to stand strictly on the rule.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Since the point of order has been raised, of course rule 19 says that no member shall speak beside the question in debate. The hon. member has put a question to the minister, and if the minister refuses to answer it, that is an end of the matter. It is a question of appreciation whether this accounting belongs to the vote now before the House or not.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister has already stated that he paid part of the salary of this account out of these votes which we are discussing.

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, no.

Mr. BLAIN. I will return now to the question of the headquarters of this accounting firm.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BLAIN. Our friends opposite have a majority sufficient to stifle investigation and

to interfere with the just and honest rights of a small minority in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. BLAIN. No, I do not propose to take one word back, but to repeat it. The hon. minister sits in his seat and refuses to answer an honest question which I am clearly within my rights in asking. Now, what was the answer given before by the minister to this question ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the minister takes his stand on rule 9, the work done by this firm of accountants does not come within the purview of the item now before the committee.

Mr. BLAIN. Has it not already been decided by the government that when the opposition allowed certain items to pass, there would be full and unrestricted discussion on every item.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. That was a matter of courtesy, not of agreement.

Mr. BLAIN. We have been discussing this item all last night and to-day, and at this late hour the minister himself calls it obstruction.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BLAIN. Obstruction not by the opposition but by the government. I repeat that the minister misled the House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister was misleading in his answer when he stated that the head office of this firm was in Montreal when he knew it was in New York, and as proof that he knew, he paid the expenses of these men from New York to Ottawa on more than one occasion.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I insist on a ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is well known in this committee that these rules have often been waived——

Mr. FOSTER. If you are going to make a ruling I want to speak on the point of order.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. The rules of the House are often waived to allow discussion on general items, but when hon. gentlemen opposite are obstructing the estimates the rules should be rigidly enforced. My point is that the hon. gentleman is not discussing the item before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. After twenty-four hours of debate, ranging over every imaginable point, the minister, when he finds himself defeated in every other respect, tries to choke off discussion. Great latitude is always allowed in debate in Committee of Supply and that is not a matter of courtesy. if either side has to live by virtue of courtesy it is not the opposition. The life and comfort of the government depends on the courtesy of the opposition. Every wise minister and every wise government has given the greatest possible liberty in debate on estimates. The minister is now raising an objection that has not been raised before in this debate. The first point I make is that in the interpretation of parliamentary rules the greatest care should be taken not to curb the liberty of the opposition in debating the supplies, the very basis of this opposition has arisen from the objections made by the opposition to going on with this minister's estimates because this minister was in debt to the House on orders for two returns and in default of which the opposition declared they were not in a position to discuss the estimates. The minister has to live with us longer than from now until Saturday night at twelve o'clock; he has work to do in this House and he might as well learn now as later on to cultivate a fair spirit. The ruling may be in the strict parliamentary sense but it will not exhaust the resources of the opposition.

Mr. SPROULE. I want the chair to understand that when we were last in supply I was leading the opposition and we agreed to allow the other items to pass on the understanding that all these items should be discussed at any future time.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am exceedingly surprised at the tone displayed by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). Perhaps he has forgotten that last night instead of discussing this question in a calm and moderate way, as is his habit, he attacked me in a most vicious way. If the opposition have rights and privileges the members of the government side have rights and privileges too. If there is any charge to make against the government the proper procedure is for the hon. gentleman to make a charge from his seat and a committee is appointed to investigate, and if it is determined that the charge is not founded the only course is for the member to leave the House or to be expelled from the House.

Mr. BENNETT. That is a joke.

Mr. BRODEUR. That rule is founded on the principle that in the British House of Commons as well as here, members are expected to act as gentlemen and they are not expected to impute or make charges without foundation. The hon. member (Mr. Foster) instead of discussing these estimates last night thought fit to attack me in a most vicious way.

Mr. FOSTER. You had better read what I said.

Mr. BRODEUR. I can read it but I have not it at hand at present. If the opposition wants to be respected let them respect the honesty of the members on this side of the House and if they want to treat us fairly

we will treat them fairly. I can tell my hon. friend that the country sees to-day the game he is playing to prevent the business of the country being carried on.

Mr. FOSTER. One of the faults of the Minister of Marine is a lack of frankness and another is a lack of honesty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to show the minister where he has been incorrect in his statement of this case.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. That is not discussing the point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister himself dropped the point of order and attacked me.

Mr. BRODEUR. I did not raise the point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to offer my defence to the attack made on me.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was accused by the minister of making a most vicious attack on him and he has given no evidence in support of that statement. When this government don't want to give information it is getting to be a common thing for them to say that a personal attack is being made on them. I want to know if that is all the defence the Minister of Marine has to the criticism of his estimates.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. That is not a point of order.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am speaking exactly on the same lines as the minister did, and I want the minister to give some evidence that a vicious attack was made on him. The hon. member for North Toronto made no vicious attack upon the minister. He thinks he will get rid of criticism of the items of his estimates by telling the chairman that he is improperly attacked.

Mr. D. ROSS. I again rise to a point of order. I want to ask your attention, Mr. Chairman, to Bourinot, page 486, in which he distinctly lays it down that, when a point of order is raised:

> It is legitimate on such occasions for members to debate the point of order, but they must confine themselves strictly to it.

I want to draw your attention to this rule and ask you if the hon. member for Lincoln is in order in discussing this point.

Mr. LANCASTER. The minister argued the affirmative and I am arguing the negative. If the affirmative proposition was in order the negative is. The hon. gentleman cannot be serious. If he wants a little fun to-night he can have it. I am quite willing to play the game with him in any way he wants me to play it within the rules of the House. I want to say another word in regard to what the minister says about the point of order raised by one of his supporters and debated by the hon. member for North Toronto. What does the minister mean by saying that there was a personal or vicious attack made upon him last night by the hon. member for North Toronto? The minister surely does not mean to say that because his department is before the House and because we do not clap our hands and applaud him for every thing he has done we shall not be permitted to exercise our right of criticism. Does it mean that the minister, when he is criticised, is going to attempt to get out of it by saying that a vicious attack has been made upon him? What amendment has there been in the constitution since the hon. member took office? The hon. gentleman does not say that there has been any. As a minister of the Crown when he took office he was specially charged with the proper, just and faithful expenditure of every dollar that was put into his hands. If an hon. gentleman on this side of the House thinks that something ought to be done in a different way from that in which it has been done by the minister he is entitled to say so, and his saying so does not constitute an attack upon the minister. There is no reason for him to pretend to be offended and try to get his items passed without giving proper information in regard thereto. I think that this is the most difficult point of order for any chairman to decide. I think that he would really have to take the whole expenditure of the Department of Marine and Fisheries before he could decide whether the point of order was well taken or not. The whole policy of the Department of Marine and Fisheries is under review because what the minister does in one place, we have a right to suppose, he will do in another. Fifty thousand dollars was spent for patrolling these northern waters last year and $50,000 is asked for this year. I have read the minister's report through to see if the minister had given us any light upon this expenditure, but I cannot find one word in regard to the $50,000 that was used last year. The minister says that he has brought down all the information or all that he is going to bring down, and when he is asked to bring down any more he says that a vicious personal attack is made upon him. The House opened on Thursday and two important resolutions were allowed to go through by the opposition between three and six o'clock, one in regard to the Plains of Abraham and the other in regard to the constitution of the Railway Commission—motions which might have been discussed for several days if the opposition had chosen to discuss them. What thanks did we get for it? From Thursday afternoon until a few minutes before midnight the whole of the time of the House was taken up by government supporters discussing matters that they had a right to discuss

with the government and the members of the opposition did nothing whatever to hinder the progress of the business. Then the Minister of the Interior comes forward and asks us to take up his estimates. The people will tell him when they get a chance that they do not send members of parliament to this House to sit up after midnight. If it were within the rules of the House I would say that the minister had practically played a trick on the House. He wanted to go into Supply at that hour of the night and the House was moved into Supply. There was no ground whatever for supposing that any one was trying to hurt his precious feelings. Even suppose that he was the most popular gentleman on the other side of the House, was it reasonable for him to expect to get anything through the House after midnight?

Mr. D. ROSS. I want very mildly and humbly to ask if the hon. gentleman is discussing the point of order.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am discussing it; it is a very wide point of order. When the motion to go into Supply was made by the Finance Minister, one of his own supporters, the hon. member for Comox and Atlin (Mr. Sloan) practically objected, in order that he might talk about sealing matters. Why does not the Minister of Marine get that gentleman into line before he scolds us? He obstructed Supply last night from eight o'clock to midnight. If one particle of the criticism of the Minister of Marine against us is justified, ten thousands times as much should be heaped on that hon. member, because he had not any reason to object to any item, but he objected to any Supply at all until he talked about sealing matters. If the hon. minister does not want criticism to be aimed at his department let him admit that it is in bad shape, and we will try to get it into good shape for him. But he treats every criticism of his items as a matter of personal attack upon himself, and then, on the least provocation, he makes an attack on one of his own subordinates who is not here to defend himself. He said this afternoon that if a certain thing had been done, the hon. member who spoke of it was making a personal attack upon a gentleman in the department of the name of Fraser. That is not the way to treat members of this House who are discussing the department for which the minister is responsible.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Before the point of order is settled, I wish to say a few words. The hon. member for North Toronto has said that it would be troublesome to both sides of the House if the rules of the House were strictly enforced. What is the situation? Last evening, when in the ordinary course of business the House was moved into Committee of Supply, an opportunity was given to hon. gentlemen opposite to discuss the estimates of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. They said they had not the information they wanted, and the right hon. leader of the House made this statement:

> I see no reason why we should not on this occasion follow the course which is generally pursued. The opposition want certain information, and they are entitled to it and must get it. In the meantime, we can reserve an item so that the question at issue may be fully discussed. The money must be voted and the public service carried on.

That was a fair and liberal offer made by the right hon. leader of this House.

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I have a few rights here as well as my hon. friend. I want to ask whether my hon. friend is discussing the point of order.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I am informing the House why I have raised the point of order.

Mr. BLAIN. I ask the ruling of the chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member declares that he is speaking on the point of order.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I am speaking absolutely, completely and concretely to the point of order. I am pointing out that that was a fair offer to make to the opposition.

Mr. BLAIN. I ask whether the remark of the Prime Minister has anything to do with the point of order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. member should be allowed to proceed. It is impossible for me to say whether his remarks are on the point of order until he has spoken.

Mr. BLAIN. I ask whether reading from a former debate has anything to do with the point of order?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I am going to read from Bourinot. The hon. members refused to accept this very fair offer of the Premier, and consequently they come within the strict rules of the House. Bourinot at page 464, in reference to the relevancy of speeches, says:

> A just regard to the privileges and dignity of parliament demands that its time should not be wasted in idle and rambling discussions.

If that rule were strictly enforced in this House the hon. gentleman who has just interrupted me would be continuously called to order.

Mr. BLAIN. I appeal to the chair whether this is discussing the point of order or not.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. (Reading).

> —and consequently every member who addresses the House should confine himself as

closely as possible to the question under consideration. If the Speaker or the House believes that his remarks are not relevant to the question, he will be promptly called to order by the former. It is not, however, always possible to judge as to the relevancy of a member's remarks until he has made some progress with his argument.

If the hon. gentleman opposite had known that rule he would not have interrupted me.

The freedom of debate requires that every member should have full liberty to state, for the information of the House, whatever he honestly thinks may aid it in forming a judgment upon any question under its consideration. But it is nevertheless the duty of the Speaker of the House (or chairman of committee) to interfere when he finds that the member's remarks are not relevant to the subject before the House. On such occasions he may very properly suppose that the member will bring his observations to bear upon the motion before the House, or that he will conclude with something that will bring him within order. And he may find it necessary to caution a member that he is approaching the limits of propriety which confine hon. members in speaking to that which is relevant to the subject on hand, and to express the hope that he will be careful to confine himself to that which is relevant.

Now, what is the situation here? Hon. gentlemen opposite, abusing the privileges of the House——

Mr. BLAIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will ask whether these remarks are on the point of order? I ask you to rule.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is impossible for me to rule until I have heard the hon. member.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I was about to say when I was needlessly interrupted by the hon. member, that hon. gentlemen opposite, abusing the privileges of the House for the past twenty-four hours, have rambled over and discussed every subject under the sun except the particular item under discussion. Surely hon. gentlemen who want to see the work of this House proceed in a calm and orderly way, under the rules of the House, have some rights as well as the obstructionists opposite, and surely such hon. members, acting within their rights, are in duty bound to call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that the rules of this House are being flagrantly violated in order that hon. gentlemen opposite may carry on this policy of obstruction and delay of the legitimate work of this House. For the purpose of drawing the attention of the House to the fact that they are flagrantly violating the rules of this House, I have raised this point of order and I quote my authority.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the hon. member who has just taken his seat had read further he would have found this:

Mr. D. ROSS.

In the English Commons the authority of the Speaker, in cases where members persist in making irrelevant remarks on a question, has very recently been enlarged. A member who resorts to persistent irrelevance may be directed by the Speaker (or chairman) to discontinue his speech, and if he continues in his irregular course he is 'named' as disregarding the authority of the Speaker.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. You will be named the first thing you know.

Mr. J. D. REID. No, but the hon. member has narrowly escaped. Since I have been in the House we have always been allowed a great deal of latitude in discussing the items in the estimates, but hon. gentlemen opposite want to discontinue the practice that we have followed since confederation. That is a narrow policy and it will not conduce in the end to facilitate the business of the House.

Mr. LENNOX. Even though it should be conceded that the minority has no rights except such as the majority accord, this understanding cannot be violated without a breach of faith on the part of the government. The minister himself stated at the opening of the debate last night that not one of these items had been yet passed, and I call the attention of the chair to that fact before a ruling is given on this attempt to gag the opposition.

Mr. BLAIN. On the point of order, I call attention to the fact that the Minister of Inland Revenue was acting Minister of Marine last summer when the minister of that department was in England.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We might dispose of this point of order first.

Mr. FIELDING. I would suggest to both sides that the most sensible course would be to have as few points of order as possible and not to press this one. The subject of the auditing was discussed constantly this afternoon, and the committee has accepted that as being more or less associated with the item before the House, and I would not like to see the discussion on that question shut off. I do not want to broaden the discussion of course, but however it may be contrary to the technical rules of the House the discussion might continue and it may be as well not to press the point of order.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the hon. member (Mr. Duncan Ross) withdraw his point of order?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Unlike hon. gentlemen opposite, I am willing to facilitate the work of the House and if both sides think obstruction should prevail I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We must not forget we are in committee and when a convention is agreed to the rule is violated every day. But if I am called upon to ap-

ply the rule I will have to apply it. I understand the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. BLAIN. In the main I think the chairman is very fair to the opposition.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. In the main.

Mr. BLAIN. I will withdraw that and say he is altogether fair to the opposition. I want to ask the Minister of Inland Revenue if, when he was acting Minister of Marine he made a trip on one of the steamers, and if so, what was his business?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. That is an impertinent question.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend is a past master in impertinence.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have no objection to say that for a week or ten days while acting as minister I made a trip on the 'Lady Grey' down the St. Lawrence. Every one knows that, there is nothing secret about it.

Mr. BLAIN. From what vote were the expert accountants paid when my hon. friend (Mr. Templeman) was away?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The accountant of the department and the deputy minister were responsible for that, and although I was consulted from time to time, at the present moment I do not know from what vote the money was paid. I presume the Auditor General's Report will show so that it is quite unnecessary to ask the question.

Mr. BLAIN. That is a fair answer, but I call attention to the fact that although the Auditor General notified the government that the expert accountants were being paid out of the ice breaker vote the department continued that wrongful practice. And in spite of the fact that is was reported to the department that no money should be paid without vouchers, the department paid without vouchers these New York accountants $5 a day for living allowance while they only paid $1 a day in a boarding-house in Ottawa. On December 10, 1906, the minister stated that no report had been made, but as soon as it was made it would be laid on the table. I would like to ask whether Mr. Falconer's report has been presented to the department.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. BLAIN. I want to appeal to the Minister of Agriculture and to the Minister of Inland Revenue who was acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries for some time whether that report has ever been presented.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not want to be discourteous to the hon. gentleman but I submit to him that having been acting minister only during the recess it is hardly fair to put a question of that kind to me. I do not know whether Mr. Falconer has presented his report or not. During the months when I was acting minister of the department the only man that I came in contact with who had an agreement in connection with the audit was Mr. Falconer of Montreal. I never saw an American expert in connection with the matter. I was aware of the fact that American experts had been called in, but they were not the men who had the agreement with the department to carry on the auditing. Mr. Falconer is a chartered accountant who is well known to every person in Montreal.

Mr. BLAIN. If that is correct how does it come that this government paid the expenses of this gentleman from New York to Ottawa and back again in connection with the auditing of these accounts ? When we asked the question as to where the headquarters of this concern were we were told that they were in Montreal, whereas the facts and the accounts submitted prove that they are in New York. I am going to appeal to the Minister of Agriculture for an answer to this question. May I ask if this report which was promised on December 10, 1906, has ever been brought down?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot tell.

Mr. BLAIN. We have two ministers present and I would like to ask them where the $5,000 came from that they gave to Mr. Falconer. They went back on a system for which they had paid $42,000 when they allowed account after account to be paid last summer without vouchers. We are trying to gather this information but the ministers know nothing about it.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to be in his place, because I have some matters to speak of in reference to the item that is going through. Surely we are not asked to discuss estimates when the minister who is in charge of them is out of the House. That is impossible. Here are questions asked which are entirely germane. On December 10, 1906, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that $5,000 or more had been paid to these men who were at their work and that they were going to make a report and that as soon as it was made it would be laid on the table of the House. It is now past December 10, 1907, it is nearly up to March 1908, and a pertinent question asked as to that report is : Why has it not been placed on the table of the House ? The Minister of Inland Revenue does not know anything about it and the Minister of Agriculture says he does not know anything. Here is the spectacle of the Department of Marine and Fisheries under discussion and the minister out of the House. I want the Minister of Marine here to attend to his work or some other minister who is able to do it. The minister made a charge against me that I had made harsh statements in reference to

himself. I told him last night that I only said what I could prove. I have the proof before me and I propose to give it to the House, but it is not much satisfaction talking to an empty chair. It is altogether impossible to go on in this kind of a way.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that the Minister of Marine has been obliged to spend most of his time in the House now for nearly thirty hours. It is absolutely essential that he shall go out occasionally, he went out a little while ago and has not yet come back. I have sent a message telling him that the hon. gentleman wishes to make a particular statement which requires his presence and I have no doubt that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will come in for that purpose. As to the question put by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Bain), I have no very distinct recollection in regard to it but I am under the impression that the Minister of Marine has given the House an answer to that question.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the answer ?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot really recall that, but I remember something about that report being brought up and I remember the Minister of Marine making a statement. I am inclined to think that the question, like a great many other questions, during this sitting of the House has been put several times and that it has been answered long ago.

Mr. FOSTER. Aside from all that the minister knows that if we are going to discuss estimates we must have the minister in charge of those estimates here. If the minister chooses to take a course which imposes thirty hours work upon him consecutively it is no fault of the opposition. Why does not the minister give up this item and let us go on with the estimates of some other minister?

Mr. FISHER. We are quite ready to.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Minister of Agriculture think that it is possible that he is going to put the estimates of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries through with no minister to answer questions ?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then what are we to do ? Wait until the minister comes in ?

Mr. FISHER. Do as you have been doing go on and talk against time, repeating and repeating and repeating.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has no right to say we are talking against time. We are asserting our constitutional right that before supplies are granted to the Crown information must be provided. Now that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has come in I want to ask him out of what vote this $5,000 was paid to Falconer ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I could not say. I think it must have been out of the vote for maintenance of lights for Sorel.

Mr. FOSTER. What I understood the minister to say this afternoon was that there was at one time a special vote out of which he paid a portion of the money to these accountants, and that he took the rest out of the general vote. Am I right in that ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think when the first payments were made the special vote to which the hon. gentleman makes reference was not in existence.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there ever a special vote ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I have diligently looked through the Supply Bills of 1905 and 1906, and I have been unable to find any special vote.

Mr. BRODEUR. There was a special vote of $25,000 last session.

Mr. FOSTER. Then we are clear as to that. The minister came down to the House, and I dare say he explained to the House that he proposed to carry on an investigation in his department as to the best methods of accounting, asked the House for a vote for that purpose, and was voted $25,000. Then the minister was on fair ground. He spent the $25,000, and then, instead of coming to the House for a supplementary vote, he deliberately took more than $25,000 out of a vote for an absolutely distinct purpose, the ship channel vote, to implement the special vote of $25,000. I ask any minister of the Crown whether he recommends that as the policy to be pursued. Such a policy strikes at the very root of parliamentary appropriations. The minister had no right to steal from another vote in order to implement an extravagant administration of the idea embodied in his first vote. That is the first error committed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with reference to that matter. What is the next ? It came to me to-day like a sudden shock. I had been asking for the papers. I wanted to see the peculiar contract which the minister had entered into under which he had made these payments. I have been waiting for the papers for that reason. To-day the minister rose and confessed that there was no scrap of writing with reference to the agreement or the arrangement, but only a verbal arrangement. Again I hold up the minister to his colleagues and supporters and to this country as an example

of how a thing ought not to be done in the administration of the public moneys of this country—$50,000 spent in a complex way, and not a scrap of writing; he picks up a man on the street, makes a verbal arrangement with him by which he authorizes him to spend $50,000 of the people's money, and not a scratch of the pen to show what the bargain is. What is the first result of that? The minister is in a quandary to-day. Here are the accounts, Falconer's bills, and the cheques that paid the bills, and they are all drawn on Falconer's bill and on the basis of a per diem allowance for board; and yet the minister states here to-day on his word as a minister, that it was not a per diem arrangement at all. The action of the minister on the bill proves that it was a per diem arrangement, and that he paid $5, $4 and $3 per day for the board of these gentlemen, which was obtained in this city, as we all know, for one-third of that amount. The minister says he did not approve of that. That demonstrates another trait of the minister, and I hold that up to his colleagues and his supporters and the country. The minister finds fault with everybody but himself. He does not take the responsibilities that are his and his alone. What are the facts of the case? I have the documents here. Mr. Gourdeau, the deputy minister, receives a bill; the bill is certified by Mr. Falconer. Who is Mr. Falconer? The man who made the verbal agreement with the minister. Who knows anything about that agreement? Only two men—Mr. Falconer and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. One of the parties to that agreement presents his bill, amounting in all to $9,445, on the per diem plan, stated so on the face of the bill. The bill goes to the deputy minister. The deputy minister guards himself. He does not know anything about it; there is no agreement or contract to refer to. What does he do? All that he can do. He says: 'Pay if approved by the minister.' He can do nothing else. What happens next? The cheques are drawn and the man is paid his money. What is the absolutely certain inference? That the minister approved the bill. Who else could do it? What was the course of that bill? After the deputy minister had written upon it, 'Pay if approved by the minister,' it was handed, I suppose to the accountant. The accountant noticed that writing upon it; what does he do? He goes to the minister and says: 'There is no written contract or agreement; I find this written, 'Pay if approved by the minister,' and I want to know if you approve of this.' What the minister says, verbally, as in the other case, is, 'That is all right, go and pay it;' and the cheques are there as the receipts for the payment. And now the minister comes and says: 'I am not responsible for that; somebody has done wrong if that has been paid.' Why, the thing is as plain as it possibly can be; and the minister now finds where he is landed by going into a $50,000 contract by word of mouth with a man of the street. A minister who has any sense of responsibility or any decent care for his reputation does not enter into that kind of an agreement. He guards himself by a letter or a written contract or agreement, and then he has something that can be interpreted and can stand as his defence when parliament asks for an accounting of his stewardship. What happens after that? That was in November and December, 1906. It is now March, 1908. Mr. Falconer, the other party to the private and secret arrangement, goes on with his main work, and then what happens? I am going to read it to the House, as I have had a good deal of trouble in getting it into tabular form. What do we find? After the payment of this cheque for $9,445.24 certified in the way I have stated, these men go on and do work, send in their bills, and the department issues the cheques. Here are the bills put in after that: On November 30, $917.22; on December 31, $6,093.73; on January 31, $6,481.34; on January 31, $367.22, on July 28, $5,008.93; on March 30, $2,921.67; amounting in all to $21,790.11, every one of them from the same per diem plan and every one of them from the same man Falconer. What happens on the other side? Cheques go out: January 11, $1,000; January 31, $3,000; February 7, $2,093.73; March 1, $3,000; March 7, $3,000; May 4, $3,461.03; January 5, on a cheque of a yellow colour, $500; January 25, on a cheque of the same colour, $417; March 16, on a cheque of the same colour, $367.22; making in all, cheques issued on account to Mr. Falconer to the amount of $16,838.98; the bills put in were for $21,790.11; leaving at that time a balance unpaid of $4,951.13. Now, mark a peculiar circumstance. A secret verbal agreement is made between Mr. Falconer and the minister; $9,445.24 is paid in the first place on the certificate of the deputy minister subject to the minister's approval. After that, what happens? A bill for $917.22 is put in on the same per diem plan, and that is certified by whom? By Mr. Falconer, the man who makes the bill. Falconer puts in his bill, and certifies to his own bill. This bill for $917.22 is certified also by Mr. Desbarets, of Sorel, if I mistake not, the superintendent down there. The first cheque for $9,445.24 was paid, as I have said, on the certificate of Mr. Gourdeau subject to the minister's approval. When this second bill for $917.22, put in and certified as I have stated, comes up, the deputy minister simply writes on it the word 'pay.' Why did he do that? Because he knew that the first bill had been paid and therefore must have been approved by the min-

ister, and he said, 'That sets the example; this comes in exactly the same way, certified in exactly the same way, therefore pay it.'

A bill for $6,093.73 is put in by Falconer and certified to by Falconer and it is paid, and outside of Falconer there is not a scratch of a pen by anybody in the department upon it. The next bill for $831.34 was put in by Falconer, certified to by nobody and paid in the same way. On the last bill for $2,921.67 there is no certificate of any kind whatever. We have a total amount of $21,790.11, of which only $917.22 is regularly certified and the rest in the main is absolutely uncertified by any officer of the department. That is the most remarkable and peculiar transaction. If the minister went into that knowing what he was doing he made a very false step in his own interest and in the interest of the public. No man living knows what the agreement is except Mr. Falconer and the minister who made the secret agreement with him. I venture to say that in the history of departmental doings by ministers of the Crown in Canada we can hardly find a grosser case than is presented in all this. This House would not be doing its duty if it gave the minister a single dollar of his estimates without full information and inquiry. I repeat that the minister was not frank in his statement and I will prove it. Yesterday I made objection to going on with the items because the information I asked for was not down and I quote what took place:

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend has not been here, and he does not know that my travelling expenses have been brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. Which ones?

Mr. BRODEUR. My travelling expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. Three returns were asked for, and one has been brought down and the others have not.

Mr. BRODEUR. The return with reference to the travelling expenses of the different ministers at the Colonial Conference has not been brought down, I understand, but the return as to my travelling expenses has been brought down, and in it are included my expenses at the Colonial Conference. The information with reference to all my expenses is brought down, and it is no reason why these estimates should be held up that the returns with reference to the travelling expenses of other ministers are not brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. Three important returns affecting the minister and his department have been asked for, and only one has been brought down. It could have been brought down in five minutes, but they have been held for nearly two months now.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is mistaken. All the information with reference to my travelling expenses and the travelling expenses of my secretary and of the messenger has been brought down. As far as I am concerned, the hon. gentleman cannot be any better informed if the other returns were brought down.

Mr. FOSTER.

And yet my statement is absolutely correct. The minister brought down just one return, his expenses from 1900, but he has not brought down the expenses from 1904 to 1906 which I asked for. He misrepresented knowingly or otherwise. He says I made an attack upon him and I will read from 'Hansard' everything I said, but before I read it I tell the minister that I do not subscribe to his new fangled constitutional doctrine that if a member criticises him sharply for his personal estimates or any other estimates it is necessary for that member to make a specific charge against the minister. He says if I fail to prove that charge I must leave the House. What constitutional authority is there for that? The minister undertook to remodel the diplomacy of the British empire in his French treaty, and now he undertakes to remodel the constitutional history of parliament. If I make a charge against him and if I prove it it is proven, and if I don't prove it I am the judge of my own conduct and the minister and his supporters have not one scintilla of power to force me to leave my seat in this House. My seat was given to me by my constituents and my seat will be taken back from me by my constituents.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TALBOT. The province of New Brunswick has answered that.

Mr. FOSTER. What a wonderful wise man the hon. member is.

Mr. TALBOT. They drove you out of the province.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose I reason for a moment with the hon. member, if that is possible. The province of New Brunswick drove me out of the province, did it?

Mr. TALBOT. That is right.

Mr. FOSTER. How many times was Sir Richard Cartwright driven out?

Mr. TALBOT. We are speaking of your affairs.

Mr. FOSTER. How many times was the hon. member's own leader driven out? How many men 25 years in public life have not been defeated in some constituency? It is the essence of purility to say that a man is driven out from his province because he has been unfortunate enough not to get a majority of votes in some constituency. I contested five different elections in my own county of Kings and I won in every election. I was invited to stand for the sixth time, but I took another county and was returned by a majority of two to one. I then went to the city of St. John, the old haunt of a minister of the Crown, and bucked up against him and did not receive a majority for very good reasons which it is not necessary to explain.

Mr. TALBOT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. That 'hear, hear' shows the calibre of the hon. gentleman. The Minister of Marine said I made a vicious attack on him, and I will read carefully what I said :

More than that, according to the information we have—and all the information has not yet been brought down—the minister himself is in the habit of drawing large sums and keeping them in his own pocket for months and months and using them for his own purposes, and then when called to book by the Audit Department making a refund. Why should he carry around the people's money? The very moment he has spent what he needs, he should give back to the treasury what he does not need. In doing what he has done, he is setting a vicious example to every accountant in every branch of the service. He is setting them the example of overdrawing and keeping the money and using it for their own purposes and only refunding when compelled to.

I may have said in the heat of debate more than I would otherwise have said, but the essence of what I said I will prove. It may be a little too strong to say he was using it for his own purposes, but I will say that it is not used for public purposes and it is kept by the minister in his own pocket or private account.

Mr. BUREAU. That makes a wide difference.

Mr. FOSTER. There is not the least difference in principle. The Solicitor General is the advocate of the principle that a minister or an employee can draw out $1,000 at the beginning of the year when he does not know he is going to spend $200, and that he can keep that $1,000 in his hands until the end of the year when finding he has only spent a few hundred dollars he puts the rest back when he is asked to do so.

Mr. BUREAU. There is a wide difference between accusing the minister of taking the people's money and using it for his own purposes and the fact of a minister asking for an advance and neglecting to account. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) admits that difference now when he qualifies the statement he made last night.

Mr. FOSTER. Neglected to account—the minister draws out $1,000 when he knows that he would not spend it inside of months.

Mr. BUREAU. He didn't know anything about it.

Mr. TALBOT. He didn't know where the money came from. The money was supplied to him by his officers.

Mr. FOSTER. How innocent he is. I would think a prudent minister would guard himself by not taking too much money at a time. If he takes the money and pays it to his own private account that is using it for his own purpose.

Mr. TALBOT. No.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not using it for public purposes; he puts it to his own credit in the bank.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Was the minister not engaged in public business when he got the money?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. The hon. gentleman is by inference an advocate of the principle that because a man is engaged in public business he can take from the public treasury $1,000 which he cannot spend and at the year's end pay the unused portion back.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. If the hon. gentleman wants to interpret my principles he should do so correctly.

Mr. FOSTER. I have here the return brought down with reference to the minister's expenses commencing July, 1906, and running up to December, 1907, or for one year and a half :

Advances and travelling expenses of the Hon. L. P. Brodeur:

Contingencies—	
July 6, 1906..	$ 68 27
July 28, 1906..	250 00
October 4, 1906..	8 58
December 5, 1906..	227 97
April 2, 1907..	109 50
Total..	$664 32

Taken by the minister in those months out of contingencies, and properly so, because contingencies are meant to cover travelling expenses. On April 2, 1907, $2,000 was taken by the minister out of the ice breaking steamer vote. That is the first inroad on that vote—taken out for travelling expenses. I want to emphasize what was so well said by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) last night, that travelling expenses should always be provided for in the contingencies, or, if they are made specially, there should be a vote for the travelling expenses connected with the special work for which they are made, and that it is a very improper system to allow spending officers to take their travelling expenses out of votes passed by parliament for absolutely different purposes. The minister had contingencies and he wanted to travel. He either had not sufficient money in his contingencies or he did not want to take it, and took that $2,000 for travelling expenses on April 2, out of that vote for an ice-breaker. On January 15, 1908, he refunds $680. He did not make that refund when he came back, because he came back in October, or November but he retained that money until January 15, after he had been sharply criticised in this House. The minister took the abnormally large sum of $2,000 out of a vote from which he had no business to take it

and kept the $680, which he admits he did not spend, until January 15, 1908, instead of refunding it as soon as he came back. And he did not refund it until in January it was under criticism. On April 2, when he drew that $2,000 cash, he also drew for transportation $915. He does not say from what vote he took that amount, but no doubt it came also out of the ice-breaker vote. A part of that went to Mr. Venning, and a part to his own two men, Messrs. Wiallard and Potvin, I suppose in about equal proportions, and I see there was a refund of $285 of that amount, not expended by Venning, Wiallard and Potvin. The two latter were his own expenses for they were gentlemen he took with him, and I suppose about one-half of the refund was by Venning. On October 11, 1907, he took from the ice-breaker vote, $197.94, in addition to what he had already taken, and he took this, although in January, 1908, he refunded $680 out of the $2,000. Where was that money? He had not spent it? Why then did he take this fresh amount when he had this $680 still unspent? On November 23, he received from the Department of Finance, on account of the Colonial Conference, $4,000, which makes a total spent of $6,467.26. That is the minister's side of the account, let us take the private secretary's side. He began July, 1906. He was paid :

Contingencies—	
July 24..	$100 00
August 17..	100 00
September 21..	33 50
October 15..	20 00
November 5..	50 00

A refund out of this was made on November 5, of $38.65. I do not think those expenses are at all abnormal. They are the usual contingencies, but on April 2, an advance was made of $1,000 to Mr. Wiallard on account of the ice-breaking steamer and transportation, $127.50.—also I think out of the ice-breaker vote. On July 2, there was another advance, from the ice-breaker vote I assume, of $1,000. There you have two advances to the private secretary from the ice-breaker vote amounting to $2,000, so that both the minister and his secretary were paid out of that vote $4,000 in all up to that date. But on July 30, there is another $1,000, on September 30, another $1,000, and September 5, $500, out of the same vote. This makes $6,500 in all taken in that time by the minister and his secretary out of that vote. I would ask the minister what travelling expenses were legitimately incurred on account of this ice-breaking vessel? Will he tell me what travelling expenses were incurred and how much were incurred absolutely on account of this steamer?

Mr. BRODEUR. I will answer the hon. gentleman later on.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I shall leave the statement and the analysis of it to the judgment of the House. What does it all amount to? It amounts to this, that the minister, in that one year and a half, took out of the moneys of this country for the travelling expenses of himself and his secretary, $11,769.66.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) intimated that the accounts of the establishment at Halifax were unsatisfactory and that Mr. Falconer reported that no just account could be taken of the assets of that establishment. I might remark that the agent of the Marine and Fisheries Department was appointed by the late government, of which my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was so distinguished an ornament, and that the system of accounting in that department was established by that government, so that he is accountable for any defects in the system, unless the appointee of the late government has not administered it properly. If my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) were conversant with the circumstances, I do not think he would have made any severe animadversions on the situation at Halifax. About a year ago the agent of the Marine and Fisheries Department was at the point of death. He remained long in that condition and recovered very slowly. I believe he had to take a long vacation in order to restore his health in some degree, and is now in a very infirm condition. The inspector, who was in charge of the department, was taken suddenly ill and died. That left the department deprived of its two managers. Again there was another circumstance. The Railway Department had been all along demanding the premises occupied by the Marine and Fisheries Department and finally removed the latter to Dartmouth, where new wharfs were constructed and the stores conveyed, and the gentleman who afterwards died was put in charge. Again the establishment was removed to a dockyard and the stores and other paraphernalia had to be also removed, so that it was very difficult to take a thorough accounting of the stores, the establishment being in so transitory a state and those who were administering it having been incapacitated. In fact it would have been wonderful were the conditions not precisely as they have been described.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought the minister was going to reply, but I will supplement my remarks and he can reply to them all at the same time. I have been looking for that vote of $25,000 and also for the vote on contingencies, and my hon. friend to my left has just put them in my hand. This advance of $2,000 on the ice-breaker vote was taken on April 2, just the beginning of the new year. At that moment the minister had $3,830 voted for contingencies in the Department of Marine and Fisheries as well as what remained over from the preceding year of the old vote. But I find this item. It does not seem possible to get a clear

statement from the minister, but I find this peculiar item. The heading is:

Lighthouse and coast service—maintenance and repairs to lighthouses—further amount required to pay for the services of an expert staff reorganizing the system of book-keeping to assimilate with all the branches of the department through the Dominion, $25,000.

The wording would lead the House to suppose that the reorganization to put the lighthouse and coast service in harmony with the other accounting branches of the department would cost $25,000. But the peculiar thing is this, that when the money comes to be taken out and paid, it is taken out of the vote for the ship canal. Although we have the express statement that this was for maintenance and repairs of lighthouses, the minister seems to have taken the money from another source altogether.

With reference to the cost of that accountant, the minister said the expenses were about $36,000. I have his answer here and will read it in order that he may have the whole of it:

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What amount of money has been paid to the experts employed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to reorganize the system of keeping accounts for the department?

2. What are the names of these experts, their place of residence, and the sum paid to each?

3. Is their work completed?

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

1. $35,499.56.

2.

W. B. Richards	$2,277 61
J. N. Gunn	182 12
W. F. Russell	2,310 89
Geo. E. Faucett	504 44
Kenneth Falconer, Montreal	7,032 04
L. R. Acton	1,180 64
F. H. Leland	5,861 65
Geo. Pare	1,378 26
M. L. Cooley	2,231 28
C. B. Annett	8 93
H. A. Marven	5,282 05
C. C. Schooley	7 14
S. Ketridge	3,407 55
J. J. Moorman	476 04
A. B. Murray	1,551 04
L. D. Conne	546 61
F. B. Whittet	1,524 95
H. H. Petze	1,044 48
H. Hipwell	2,275 55
J. R. Ellis	748 22
H. G. Whittet	846 06
H. B. Cross	73 38
A. T. Dowd	163 41
J. C. Stafford	2 14
A. L. Risley	36 42
R. A. Willis	6 43
W. C. Martin	7 49
C. H. Michalis	9 63
M. V. Finnicane	5 00
E. McGivney	90 52
E. C. Moulton	82 00
J. Meikle	58 50
S. E. Burton	25 12
M. C. Schelander	1 25
L. H. Leyden	$ 3 50
M. L. Gettens	28 99
M. Cornely	26 00
H. Weighland	2 75
Miss F. Wilson	321 41
Miss G. Graham	264 41
Miscellaneous, which includes telephones and telegrams approximately	176 95
	$42,062 85

The minister has told us there are claims of about $5,000 still outstanding, so that the total cost of this precious business will amount to at least $50,000. I commend that to business men carrying on manufacturing or other operations as an advisable expenditure in order to get at a system of book-keeping and accounting. They should do this by a secret verbal contract which nobody could interpret but the man who is paid the money and the minister who has promised to pay the money. We have the further revelation that these high sums, varying from $75 down to $3.50 per day, were made to simple clerks who would be well paid in the ordinary course at $30 to $40 per month, and who were paid at that rate until they were slipped into this work. These are matters which should be considered by those who are anxious to get estimates through for ministers without the production of an immense amount of papers, in which the details of this transaction are hidden, and which were ordered by this House two months ago.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is certainly due to the House that I should give some explanation with regard to statements made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I am glad that he has seen fit to withdraw some of the statements which he made last night concerning me. He had gone so far as to state I had been in the habit of taking from the public chest moneys which I kept for months and months and afterwards refunded. No more unfair or incorrect statement could be made by a member with regard to another member. We must have some rules for the conduct of our debates; it is in the public interest that they should be conducted with decency, and that the members should treat one another as gentlemen should. That has been the principle underlying the rules of debate in the House of Commons in England, where no one is permitted to say anything disrespectful, to impute motives or to make charges of dishonesty in regard to any fellow-member. In this respect the English House of Common has become very severe, and the members of that House are forced to treat one another with the courtesy of gentlemen. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has been a member of this House for many years; he is an old parliamentarian, and I would ask him if he thinks it worthy of himself or worthy of

this House to indulge in the language in which he indulged in last night with regard to me? If there was the least reason or provocation for his using such language his action might be understood. It is to be regretted that the rule in this House requiring courtesy between members has not been as strictly followed by hon. gentlemen opposite as it should. The hon. member, in the remarks he has just made, stated that I stole from a particular vote a particular amount of money. Does my hon. friend think that is an expression worthy of the parliament of Canada? He may have some personal feeling against me, it looks to me as if he had, although I have not been able to discover why, for some months past he has made unjustifiable personal attacks upon me. I have never said anything in the House or out of it which would justify these attacks. I hope my hon. friend on reflection will see that this expression, that a minister of the Crown has stolen from a vote, is not worthy of this parliament.

It is due to the House that I should explain the change which was made in the book-keeping system of the department. I cannot say that when I became minister in 1906 I found the book-keeping system a good one. I had not time to study the situation very carefully, but just at that time during investigations before the Public Accounts Committee into some of the purchases of the department it was established that in at least two instances the accounts were defective, the balances were not given in a proper way. The amounts were not large, but they showed that the system was not absolutely regular. Besides that, it was stated by hon. gentlemen opposite that the department was in a very bad condition and had been badly administered, and I thought it necessary to make a thorough investigation and to institute a system of book-keeping which would place me in possession of information as to the accounts at all times. I had been trying to get monthly statements of appropriations and expenditures from different votes, but this took a great deal of time, and confirmed my judgment that the system of book-keeping required revision. It might have been perhaps better for me not to have done anything of the kind. In doing it I incurred the bad will of some people who have probably been prompting my hon. friends opposite in the attacks which have been made upon me. I do not say that is absolutely so; my hon. friends know better than I whether the supposition I am now making is correct or not.

Mr. BENNETT. What about insinuations now?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no insinuation in that.

Mr. BENNETT. Who does he insinuate has been supplying information, his own clerks?

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. TALBOT. It would not be the first time.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no insinuation in that. Hon. gentlemen opposite receive information every day in regard to transactions. I do not charge any one with dishonesty in connection with it, but I do say that this information might have been prompted by people who thought they had a right to give it. At all events, it would have perhaps been better for me had no change of that kind been made, but I thought it better to have this investigation and change in the interest of the best administration of the department. I feel that I should be posted every month as to the administration of the department. So long as I have anything to do with the administration of any department I intend to do my duty faithfully, even if the fulfilment of that duty should bring upon me the rancour or wrath of some people. I shall perform my duty without partiality or favour.

Was it advisable for the department to have a complete system of accounting? We were carrying on certain manufacturing processes in the department at Sorel, Prescott and other places. Mr. Blain has seen the report of Mr. Falconer, stating that it was impossible, as far as Halifax was concerned, to have a clear statement of the assets and liabilities of that place. The senior member for Halifax has given some reasons why we might expect that everything was not absolutely correct as far as that place was concerned. But there was no system established in most of those places so that we could ascertain the cost of everything there. In ordinary manufacturing establishments the expenses and receipts are accounted for and the cost of everything which goes into the manufacture is ascertained in order to determine whether it is possible to continue manufacturing it. I say it is in the interest of the department and of the country to establish such a business system in our service even though it were necessary to incur considerable expense to do it. By the system I have established—and I am glad to have established it—in Halifax, in Prescott, in Sorel, we can tell what the cost of every article is and we can tell whether it is profitable for the government to continue to manufacture that article or whether it would be better to purchase it elsewhere. As regards the departmental accounts, when I came to the department I gave formal instruction that there should be no more over-lapping of the fiscal years and that the expenditure in each fiscal year should be charged in that particular year. In future we will therefore have a regular system which may prevent the irregularities in book-keeping which have existed in the past. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) seems to think it is extraor-

dinary that no formal agreement has been made with these experts as to their remuneration, but the schedule of rates to be paid these accountants is well established. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was minister and when he needed the services of a professional man, a lawyer for instance, was he in the habit of bargaining with him beforehand as to his fees?

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Shepley for instance at $250 a day.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, and Mr. Shepley is a very prominent and a very able lawyer and he was worth that I suppose. I have the honour of belonging to the same profession and it is the first time I have heard a lawyer in parliament or out of parliament stating that the fees charged by a brother lawyer are exorbitant.

Mr. LENNOX. I can tell the minister that if this is the first time he has heard it, it will not be the last time. I have no hesitation in saying upon my own responsibility as a member of this House that the fees are absolutely outrageous.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have some professional etiquette in our province but perhaps the custom is different in Ontario.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the minister one of these schedules of fees which this firm of accountants sent to him ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No. The same procedure was adopted with regard to these gentlemen as is adopted when the services of a notary, a lawyer, an architect, a doctor, or any professional man, are required. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) wants the services of a doctor does he bargain with him about his fees beforehand?

Mr. BENNETT. There was no question of compensation discussed between the minister and Mr. Falconer.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, he was to charge the same price as he charged to other people.

Mr. BENNETT. The agreement with the minister was that he was to charge the same price as to other people.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. I stated yesterday and I was then under the impression, that the board of these people had been paid on vouchers, but it now appears that no vouchers have been produced, although the correspondence shows that they have been requested to supply vouchers.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the date of the first request ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I don't remember now. According to the agreement I had with Mr. Falconer they were to be paid their board according to the amount they expended for that purpose.

But they now have a claim against the department which I have refused to pay. Since the month of September they have been pressing me for the payment of that amount ; they have been urging it upon me and almost using threats.

Mr. FOSTER. Poor man.

Mr. BRODEUR. I know what my duty is and I will fulfil it.

Mr. FOSTER. That's right.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have a sense of honour which perhaps some gentlemen opposite don't understand. Since I have been in public life I defy anybody in this House or out of it to make any charge that may affect my honesty or my sense of duty in the administration of public affairs. I know what I owe to my country and I can assure the House that so long as I occupy a position of trust in public life I will never be considered found not carrying out that trust in a proper way. That has been my policy in the past, that is my policy to-day, that will be always my policy. I may make enemies because of that, I know I have enemies because of it, and my hon. friends opposite know. I know why some of these personal attacks have been made on me. But these gentlemen opposite know they cannot touch a hair of my head ; they know that they cannot make a charge against me, and so they have to indulge in insinuations. Let them come into my province where I am known ; let the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) who for two days has been alongside the member for North Toronto, the member for East Grey, the member for Victoria-Haliburton to attack me ; let him come with them in my province and they will see whether the people have confidence in my honesty and in me. Let them come into my own county if they like. I may go into the county of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, and if he were here to-night I would make him a proposition—I have no fear to go into his county now and fight with him there the battle, and to see which of us has the confidence of the people of even that county. I am not afraid of these insinuations ; I have been discharging my duty in a proper way and I shall continue to do so. Now, it has been charged that some of the payments to these accountants has been taken from the maintenance of light service and is it not fair that that should be done seeing that the experts have been in Prescott and Sorel discharging their duties there in connection with the accounts of this service. The hon. member for North Toronto used a very mild and polite expression towards me—I am sorry that a young member like me should be obliged to say it of an old parliamentarian like him, but he seems to forget himself sometimes, and because this money was taken from the light service

vote he has used the very mild expression that I had stolen the money from one vote to apply it to another.

I presume my hon. friend is anxious to gain the respect of his fellow members, but judging by the language he uses towards others, one would be inclined to come to a different conclusion. But if he be, why should he not use towards others the manner of expression which gentlemen are accustomed to use in their relations with one another? A great deal has been said regarding my travelling expenses to England, France, Germany and Italy. Well, this is not the first time when a public man has had to face attacks of that kind so that I find myself in very good company. Let me cite, for instance, the distinguished man who for many years was the leader of the Liberal party in the province of Ontario, the Hon. George Brown. In 1874 Mr. Brown went to Washington to negotiate a treaty. He came back with a treaty, but unfortunately the American senate refused to sanction it. His negotiations lasted about two months and his travelling expenses were a little over $4,000. Well, he was accused of having obtained the support of the American press by the corrupt use of public money. Mr. Brown denied this charge. 'Not a shilling, he said, had been spent illegitimately and the whole cost of his negotiations were only a little more than $4,000.'

Saturday Morning.

Mr. TAYLOR. That was not for himself alone, but for the whole party.

Mr. BRODEUR. He was alone to negotiate the treaty.

Mr. TAYLOR. He had his secretary and staff with him.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend, who is so very captious, was a member of this House in 1882. How is it that he then sanctioned the expenditure of $8,000 by Sir A. T. Galt who went to Paris to negotiate a treaty, but failed? He was accompanied by Mr. Barnard, and he failed in his mission because he was instructed to ask the minimum tariff on razors and cutlery, two articles which we do not manufacture in this country. And his mission cost $8,000. My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) however swallowed that without making a wry face, as he will everything that his party supports. I went to England to attend the colonial conference, and I went to Paris to negotiate a treaty. I also went to Germany with regard to the ice-breaker and to Italy where I had some negotiations with the Minister of Foreign Affairs. In none of these countries did I spend lavishly. In fact, my expenditure was on a very modest scale compared with that of two representatives in Paris of countries which cannot be compared with Canada in importance, revenue, extent or prestige. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to realize what those international negotiations mean. They do not realize the necessity of the representatives of any country keeping up the dignity of the state he represents. Take Great Britain and see what expenditure she incurs in her diplomatic service. She is not niggardly in her expenditure to keep up the dignity and influence of those who represent her in the foreign diplomatic service. Why, the English ambassador in Paris occupies a castle, which was built for one of the members of the family of the first Napoleon and which was purchased by Great Britain as a residence for her representative. And should I be called on again to go abroad on a similar mission as that which brought me to Paris last year, I shall do exactly as I did then. I shall consider it my duty to represent my country in a dignified manner. If hon. gentlemen opposite think they are going to influence public opinion by these picayune criticisms, they will find themselves very much mistaken. It may suit the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) to boast of the small expenditure he made when he went abroad, but during his time Canada was not known, whereas to-day Canada is becoming widely known and it is the duty of our public men to maintain their position in a dignified way. I have no desire to detain the House. That may suit my hon. friend who went to bed last night.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not go to bed until 9 o'clock this morning.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, I have not gone to bed since yesterday morning, but am still fresh and vigorous enough to reply to the attacks of the hon. gentleman and am quite prepared to stay here just as long as these hon. gentlemen are willing to continue their policy of obstruction. That seems to be the policy of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who for the time being occupies the position of leader of his party. He wants to prevent any money coming out of the public chest for the administration of this country's affairs after the 1st April next. So irritated is he because this country is prospering that he would like to stop all expenditure on the public works we are now carrying on. Well, let him take the responsibility of such a course and he will no doubt find that when the people have an opportunity of giving a verdict they will leave him.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) reminds me of the lady who is continually protesting about her virtue. The hon. gentleman says he is perfectly honest. Well, he is certainly anything but frank, and when he attempts

to lecture this side of the House about courtesy, he ought to remember that the first essential of a gentleman, as well as a minister of the Crown, is to be always ready to disarm criticism by throwing every possible light on transactions in which his own personal honour is concerned. Will the minister explain how it is that on the file there are letters to which the answers are not brought down and replies to letters which are not included?

Mr. BRODEUR. I explained yesterday that orders were given for the preparation of the return and when it was brought to me I found these letters missing. I gave instructions to the deputy to have the letters hunted up and included and I have explained to the House that the return is not yet complete. When the report of Mr. Falconer is presented I believe I will be justified.

Mr. LANCASTER. We must be allowed to use our own judgment as to whether the information we ask for is necessary before we allow this item to pass.

Mr. BRODEUR. The return asked for has nothing to do with the item before the House and the country will judge as to this obstruction.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister gave his solemn word that he would bring the papers down and he has not implemented his promise. He should either bring the papers down or withdraw his estimates.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have been sitting here since the day before yesterday and I had no opportunity to go to my office.

Mr. TAYLOR. It's your own fault.

Mr. BRODEUR. I don't think there is any reason for a statement of that kind. My deputy minister is out of the city and at eight o'clock this morning I sent for the assistant deputy and got the papers which were handed me the other day and showed them to my hon. friends and everything is complete except a few papers which I found were missing. I have asked Mr. Stanton, the acting deputy, to try and complete the report. I have always been willing to comply with the request of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I could show them instructions I have given concerning these reports and if they are not yet down it is not my fault.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is your fault that you don't withdraw the estimates when these papers are not here. The opposition will show you they have rights and you can make up your mind to stay here till Sunday morning.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am accustomed to these threats, I have no fear.

Mr. TAYLOR. Any minister that will get up in his place and make a false statement or a statement he cannot fulfil——

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman has no right to say I made a false statement.

Mr. TAYLOR. I didn't say it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I ask for the ruling of the chair.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. G. H. McIntyre). What I understood the hon. member to say was that a minister had no right to make a false statement.

Mr. BELAND. Did the minister make a false statement ?

Mr. TAYLOR. He said he would bring down a return to-day and he has not brought it down complete.

Mr. BELAND. That is not a false statement.

Mr. BRODEUR. When I made that state- I expected I would be able to go to my office and attend to the business of my department, but I have been kept here since the day before yesterday. As a matter of fact I could not present a report when the House is in committee. I have asked the acting deputy to try and get these papers down tonight and I hope they will be finished tonight.

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) knows he is not serious—if he saw himself in a glass he would laugh at himself.

Mr. TAYLOR. I ask the protection of the chair from the slanderous attacks of the gentlemen opposite.

Mr. TALBOT. I resent that statement.

Mr. TAYLOR. Order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. G. H. McIntyre). The hon. gentleman is not at liberty to interrupt the member for Leeds who has the floor.

Mr. TALBOT. He wants interruption ; they are simply killing time.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister gave a good reason for not producing the papers while his deputy was away, but he has no business to try and shove it down the throat of the member for North Toronto that he will rush those estimates through the House.

Mr. BRODEUR. If you give me an hour I will go to the department and see how the copying is getting on.

Mr. TAYLOR. Do so and we will take up the agricultural estimates.

Mr. BRODEUR. Very well I will do so to show you how anxious I am to comply with the orders of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister can go and we will take up the agricultural estimates.

Mr. FISHER. Oh, no.

Mr. BRODEUR. All right I will go.

Mr. TAYLOR It is not constitutional to proceed with the estimates in the absence of the minister.

Mr ARMAND LAVERGNE. No one understands better than I do the thankless position which an opposition occupies and perhaps with the exception of being a member of a party all by yourself there is no position more ungrateful. Every one knows I am not a blind supporter of the government and perhaps the opposition will take a little advice from me. We have been three weeks on these estimates and there is now a deadlock. It is evident the government will not yield, and while it is evident the opposition had some reason for starting the obstruction yet now the situation is changed and the information has been brought down.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. As the matter stands, the information required has been for the greater part brought down but there is some part not yet laid on the table. I understand also that it does not relate specially to this item of patrolling Hudson Bay. In view of that fact and in view of the rule that a minister cannot bring down a report when the House is in committee, I think we ought to adjourn so as to give the minister the opportunity of bringing down what is required. The government however refuses to adjourn. And while the minority have rights, not only in the House but in the country, the opposition has made its point, and it ought now let the business go on. The opposition has made its case, and it will be for the country to decide whether it is a good case or not, and I think it would be quite proper for the opposition to allow this vote to pass and the committee report progress and ask leave to sit again. I do not see that the opposition can make its case any stronger by compelling us to sit here until Sunday morning.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend has been very fair, but when he says that papers cannot be laid on the table while the House is in committee, I would remind him that the minister promised to bring down these papers, and that he did bring a portion of them and handed that portion over to the leader of the opposition but he did not bring them all. If he brought down a complete return, that would put an end to the difficulty, but we are within our rights in insisting that he shall fulfil his promise and bring down the information we require or we shall not allow him to pass any of his estimates. I see in the Auditor General's Report some pretty large amounts paid George F. Caldwell and F. E. Calderone explorers. What explorations did these gentlemen make ?

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. FISHER. We will try and get the information for the hon. gentleman sometime.

Mr. TAYLOR. We want it now. The minister ought to be in his place when his estimates are going through. When the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked if it was not the right of parliament that the minister should be in his place when his estimates are being discussed, the hon. gentleman admitted that he should. Will the hon. gentleman allow the House to take recess until the minister returns ?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. CONMEE. I would not in any way curtail the privileges of the opposition but it must be admitted that it is the duty of the government to conduct the business of the House, and the government cannot allow the opposition to dictate to us just what business will come before the House and the order in which it shall come. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has tried to convince the House that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries took the ground that because some personal remarks were made regarding him, he would not bring down certain papers. The minister never made such a statement. As I have said, the opposition cannot expect to take the control of the House from the government.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has the hon. gentleman any proposition to make?

Mr. CONMEE. I may have one before I sit down. I find that the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) used this language in the course of this debate :

But there is information we asked for and we cannot allow this item to pass until we get that information.

Some hon. MEMBERS. That is right.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has repeatedly taken the same ground. The responsibility for the order and proceedings of the House rest on the government, and I do not think it will conduce to the reputation of the House and the business of the country or will enhance the reputation of hon. gentlemen outside the House to take the ground they have taken, that is that the government must do as they say and in the order they say or they will not allow any business to be done.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. CONMEE. That is logically your position. The hon. gentlemen, contrary to a principle of British law, are endeavouring to take advantage of their own wrong, for it is largely their own obstruction that has prevented the minister from complying with their request, as he has not been able to go to his department even to see how the copying is going on.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said that it was becoming a scandal, that ministers were in effect adding to their salaries by taking expense money more than they would require and holding it for an unreasonable time. The hon. member took back part of what he said, explaining that he did not mean to say that the minister was personally dishonest.

Mr. LANCASTER. He did not say anything of the kind .

Mr. CONMEE. What do you say about it; do you say that the minister is personally dishonest? No gentleman will say that outside the House.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is inside the House we are talking now.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) went further and said this was a thieving government; he used the words 'highway robbery.'

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I beg to differ.

Mr. CONMEE. That was put into his mouth by another gentleman.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. In what way did he use it?

Mr. CONMEE. You used it in connection with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the whole government.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I want the hon. gentleman to take that back.

Mr. CONMEE. No, I will not.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Because I never made such a statement.

Mr. CONMEE. I ask the chairman to call in the reporters and ask them to read over what he did say.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I said that this was a blundering, plundering government, and I was justified in making that statement.

Mr. CONMEE. Did you not use the words 'highway robber?'

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No, Sir.

Mr. CONMEE. I repeat that you did.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. G. H. McIntyre). Order. The hon. gentleman must address the chair.

Mr. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has not accepted the denial of the hon. member for Lambton.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. G. H. McIntyre). If the hon. gentleman denies the statement attributed to him the hon. gentleman from Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) must accept his denial.

Mr. CONMEE. I accept his denial, but I am in the judgment of the House as to what I have said.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is a qualified acceptance.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. G. H. McIntyre). I hope the hon. gentleman will not make my task difficult. It is necessary to accept the denial without qualification.

Mr. CONMEE. I did accept it without qualification, and I have at least the right to say that I am in the judgment of the House, but if the chairman rules me out on that point I will withdraw that too.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. G. H. McIntyre). There must be no qualification.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentleman has stated that he did not use the words in connection with the government and I accept the explanation. I will not repeat what the member for Dufferin stated because I presume he is responsible to himself. I have been in this House for four years and I have not heard a single gentleman opposite make a charge against any minister or against the government. If these gentlemen opposite get up and simply make insinuations and shield themselves behind the privilege of parliament to say here what they would not say elsewhere; a man who does that is taking a cowardly position. The hon. member (Mr. Foster) said that if he made a charge and did not prove it he did not have to leave the House. I admit there is no power to expel any member who fails to prove a charge, but I do say that no gentleman who ought to have a seat in the House would remain in the House under such conditions. I know of no case in British parliamentary practice where a member has not retired under such circumstances. Mr. Tarte made a charge in the House some years ago and he put that charge in writing and made it in a formal manner and it was referred to a parliamentary committee. If hon gentlemen opposite think a minister has wrongfully taken money and applied it to his own use or if they think this is a thieving government; the man who makes such a charge is a coward unless he takes an opportunity of proving it and taking his chances. The government is responsible for the order in which business shall come before the House, and the opposition in this case have taken the ground that unless the majority allows the minority to dictate to them there will be no business done. As Mr. Taylor said, the hon. member for North Toronto has told you chaps what to do and you must do it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Rainy River is out of order in referring to a member of this House by his name.

Mr. CONMEE. That was a slip of the tongue. The minority is not responsible further than to make fair and reasonable criticism and I think they have done more than that in this case and they ought to be sat-

isfied. Hon. gentlemen opposite think it to be a serious thing that the minister took $2,000 for expenses when he went to Europe to transact the business of this Dominion. I know that I would not start on a trip like that with less than $2,000 in my pocket. The minister had a right to take his expenses and all fair minded men will admit that the money was taken out of the proper appropriation for that purpose and that it was properly applied and properly dealt with in every way. Hon. gentlemen opposite dare not say that the minister used one cent wrongfully. He could have done nothing else than what he did do and if these hon. gentlemen opposite wish to go to the Public Accounts Committee and inquire to their hearts content they will find that that expenditure was just and honest. I hope we have heard the last in this House of the idea that the majority must be dictated to by the minority. I hope we will not any longer hear these gentlemen opposite say that we must do what they tell us to do or we will do nothing at all. I protest against that doctrine and so long as I have a seat in this House will not let it go unchallenged.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When the hon. gentleman makes a statement that we are holding up the government, the statement is false so far as we are concerned.

Mr. TALBOT. I for one will make that statement also and I will stand by it.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. member (Mr Armstrong) has accused me of making a false statement and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) knows that the statement he made is not true.

Mr. CONMEE I want the ruling of the chair

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. G. H. McIntyre). I rule that it is not in order to say that an hon. gentleman has made a false statement.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will substitute 'not true' for 'false.'

Mr. CONMEE. That wont do. The hon. gentleman must withdraw the statement.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. G. H. McIntyre). As I did not hear the statement myself I can only rule that it is not in order to say that another hon. gentleman has made a false statement.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I abide by your ruling as to the word false, but I wish to say that it is not true that this side of the House is obstructing the estimates. The hon. member for Rainy River said that I called the minister a highwayman, but that is not so and he wont get the minister to say I did.

Mr. CONMEE. I said you referred to the government as highwaymen and every one in the House heard you, and I say it is cowardly to say so if you do not make a charge.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When the hon. gentleman calls me a coward in regard to these matters I tell him I believe I am doing my duty to my constituents and to the country as a whole. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries tried to find some consolation for the unfortunate position in which he finds himself by making a reference to the hon. George Brown, leader in his day of the Liberal party. Well, if the shade of the late George Brown and the late Alexander Mackenzie could witness the degeneracy of the party they once led, they would come to the conclusion that there were some respects in which this country had made anything but an improvement since their day. Here we have a minister of the Crown trying to force his estimates through and yet at the same time refusing to furnish the information which the opposition deem essential.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES moved that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. The committee cannot pass estimates in the absence of the minister responsible for the department.

Motion negatived—yeas 15, nays 43

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I ask the minister leading the House how can we proceed without the Minister of Marine being here.

Mr. BELAND. No questions were put to the minister when he was here for hours.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I know of no rule which compels a minister to be present under such circumstances. It is asking rather too much of the minister to remain here for days continuously when the members of the opposition can form themselves into relays and get rested. It is physically impossible for the minister to be here all the time and it would be a most extraordinary act of cruelty to atempt to compel his attendance. If there were such a rule it would be possible for the opposition to prevent the carrying on of public business.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Agriculture said it was the duty of the minister to be present when his estimates are being discussed.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have great regard for the Minister of Agriculture, but I am not bound by his ruling.

Mr. FISHER. And that was not my ruling.

Mr. SPROULE. If the minister is unable to attend to his duties he can move the committee rise and then he will have an opportunity for rest and recreation.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No man could have done more to satisfy the opposition than the Minister of Marine has done for the past two days. Even if he were here he could only repeat what he has said already twenty or thirty times.

Mr. PARDEE. Since this discussion started it has appeared to me remarkable that nothing has been said on the item before the House and that these gentlemen opposite have continuously indulged in nothing but insinuations which it is absolutely impossible for them to substantiate. Prior to this debate I can candidly say that I have listened with interest and I hope instruction to the remarks of the member for North Toronto. But from his conduct in this debate I can gather neither instruction nor profit. He has said every word he could say without absolutely laying a charge,—to quote his words—that the minister has stolen, that he has filched, and he went further and insinuated that the Minister of Marine—and than whom there is no more honourable man in this House—had actually rifled one account for another in order that he might get his expenses. And, mind you, these expenses were necessary for him to attend the important public duties which called him to England. It may be an old saw, but I say in all sincerity that when a member of this House on his reputation as a representative of the people of the province of Ontario or any other province, when he says that a brother member has stolen, when he says he has used public moneys in a way he should not, when he says he has filched public money to his own personal advantage, when he says he has rifled the accounts of the Dominion, that member must be prepared to make a charge and substantiate his statements or the people of this country, honest as they are, will punish the member who refuses to substantiate these statements. I look at the definition of the word 'rifler,' and I find it means robber, and when a man sent to this parliament as a leader of public opinion says that a member of this House has stolen and filched and rifled the public chest, I say if that man has any red corpuscles in his whole body and if he is a man he will make such a charge on his responsibility and he will take the consequences.

Let me tell hon. members opposite that, so far as he was concerned, he did absolutely all that his oath of office called for. He has administered the department so efficiently that hon. gentlemen opposite have to show their discontent by these obstructive tactics. They cavil at the amount he spent on his trip to Europe. Well, the results of his mission to the old land, to France and to Germany have been such that Canada to-day occupies a position she never did before and such as the Conservative party were never able to achieve. The meagre amount he spent was absolutely justified by the profits which are bound to accrue to this country from the work he has accomplished. We have had some very peculiar criticisms on this trip of the 'Arctic' to our northern regions from hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) said it resulted in little or nothing except the collection of $500 from certain fishermen. But what are the facts? We have had the United States from year to year endeavouring to claim these waters as their own and planting their flag on those shores, but we have asserted our sovereignty over that region, and in this have carried out the policy of that greatest Britisher and Canadian of them all, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who declared that Canada must be for the Canadians. But that grand old Conservative party, which claims the monopoly of loyalty, by cavilling at this policy, show their willingness to sit idly by and see Canadian territory pass into foreign hands. Had we not asserted our sovereignty over that territory, we would have had the American people taking possession of it, and thus lay the grounds for an international dispute in the near future beween them and us. But these expeditions have upheld the nationality of Canada on those waters and shores, and the people of Canada are bound to reap every possible benefit that will accrue from its teeming fisheries and its abundant mineral and other wealth. We had the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) deploring the decadence of the present Liberal leaders as compared with the late Alexander Mackenzie and the Reformers of his day. But when Mr. Mackenzie was in office the party opposite declared that the treasury of the country was being rifled from day to day. But now that he is no more, they can hardly find words sufficient to express their appreciation of his great qualities. Sir, the traditional principles of the Reform party have come down from year to year, and are as strong to-day as they were in the time of Mr. Mackenzie. The discussion has wandered far afield for the simple reason that hon. gentlemen opposite, in default of argument, have resorted to obstructive tactics. Why, the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) inquired how long the Hudson straits were open in the year. Had he read the history of that country as carefully as he does the history of the German surtax, he would have known that it is open from four to five months every year. This is only one evidence of the childish criticisms of hon. gentlemen opposite. They are simply turning constitutional government into a farce.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. We have been sitting here for something like forty hours and it is useless for hon. gentlemen opposite to pretend that they have not deliberately set themselves to obstruct the work of this committee. What is the reason for

this obstruction ? The chief reason, I believe, is that the hon. gentleman who represents North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has become soured. For a brief period he has had the leadership of the party opposite and as he feels the unfortunate position in which he stands before the country, he is now resorting, like a ruined gambler, to a desperate throw and imagines that by engineering these obstructive tactics he will draw the attention of the country on himself and possibly make some little political capital out of it. But unless I am very much mistaken, the verdict of the people will be that men of his calibre are not fitted to have any share in the administration of the country's affairs. The delay and obstruction of public business which we have witnessed during the last few days is due to the unfortunate temper in which my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) finds himself. I am sure that if the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) were here, he would have prevented this obstruction and would not have allowed the opposition to get themselves into anything like the position in which they have placed themselves in the last forty hours. Hon. members have made vague but high-sounding charges against the minister, but it is astonishing to see the agility with which the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) sought to escape from what he had said about that minister when he was taken to task by the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What does the hon. member mean by saying that I attempted to escape from any statement or criticism I have made ?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I will come to you later. Does he imagine for a moment that the people of this country are going to be deceived by such tactics ? A fair and reasonable criticism of public expenditure is what any government should welcome, but my hon. friends opposite have exceeded that and gone beyond possible limits. They have made all sorts of insinuations and innuendoes and indirect attacks against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I ask does any one of them believe in his heart that the minister is a thief? If there be such a one, let him have the manliness to make a direct charge, and we shall furnish him with the fullest opportunity to have a most thorough investigation.

Mr. LENNOX. It is quite evident from the last two speeches we have heard, that hon. gentlemen opposite are becoming very restless. They tell us that our proceedings will not redound to our political advantage. Political advantage is all they think of, but what we are fighting for is our constitutional rights. If there has been any spectacle during the past forty hours, it is that afforded by hon. gentlemen who have not the courage to face the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) when he is in the House but who attack him behind his back.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is now almost seven o'clock and I observe that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has returned. I presume that he will now give us the information which the Minister of Agriculture said would be given in due course.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. The situation we find in the House for the last two days is that a coterie of Ontario Tory members evidently for no other purpose and for no other good reason than that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries happens to be a French Canadian, have united to harrass him and to do everything possible to make his life miserable.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. I ask the ruling of the Chair as to whether an hon. member is justified in imputing motives to members on this side of the House when they are discharging their duty.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I am not imputing any motives, I am stating the fact that during the last two days they have done everything to harrass the Minister of Marine and Fisheries because——

Mr. SPROULE. I want your ruling Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. There is a rule that prevents an hon. member from imputing motives.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. If I have imputed any motives I cheerfully withdraw them, but any facts I have stated I just as cheerfully insist in placing them before the House. It is absolutely unfair that a minister of the Crown, even though he comes from the province of Quebec, should be treated as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been treated by the opposition. They ask him to give information at 7 o'clock on Saturday morning after keeping him here since Thursday night, and if they had the true spirit of sportsmen about them they would cease to harrass him any longer. I believe in playing the game of politics fairly, but I don't believe in a coterie of Ontarie Tories persecuting a minister of the Crown because he happens to be in charge of a prominent department and because he happens to come from another province.

Mr. PERLEY. I have always found the hon. member (Mr. D. Ross) a reasonable man, and I would like to know what he means by talking of a coterie of Ontario Tories ? The opposition has objected to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries going on with his estimates until he gives us information. Does the hon. member know that the hon. gentlemen from Jacques Cartier and Laval argued most strongly against these items going through without proper information being accorded ? Why

should the hon. gentleman (Mr. D. Ross) introduce sectional and racial matters into a question like this. Surely we never considered on this side of the House whether the minister comes from Ontario or Quebec.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Perley) happens to represent a Quebec constituency it appears to be an accident and I will have to class him as an Ontario Tory.

Mr. PERLEY. What about the hon. members for Jacques Cartier and Laval ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. They are not here.

Mr. LAPOINTE. They got disgusted.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I am sure there is no stronger French Canadian in this House than I am, and I must say that the hon. gentleman from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. D. Ross) seems to be mistaken, for I do not believe the opposition ever had the idea in their minds which he says they have. I think the opposition were justified perhaps at the start, but I think they have stated their position long ago, and what in my opinion they should have done was to record their vote and let the business of the House proceed. I am glad to say that I do not believe the opposition had in their minds the motives attributed to them by my hon. friend (Mr. D. Ross).

Mr. TAYLOR. The government members have been obstructing for the last six hours.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. My hon. friend (Mr. D. Ross) was mistaken, and any man who has sat here for so many hours is liable to make a mistake. As I said, if the opposition believed at the outset that a minister of the Crown refused information they were right in starting the discussion, but having stated their position, what they should have done was to record their vote and leave it to the verdict of the country as to whether the minister was right or wrong. I do not believe there were any racial, sectarian or narrow motives inspiring this matter. At the same time I think the obstruction should have ceased long ago.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Armand Lavergne) has been very fair and as an Ontario man I am very obliged to him for the rebuke he has given the member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. D. Ross).

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I did not give a rebuke to anybody, I merely stated my views.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the minister give us the information now as to how this $50,000 is going to be expended ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall be very happy to give the information when the opposition are ready to transact business.

Mr. FISHER. The Prime Minister made a very fair proposition at the opening of the debate when he said that if one item in these estimates were put through this item could stand and they would get all the information they wanted on it later. That was a fair proposition because we thought the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should be vindicated.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Agriculture has propounded to the House some most amusing information with regard to the procedure.

Mr. FISHER. The opposition seemed to need it.

Mr. SPROULE. He assumes the authority to give it at any rate, whether right or wrong. In the case of the Farnham post office the Minister of Agriculture assisted to obstruct from Wednesday afternoon until Saturday night.

Mr. FISHER. I was not in the House when the item to which he refers was dealt with. I confess I have held up the late government when they were trying to pass improper items, not because they did not give opportunity to acquire information but because I thought the item was improper and tried to prevent it passing at all.

Mr. SPROULE. I say that until the minister is prepared to furnish all the information which the opposition want and which he promised, he has no right to ask us to pass any item at all. All he has to do is to allow some other department that is prepared to go forward. Are we not justified in asking that the estimates for that department be held over until we get the information ? Let any other department be taken up and we are willing to go on.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Agriculture should not question the course of the opposition in this case as he, when in opposition, assisted to keep the House from Wednesday, shortly after 3 o'clock, until 12 on Saturday night, and the minister refused to allow the government to pass the item under discussion or any other item.

Mr. FISHER. No question of any other item came up.

Mr. TAYLOR. You did not ask one.

Mr. FISHER. We were told the item had to pass if we stayed a year.

Mr. TAYLOR. And it did pass.

Mr. FISHER. Eventually, yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Our case is a great deal stronger.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. minister kindly let me have the report of the historian of the 'Arctic,' which, he says, is in his department ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I gave instructions yesterday to have it copied.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not necessary to have it copied ; I will not steal it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have no objection to that.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a document which he could get in two minutes.

Mr. BRODEUR. I gave instructions to have this report copied. Shall I withdraw those instructions or tell them to go on ?

Mr. FOSTER. The minister can do whatever he likes ; all I ask for is the report.

Mr. BRODEUR. Shall I get it copied ?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose others would like to see it besides myself.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I wish to record my objection to having the report taken out of the department. I want to see a copy of it.

Mr. BENNETT. I assume that the expenses of the 'Arctic' will come out of this vote. It says 'vessels' and in the fortieth annual report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, 1907, I find that there are a number of vessels owned by the government and, as more than one vessel may go to these northern waters, I am going to draw the attention of the minister to the vessels mentioned here, and ask him whether he thinks one or more of these may also go. On page 12 I find a reference to the 'Stanley.' The minister appears to be unable to give me any information as to what the flotilla will consist of. I have no doubt that the minister will have no inconsiderable fleet upon that occasion because I find by reference to this report that he has a perfect armada under his control. There is nothing small about the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when it comes tc spending other peoples' money. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he thinks the 'Stanley' would be as well fitted for his expedition as the 'Arctic.'

Mr. FIELDING. Not quite so well.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, I assume that the minister fears that, never having been there before, she might make a mistake.

Mr. FIELDING. There is a good deal in that.

Mr. BENNETT. In every well-equipped armada there is a flagship and on this occasion, when the fleet will sail out from Quebec, there will be on the flagship that hardy and worthy mariner, Capt. Bernier. There should be no danger to the fleet with Capt. Bernier on the bridge. If the 'Stanley' is there, she will follow the lead of the 'Arctic.' But in case the minister fears that the 'Stanley' is not well fitted, I would like to call his attention to the 'Montcalm,' and it is really too bad that the Minister of Marine is not here to answer my questions. I would ask the Minister of Finance if he thinks the 'Montcalm' is fitted to go on this trip ? He is doubtful about her—cannot say anything against her, and cannot say anything in her favour. One great feature of this northern expedition is that it is a kind of missionary trip to establish peace and amity with those benighted heathens in the north—the Esquimaux.

I would impress upon the Minister of Finance the advantages of sending up the 'Montcalm' on this Arctic trip. She is supposed to be under the eagle eye of Commander Spain. And by the way, I notice that these letters precede the name of Commander Spain, O.G.V. Now, I would like to ask the Finance Minister what those letters mean. I think these letters should follow instead of preceding his name. It would seem that Mr. Spain is high up in the admiralty of the Canadian navy. The only meaning I can get from these letters is that they stand for 'One Great Viator,' if the House will indulge me in this mix up of English and Latin. In the blue-books it would be permissible I suppose to call him 'One Great Traveller.' Another point. I do not understand how the minister is going to make this trip this year with only $50,000, because we remember that on former occasions the expenditure has run up to about $125,000. How is it possible that this trip can be accomplished on $50,000 ? Since the flight of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I am unable to know how many vessels there are in the fleet besides the 'Arctic.' Perhaps the Minister of Finance could tell me.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no idea.

Mr. BENNETT. That is very sad, because there is going to be a lot of rivalry over this trip. Will the Minister of Finance give me a half promise now, even if it is a faint hearted promise, that the 'Montcalm' will be one of the equipment?

Mr. FIELDING. I will take it under consideration.

Mr. BENNETT. I wish the hon. minister could go further. The 'Montcalm' is an ice-breaker, and, as such, she would be particularly suitable for the navigation of these northern waters. Especially so if she has a French Canadian for her captain, like Capt. Bernier. I have the honour to have many French Canadians among my electors, and I am glad to say that I get the votes of more and more of them with each recurring election. With a French Canadian as her captain, the 'Montcalm' could do good service in these northern waters. It is true that the Public Works Department might feel that the 'Speedy' should be impressed into this service. But, on second thought, I am not sure that the Public Works Department would be willing to let her go. I would like to consult the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) about that. Does he think that the 'Speedy' would be a

proper vessel to send on one of these voyages?

Mr. FIELDING. The name seems good.

Mr. BENNETT. Must the Minister of Finance judge only by the name? Does he mean to say he has never seen her?

Mr. FIELDING. Never.

Mr. BENNETT. Never saw her beautiful mahogany cabin? Never reposed luxuriously upon her beautiful divans? Never stretched his legs under her hospitable hundred-dollar table and drunk Radnor water and other etcetras? We are told that this vessel lies half the time at the dock. Better have her machinery rust out than wear out. I hope the Minister of Finance will have this vessel placed at his disposal and that he will make a trip up the lakes with her. If he will call at the town of Midland, he will be most hospitably received. I regret to observe that I failed to command the full attention of some hon. members at the rear of the chamber. I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, as a man of experience in public speaking, to sympathize with me in my difficulty of making an address worthy of this occasion with some of my auditors at such a distance and so inattentive. I am glad to know, however, that I have the attention of my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith), and that my hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Brown) is also an intent listener. With this very select, though small list of auditors, I am—I will not say goaded—but led to continue my remarks.

Now, I am going to ask the Minister of Finance if he does not think that the insurance of the lives of the crew should be looked after. Let us consider for a moment the perils to which the crew will be exposed. It goes without saying that everything that was done on the last occasion of the trip of the 'Arctic' will be done on the coming occasion. I was going to appeal to the hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Wm. Roche), who I regret to see is going out of the chamber, because he is a marine man, and lives down by the sounding sea. Does the hon. member for Halifax wish these men to go down to the sea in vessels without their lives being insured? Now, why should this great country of ours, which is paying so many millions of dollars in taxes to this government, not be willing to insure the lives of these men? This country cannot afford to lose Captain Bernier. Remember what Captain Bernier is doing for the country. There is never a year goes by that he does not come back from the northern regions and tell us that he has discovered so many more islands. He comes back here with a beautifully prepared map dotted with red spots, and he puts his finger on these spots and says: There is another island that I have discovered for the people of Canada. Now, the captain is very modest, I think. I am going to appeal to my hon. friends from Bagot (Mr. J. E. Marcil), and my hon. friend from Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau), who I see are listening to me very attentively. Do they not think that it is great folly on the part of Capt. Bernier, when he makes these red spots on the map to show that he found a dozen islands, say, last year, that he should be so modest and not put down a few more red spots to show us that he has discovered a few more islands? It is just as easy for the captain to mark with red spots forty islands as it is to mark a dozen islands, and the result would be that the captain would be showing some better results of his trip. Now, if the captain were to bring us a new map every year with a lot of new islands marked on it with red spots, of course these maps would remain in the archives of the department, and the result would be that in a few years from now the map would be dotted all over with islands, and then the people would say to Capt. Bernier: There are no more islands to discover, there is no more use in navigating those regions because the waters are full of islands. Besides the dangers of the deep, there are dangers from the people amongst whom these navigators go. And with this immense display of silverware on the 'Montcalm' is there not danger that Capt. Bernier and all his gallant crew may be murdered by those who desire to possess themselves of these riches?

Now, looking over the accounts, I do not find any amusements have been provided for the crew, except in the form of drinking liquor, smoking tobacco and playing cards. Had it not been for the love of economy, I suppose a piano would have been provided. Can the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) tell me whether there is a piano aboard the 'Montcalm?' Apparently, the hon. minister does not know. Here again, we are at a loss because of the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. We know that there is a piano on the 'Speedy.' Might it not be possible to place the 'Speedy's' piano aboard the 'Montcalm,' should she be chosen as the sister ship of the 'Arctic' in these expeditions. Of course, there may be the drawback that there is not a good piano player among the crew of the 'Montcalm.' But, though the people of Canada are economical, I think they would like to feel that the crew are not confined to seek amusement in drinking liquor, smoking tobacco or playing cards, and would be willing to engage a piano player. The dances of which we read in the evidence as having been held would be all the more enjoyable if they had a piano on the vessel. I have spoken of the 'Montcalm' for, of course, the 'Arctic' will be sent—that goes without saying. And it goes without saying that Captain Bernier will be in command. Why, I believe that the very engines would refuse to work were

the signal given by any other than the strong touch of Captain Bernier. But should there be any thought of sending the 'Speedy' I enter my protest against that course of action. The 'Speedy' entertains the people of these more southern portions of the Dominion with the splendour of her entertainments and her $25,000 of expenditure. God help the long-suffering people of this country so long as the men now in office handle their money. If they would but handle the public money as they handle their own, the expenditure of this money would be $50,000,000 instead of $150,000,000.

Now, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has just entered the chamber. I would like to ask him whether Captain Bernier left Joe Lane in that northern part of the country. The Minister of Marine does not answer. Apparently he has not the information at hand. He comes here and asks for $50,000 for this expedition, and yet he practically confesses that he does not know whether Joe Lane is there or not. What would have happened to Captain Bernier and the other gentlemen if it had not been for Joe Lane? According to the evidence concerning a former expedition, if it had not been for Joe Lane the expedition would have been in sore straits indeed. We do not know whether Captain Bernier brought Joe Lane down or not. He may have brought him down. It may be that Joe Lane at this moment is over in Hull, having a good time at the expense of the country. Now, will the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tell me how the supplies will be purchased for this next expedition? Again, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is deaf to my questioning. However, I know one thing, and that is that these purchases will not be made in the open market. Everybody will look on this as a junketing expedition. Now that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has been out of the chamber for some time, has returned, I wish to ask him if he has decided what vessel is to accompany the 'Arctic' on this trip. I think the minister should answer that question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, he is not going to get these estimates through quickly in this way. Has the minister decided what vessel is to accompany the 'Arctic?'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. BENNETT. It is not carried, and will not be carried in the next week or for several weeks. If the minister thinks he is going to sit there and not answer a proper question, he will not get any estimates carried. I ask him if there is to be more than one vessel on this trip? Will the minister answer the question?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have answered. I have stated that when hon. gentlemen opposite are ready to take the estimates seriously, I shall be ready to answer them.

Mr. BENNETT. I am now asking questions seriously about this trip for which this vote of $50,000 is asked. Will any vessel besides the 'Arctic' go on that trip? The minister need not think he can jolly these estimates through the committee. The day for jollying has gone by. The day for getting anything voted for that department has gone by unless the payment of the money is verified under oath in the Public Accounts Committee. That may just as well be understood first as last. We are not going to be satisfied when the minister stands up in this House and says that a payment was made to this man or that man; we are going to have the man state under oath whether he got the money or not, and whether he got all the money. Has it come to this, that when a minister gives the House an assurance that a certain sum of money has been paid to a certain person, his word cannot be accepted, and that we have to go before the Public Accounts Committee and produce documents with their tell-tale evidences of crookedness and have them verified under oath? It has come to that in this department. Let us look at this shameful statement presented to this House, which shows a case of open thieving and nothing less. The minister has said that he has invited this man Falconer to go to court with an action against the Dominion of Canada. He said the statement of Falconer could not be maintained, because there would be the oath of the minister against his oath. I assume that we shall have the oath of both of these gentlemen in the Public Accounts Committee. This is no time for mincing matters. If Mr. Falconer gets into court, he will have something to back up his verbal contract with. He will have this, that on several occasions he placed bills before this department which were certified to by the minister himself, and that the minister agreed that the men employed by him were to be paid, according to their grades or classes, $3, $4 or $5 per day as an allowance for board and lodging; and the minister will have to maintain that that was not the case at all, but that he had a verbal bargain with Falconer that he was to be allowed his actual disbursements. But the country will never see this case ventilated in a court of law. There is not a man inside or outside of parliament who, when he hears of the facts of the case, will ever believe that this man Falconer or those who associated with him ever got the $50,000. There will be the same old idea that there was a go-between, and the public will judge as to the capacity of a minister who allows bills amounting to hundreds of dollars to be paid by his department without a single certificate of any official of his department upon them. What an easy

department this Department of Marine and Fisheries is. While the public treasury is being raided as it is to-day, the fight before the people of Canada cannot come on too quickly. Hon. gentlemen talk about obstruction. The honest thinking people of Canada will be glad to think that this discussion has gone on for two days and two nights, and their eyes will be opened to the exposure that has been made. They will realize that this is only one of many cases to show them where their money has gone, and will go to strengthen the suspicion in the minds not only of honest Conservatives, but of many honest Liberals, that 40 or 50 per cent of the public money has gone, not in graft at all—that is too mild a term—but in common, ordinary thievery.

An hon. MEMBER. Highway robbery.

Mr. BENNETT. Highway robbery would be a gentle term to apply to this. The highway robber met you in the open ; he did not skulk behind the doors of a government department as these thieves do. He was a gentleman compared with the man who is thriving to-day at the expense of the people of this country by means of payments such as these, that are not vouched for by either the minister or any official of the department. There will be a rude awakening when hon. gentlemen opposite have to face the people. I have heard the old story told around the corridors, 'Don't be afraid ; it will be all right ; we will work the race and religious cry in the province of Quebec, and we will work the foreign vote in the Northwest.' But the race and religious cry will soon be played out in the province of Quebec. I have more respect for the French Canadian people than some hon. gentlemen opposite. You cannot fool the French Canadian people much longer.

An hon. MEMBER. You will not fool us.

Mr. BENNETT. I invite the Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau) to come up to the township of Tiny. He will find there a gentleman who can hold his own on the public platform with the Solicitor General himself, a French-Canadian farmer, a man of ability and conversant with the political history of this country, a man who had much to do with bringing about the downfall of the rotten, ragged, disgraced Ross administration of Ontario.

Mr. LOUIS LAVERGNE. Was he born in Ontario?

Mr. BENNET. He was born in Quebec, I think.

Mr. BUREAU. Contaminated in Ontario.

Mr. BENNETT. And if the Solicitor General comes to that section of country, he will find that the most prosperous, the most intelligent French Canadians there are Conservatives. This idea of hon. gentlemen opposite that they are going to win on the foreign vote in the Northwest and on the religious howl in Quebec cuts both ways.

Mr. BUREAU. It cuts only one way. We never hear it in Quebec. You are the only people who raise it.

Mr. BENNETT. Why, it is not so very long ago since the leader of the government, on the public platform in Quebec, thanked God that there was not an Orangeman in the Liberal party.

Mr. BUREAU. That is right, but that is not a cry of religion.

Mr. BENETT. Now, the Solicitor General also thanks God that there is not an Orangeman in the Liberal party. I suppose he will say that he does not want one either.

Mr. BUREAU. I did not say that. I never knew that Orangeism was religion. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) denied it when I spoke about that in the session of 1904-1905.

Mr. BENNETT. I know Orangemen who sometimes vote on the Liberal side.

An hon. MEMBER. Here is one, the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Finlay).

Mr. BENNETT. Oh, well, he will soon be numbered with the dead politically if Jim Stratton does not chloroform him, the Liberal-Conservative party will attend to him. But we do not worry much about this parliament, it is the next parliament we are worrying about.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT. And it is not causing us much worry. There will be an election in Ontario next summer. Talk of the ragged remnant who came out of the wreck of the Ross government. They are an army compared with those who will be left after the next election. And this government cannot bring on its election too soon to suit us. They are reduced to such methods as the Ross administration used—stealing ballots, burning ballots and things of that kind. But all that will not help them. And I point to the fate of the Ross government as an example. Why, I have seen men who used to be cheek by jowl with the ministers in the corridors of the legislature in Toronto. They had the ministers in their power. And what has become of them ? Deprived of the help of their friends in the government, they became political and social outcasts, and as such some of them have gone down to their graves. The Ross administration and the crowd that followed them were responsible for bringing down politically, socially and morally a number of young men, who, but for the temptations placed in their way might have been useful and honoured citizens. And the Ross government met its

doom. I do not think there will be a Dominion election this year, though this side of the House desires it. My hon. friend from Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Louis Lavergne), the whip of the Liberal party shakes his head as indicating that there will be an election. It cannot come too soon for the Liberal-Conservative party, nor can it come too soon for the well-being of the people of Canada as a whole.

Mr. BARR. The weary faces of hon. members remind us of soldiers during a siege. And, looking at the clock, we see that we have yet thirteen hours to fight the battles of our party and our country before the relief comes with the Sabbath, when, under the laws of the land, it will not be possible for this House to continue in session. We have had an experience which, I am sure, hon. members on both sides will hope not to see repeated for many years.

We have been told that an election is coming on. We have reason to believe that in the province of Ontario we will have an election next June. Now we know that in Ontario to-day we have one of the purest governments that ever governed a country, a government that is pure and white as the drifted snow. They took upon them a lease of power from the free and independent electors of Ontario.

Mr. DEVLIN. I rise to a point of order. I fail to see what connection there is between the snow-white government of Ontario and item 209 which is before the committee.

Mr. BARR. I may remind the hon. gentleman that some of his friends have been sleeping, probably not the sleep of the just, while we on this side of the House have been struggling for the liberties of the people. I thought it was settled last night when the point of order was raised that we had the privilege of discussing a wide range of subjects. I was going to proceed to discuss the platforms of the different parties of this country.

Mr. DEVLIN. I insist upon a ruling of the Chair to know whether the hon. gentleman is in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. J. J. Hughes). No doubt the discussion has wandered widely from the item under consideration. But if the point is pressed, I will have to ask the speaker to confine his remarks to the question before the Chair.

Mr. BARR. Of course there are a great many other questions that we can discuss if hon. gentlemen opposite prefer it. But we have at least this satisfaction, that in 13 hours from now we shall necessarily be relieved from the necessity of discussing anything at all. Now, I desire to submit to the House a platform which, if it were adopted by this government, would, I think, relieve them from the difficulty they have got into.

Mr. PAQUET. I rise to a point of order. For a long time now the hon. gentleman has been speaking on questions that have absolutely nothing to do with the question before the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If an hon. member insists upon the application of the rule relevancy, then the hon. gentleman who has the floor must confine himself to the question before the Chair.

Mr. BARR. I have no doubt my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Paquet) is quite within his rights, although I question his object in pursuing that course. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in bringing in from New York experts to reorganize the bookkeeping system in his department, thereby acknowledged that something was wrong. But in engaging these New York experts he made no written contract with them, and the result is that we are met with overcharges for board of an extraordinary character. When the public learn of the unnecessary waste of time that is going on, they will hold the government and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries responsible for refusing to supply the information demanded by the opposition.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. member for North Toronto asked me to let him see the originals of the letters of Mr. Vanasse. I beg leave to present them to the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very glad to get the report of Mr. Vanasse, for which we had not previously asked. If the minister had been as prompt in obeying the orders of the House for returns ordered two months ago, we would not have been in the condition we are to-day. Here we are within a few hours of the close of the week, and the minister still persists in pushing his estimates without bringing down the information the House has ordered.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have got it. I have stated time and again, during the night, let us do some work, and as soon as as the Speaker is in the chair, I will lay the report on the table.

Mr. FOSTER Well, my hon. friend will not make any progress in that way. The returns are to be brought down before the Supplies are voted. It is necessary for the information to be in the hands of those who have the voting of the Supplies before they vote them to the Crown. There have been a number of new doctrines laid down by the minister, and this is his latest one. Information which was ordered by the House two months ago he brings down in the midst of the conflict and locks it up in his desk. Then he says to the voters of the Supplies, we will reverse the old proposition that the information must come before the

Supply is voted, and we will put it in this way ; I have the information ; here it is ; you pass the Supply, and I will give you the information. No man in this House will stand by the minister in that position. Of course, hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to save his face. They know that he got himself into this muddle ; they are sorry he did ; but they are standing by him now, and they are willing to remain silent under that novel and destructive doctrine. Fancy a minister standing up in the face of the House and saying, pass my estimates and I will give you the information, not before.

Mr. BUREAU. That is not a fair statement. The minister says he will put the papers on the table when the Speaker is in the chair.

Mr. FOSTER. He has an easy way of getting the Speaker in the chair. He will not move that the deputy Speaker leave the chair in order to get the Speaker in the chair. He says : Pass the estimate, and you will get the information.

Mr. BUREAU. That is an unfair statement.

Mr. FOSTER. An unfair statement ? And this is a member of the legal department of this government, the Solicitor General, with some of the traditions of justice under his care and keeping. He has heard the Minister of Marine and Fisheries make the statement here that if we will make progress and pass the estimates, then he will give us the information. Now he says mine is an unfair statement. I will leave the Solicitor General to make the statement as he understands it.

Mr. BUREAU. As I understand it, the minister explained that he could not lay the papers on the table until the Speaker was in the chair. While the committee is sitting, the Speaker not being in the chair, he cannot lay the papers on the table. But my hon. friend insinuates that the minister said, pass the estimates and I will get the information.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no doubt about what he said. 'Hansard' will show it.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman had the report in his hands yesterlay with the exception of a few letters.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not seen the report. The completed report has not been in the hands of any man on this side of the House.

Mr. BUREAU. That is hair splitting.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not hair splitting. The Solicitor General is doing the hair splitting. The House ordered the returns two months ago ; the minister has not laid them on the table of the House ; and now he refuses to get into a position to lay them on on the table ; and what he says, in words and in effect, is : I want you to pass this estimate ; if you do that, you will get the information ; if you do not, you will not get it. No man can maintain that position inside or outside of this House. The constitutional position is, before we pass the Supply we must have the information.

Mr. BRODEUR. Anything to make obstruction, that is all.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has no right to charge me or the opposition with obstruction. He has been a Deputy Speaker, a very expensive one, however, and he is supposed to know the rules of the House ; and he knows that no member of this House has the right to charge another member with insincerity. He himself was an actor in a similar event some years ago. In April, 1904 when Mr. Daly, the Minister of the Interior, charged a member of the then opposition with being insincere, no man was quicker to take the floor on a point of order than Sir Wilfrid Laurier, at that time the leader of the opposition, and the Speaker sustained the point of order, which was this, that no member has a right to charge another with being insincere. What we are doing to-day on this side of the House is standing for the right of the opposition and of parliament, and we are sincere in doing it; and the hon. gentleman, who presumably understands the rules of the House, charges us with being obstructionists, being insincere, when he knows that he has no right to do it. That is one of the subterfuges of the minister. It is actions of that kind which have made trouble for him.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is subterfuge a parliamentary word ?

Mr. FOSTER. The Deputy Speaker is in the chair, and if I use any word that is out of the way, he will call me to order. If the minister thinks that is unparliamentary, what does he think of his own charge of insincerity a moment ago against the opposition, when we are simply upholding the rights of this House, and the constitutional method of voting Supplies. Where is the return that he was ordered to bring down to the House ? Will he now put it in possession of the House ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am ready to do so at any time. I brought it yesterday, and I said I was ready to put it on the table as soon as the Speaker was in the chair.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister was given an opportunity of moving the Deputy Speaker out of the chair and putting the House in a position to get it ; but he has not done that. I am informed by some hon. gentlemen who saw these papers that they were altogether incomplete, and the minister acknowledged that they were incomplete. Does the minister say that he has the completed return in his possession ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well, let him put it before the House, as he ought to do. If he will do that, we will have made that much progress at least.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am ready to lay it on the table as soon as I am able to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I will allow the minister to make his motion ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It cannot be done while the House is in committee.

Mr. FOSTER. I will sit down until the minister moves that the deputy speaker leave the chair.

Mr. BRODEUR. These papers have nothing to do with the item under discussion, and I am not going to be led by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. That is just what we expected from the minister. When we bring him up to the ring-bolt he stops. Does the minister think that assuming that attitude will enable him to get this item passed ? He knows that it will not. He knows that at twelve o'clock to-night this committee rises without his getting a single dollar of his estimates. What is the use of his butting his head against a stone wall, and compelling those who are loyally supporting him, some of them beyond their conviction, to do the same? He knows that at twelve o'clock to-night he will be just where he was before the House went into Supply on Thursday. Is that his diplomacy ? The minister has a great desire to be styled a diplomat, since he has been flashing his maiden sword in Paris. Is this diplomacy, or is it the outcome of deep-seated obstinacy ? I said that he would be just where he was on Thursday ; but he can never get back to where he was before three o'clock on Thursday. He has put himself in an attitude from which he will never recover as long as he is Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BRODEUR. Another threat.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman may call it a threat or what he will, but that is a plain statement of fact. He has incited his followers to attack me on this ground, that because he is a French Canadian minister I am attacking him and the French Canadian race.

Mr. BUREAU. Will the hon. gentleman permit a question ? Will he inform me on what he bases that statement; that the minister is instructing his French Canadian followers to say that the hon. gentleman is attacking the minister because he is of French Canadian extraction ?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend the Solicitor General though he may not have heavy duties in his department, has intelligence enough to follow the course of the minister, and if he has done so, he knows that the minister has made that charge himself against me in this House, and has done it not once or twice merely, but many times.

Mr. BRODEUR. I did not do it.

Mr. FOSTER. I will take the opportunity, before the end of the session, to quote the words of the minister. Another means to which the minister resorts is to impute motives. He does this when he says that we are obstructing and when he verges on the line of argument that he is attacked because of his race and religion. Last night, hon. members from the province of Quebec, members whom I respect, stated—as I am informed ; I did not understand exactly what they said hurridly—that I was attacking this minister because he was a French-Canadian. Why, no matter where the minister came from, no matter what section he represented, he must be subject to criticism. It is very foolish to import these side issues, which are so trival in one sense, though, in another sense, of too much importance to be treated in this way. Then, the minister hides himself behind his officials. He presents the unique spectacle of the head of a department attacking that department. He tells us in effect, that he will have the head of this or that offender. On one occasion he turned to his followers, and, in an excited manner, and in very strong language, he said in effect, that he would make them pay for it. Then there was his diplomatic touch with relation to the historian of the 'Arctic.' He said that this historian was a Liberal-Conservative, and if the Liberal-Conservatives objected to him the government would have his head as well. That kind of thing does not stop criticism, but it does show the minister in a very unenviable light. Let the minister defend his expenditure on proper grounds so far as he can. But to drag in these unworthy side issues is an action to which we have not been accustomed to in ministers heretofore, and is not the credit of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

I think I pretty well disposed of the criticisms levelled against me last night. But there was one word to which I may refer. I took the ground that the language of a vote indicated to what purpose the money was to be put, and said that it was not proper to take $4,000 or $5,000 voted by parliament for ice-breaking steamers and use it to pay the travelling expenses of the minister and his private secretary. I said, in effect, that that was filching from one vote to meet the expenses of a different service, it was stealing from one vote and using the money for a purpose not designed by parliament. The hon. gentleman tried to give the impression that I had said that the minister had stolen the money. There is no use in following criticism of that kind. If the minister likes it and thinks he gets

good out of it, let him take what advantage out of it he can.

Now, I propose to take up the matters of this steamer 'Arctic' as this vote seems to be entirely for that steamer for the coming year, and for her forthcoming expedition. And, when I have finished, I will ask the minister to give this committee a somewhat extended and connected account of just what results these explorations and expeditions have gained. I am amazed at the paucity of the information brought down in the minister's report. I have here the reports of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for three years, during which time these expenses have been going on. I intend to show what these reports tell us of the results attained by these expeditions of the steamer 'Arctic.' Here, for instance, is the report of 1905. At page 107 of that report, I find a description of the steamer and the statement that she had returned from the far northern waters in November. One would think that the report would go on to show what had been the result of her expedition. But it is merely stated that instead of remaining for three years in the northern waters, as had been intended, owing to a breakdown in her machinery she has returned to Sorel for repairs and would go north again in the following June. It is also said that a further account will be found in the report of Major Moodie to be published as a supplement to the annual report. Now, that report of Major Moodie, I find in sessional paper No. 28, dated Ottawa, December 30, 1905. It shows that Major Moodie was sent out in charge of a patrol of the Mounted Police, and, of course, his report is confined to that view of the case.

This is a report simply of the mounted police officer Major Moodie, in reference to the details of the police force that he had in his charge, the way in which he placed it, the conditions surrounding it, its duties, and the like of that. What I want to show the committee is that Major Moodie's report has absolutely nothing to do with the 'Arctic' in her expedition into these northern waters or with the main purpose for which she was sent there. She was not bought, provisioned and sent there simply to convey some mounted police. There was another purpose that the government had in view. A half inch extract in the minister's report for 1905 is absolutely all the information we have in reference to this expedition, in so far as the purposes contemplated by the government were concerned, outside of simply conveying the mounted police control to their posts in those northern regions. Now, we come to the year 1906 and we take up the minister's report, anxious to find out what had been done in the two preceding years. The 'Arctic' is named three times in that report. At page 15 we have the bare record of her time of sailing, her time of returning and the statement that the machinery was injured, and that she had to go on the docks at Sorel to be extensively repaired. At page 151 she is mentioned again. Then comes after that the report which is alluded to there. You would think that it would be an exhaustive report giving some information as to what this expedition had done. It is this :

Canadian Government Steamer 'Arctic,'
Albert Harbour, Pond's Inlet,
Baffin Land, September 29, 1906.

The Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Sir,—It affords me pleasure to advise you that the 'Arctic' is safe and sound in Albert harbour, Pond's inlet, northern Baffin Land, where we met the sloop 'Albert,' and the whaler 'Eclipse,' by whom we sent this letter.

After our departure from Father point we had a good deal of fortune; we were fortunate in the choice of the route through the middle pack, and we arrived first at Pond's inlet on August 19, 1906. We then proceeded north through Navy Board inlet, and took possession of all the Parry archipelago islands.

There is a very pregnant phrase. What part of the archipelago islands was taken possession of by Captain Bernier? Were these islands British possessions before? They were not created by Captain Bernier. Was there any doubt that they were British territory? What does he mean by taking possession of them? What is the process, what is the result, what does it all mean?

Commencing by Bylot island, Griffiths, Cornwallis, Bathurst, Byam, Martin, Melville, Prince Patrick, Emerald, Eglington, Garrett, Davy, Young, Russell and Lowther islands, on the southern point of which I planted the flag, and called Colonel Gourdeau point.

We have three results of the expedition. There is the Préfontaine bay, Laurier cape and Gourdeau point. These are the three tremendously important results of this expedition to the north.

Mr. W. ROCHE. I am of opinion that the hon. gentleman misses some important basic information. I thought that what he wanted was to go through the process of exhaustion to arrive at some definite point. I think, from the trend of the hon. gentleman's remarks, that he has touched upon the theory as to whether land in that vicinity remains in the same place or not. Along the shores of Melville island, Baffin's island and Franz Josef land there is a theory that the land does not remain in the same place, but that it sinks and rises in proportion to the quantity of ice in these Arctic regions. Therefore, I think he should begin at some positive point and not seek knowledge through the process of exhaustion, but state something definitely and start from that. If the hon. gentleman would start from a certain point of latitude and longitude, he might proceed from that to go through all the islands in this archipelago and endeavour to fix what is British

territory and what is purely Arctic territory. Now, on that particular theory I do not want to expand——

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, expand as long as you do not burst up altogether.

Mr. W. ROCHE. That the land around Gourdeau point and Laurier peninsula——

Mr. FOSTER. Cape.

Mr. W. ROCHE—and Franz Josef land sinks and rises annually in proportion to the quantity of ice in these regions, that what may be pointed out and distinguished this year may not be in the same place next year. If the hon. gentleman will confine himself to that theory and decide that scientific point he will convey a flood of information to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend had his own basis starting out. He does not lack for basic information, yet, strange to say, in trying to find a solid point to rest his feet upon in this philosophic excursion of his he came to the conclusion at last that there was no solid land there at all, but that these islands were constantly shifting. Well, then, the basic point upon which he rests himself is a shifting over after all. I am afraid that his foundation is not as basic as he thought it was. But I think he has mooted an idea that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries might take up now to justify further expeditions to the north. I see it a little better than I did. Captain Bernier took possession of the islands. What he did with them, goodness only knows; but he took possession of them, and the hon. member for Halifax says that they will not be there next year, and next year he will have to go back in search of them and take possession again. If, as he says, they change their place of abode every year, there is an absolute reason for a further expedition to capture and take possession of these elusive, floating and shifting islands. Then we will have Captain Bernier with us for ever, or as long as he lives. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has now the basic point upon which he can found his hundred-thousand-dollar-a-year expedition in summer, and the valiant captain can go into these northern waters to chase, at the rate of three miles an hour under favouring conditions with the fast vessel that he has, the shifting, elusive islands and take possession of them. But why does he not moor them and finish the work after he catches them? My hon. friend from Halifax is of a philosophic turn. I think the minister has found that he has a vivid imagination and, if he should not take Mr. Vanasse, I strongly advise the minister that as it is very probable the term of the hon. member for Halifax, which has been lengthened by some of those floating, evasive changes of position in the last four years, in an archipelago which is not quite as cold as that of those northern islands, will be brought to an end, and as his chances of evasion and escape will be limited in the coming elections, to anchor the present member for Halifax safe and sound and send him north with Captain Bernier to work out the philosophic side of the expedition and to discover if there is some means by which, after the gallant captain has captured the islands in the archipelago, they can be moored and chained down so that he will not have to do it every year.

Mr. W. ROCHE. The hon. gentleman is something of a peripatetic philosopher himself. He has had a good many changes of venu in his political career.

Mr. FOSTER. I never found that the peripatetic cult, as it is portrayed in history, is anything to be ashamed of. I think that the philosophers belonging to that guild were a wonderfully good set of philosophers. There are various methods of practising the peripatetic system. Some men practise it in trying to avoid seizure; other men go out to teach their fellow men and in order to meet them they have to travel from place to place. My hon. friend has been particularly fortunate in having a non-basic foundation during the last four or five years and he and his brave and good-natured colleague by his side (Mr. Carney) have had a wonderful series of escapes, but escaped they have by hook or crook.

Mr. CARNEY. Why do you say anything about me? I have not raised any question. Where is the charge that was ever alleged against me? I have always admired the hon. gentleman but I think he should stick to the truth in this House. If he does we will have a litle more respect for him, but if you do not, perhaps we will go after him.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry that my hon. friend is cross because I was recommending to the Minister of Marine——

Mr. CARNEY. He is able to look after himself.

Mr. FOSTER—to take his older and more wicked partner.

Mr. CARNEY. He has always remained in the same place. He has never had to run away. He carried five elections and every time increased his majority. You cannot say the same.

Mr. FOSTER. I am awfully sorry that I have stirred up my hon. friend. This is the first time I have heard a declaration from him in the House and I think I should have the thanks of the committee for having roused my hon. friend. He is always good-natured, I knew he always had it in him and I appear to be the man who discovered his ability in this respect. The journal of the commanding officer is the whole extent of the report which is given in the minister's report of 1906 of the results of this most expensive expedition. Next year, at page 179, we have as an appendix the report of Major

Moodie in which Major Moodie again is reporting in reference to his own peculiar work, that is the posts established by him in that country. Now we come to the year 1907 after the expedition has been made for three years. We were naturally expecting to find some extensive reports in this year. What do we find ? We find a statement at page 13 that the 'Arctic' went out at a certain date, she came back fortunately, at a certain date, and that is the whole of the record of that year. At page 67 we find this :

This vessel left, again, for the northern waters of Canada, in July, 1906, and returned to Quebec about the middle of October, this year; a full report of the work she has performed will be submitted by Captain Bernier, as soon as possible.

May I ask the minister if that report has been submitted ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am sorry I was sleeping.

Mr. FOSTER. I must say in all fairness to myself and the House the minister is guilty of very great disrespect in sleeping while his department is being criticised. There again he shows his utter indifference to the feelings of the House. Well, I am a man of goodwill and I will repeat my question. Has the report been submitted ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have already answered the hon. gentleman on that.

Mr. FOSTER. Has it been ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman must remember.

Mr. FOSTER. I will allow the hon. gentleman to get on his feet.

Mr. BRODEUR. Once is sufficient.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the answer?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have already answered.

Mr. FOSTER. I demand an answer to the question and I am going to have one.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend says he is going to have it?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman who complains so much of his injured dignity, does not treat the House with respect enough to get on his feet; he mumbles something which, in so far as I can hear it, is a refusal to give an answer and under those circumstances I think I have the right to use something more than common, smooth phrases. I think I have a right to an answer. The hon. gentleman should respect himself if he does not respect others. The gentleman should respect himself if he does not respect the House, and if he has anything to say, he should rise in his seat and say it. You would think he was in a bar-rom. The habitué of a bar-room would not treat himself or his followers with such disrespect.

Mr. BUREAU. Is that in order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the language should not have been used.

Mr. FIELDING. On the point that the minister answers without rising, I think the hon. gentleman is too technical. Many times members ask questions and give answers without rising, but that does not imply any intentional discourtesy. The hon. gentleman has often done that himself.

Mr. FOSTER. That is quite true, when we are having talks backwards and forwards in the committee, but when I ask a formal question, ask it seriously and sit down till I get the reply; I am entitled to that reply in a similar way. I am waiting for an answer from the minister to that question.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have already answered the hon. gentleman that question. I do not know why he asks me again—I suppose for the purpose of keeping me in the House. I have no objection to staying. Perhaps he does it to make me sick.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, that is what the hon. gentleman is trying to do.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is another exhibition of the minister, which I commend to his colleagues, to the House and to the country. I tell my hon. friend that I never asked him that question before, never heard it asked and never heard it answered. I do not know at this moment whether that report has been given or printed or put before the House; I have not seen it. The minister at last ashamed, gets on his feet and intimates that he has already answered the question and does not need to answer it again, and accuses me of a motive in asking it, that motive being first to obstruct and then to make him sick. What a position for a man who has been elevated to the rank of a minister of the Crown. It is almost imputing to me a murderous desire. I assure him that I am entirely guiltless of a desire to rob him of his rest and make him ill and deprive this country of the budding diplomat that he is evolving into. But I want that information, and it will be much less trouble for the hon. gentleman to give it than to refuse it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have said that that question has been put before and that I have answered it. The hon. gentleman has just stated that he never asked me whether there was a report or not. If he takes up 'Hansard' of yesterday he will find it answered at page 4446.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister hand me that ?

Mr. BUREAU. There are some notes.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to see the notes.

Mr. BUREAU. I am surprised.

Mr. FOSTER. That is another wise thing for the Solicitor General of Canada to say. I was reading with reference to the 'Arctic' from the minister's own report, which stated: 'A full report of the work which has been performed will be submitted by Captain Bernier as soon as possible.' I asked the minister if Captain Bernier's report had been received. The minister refused to reply, and by his reference to 'Hansard' implied that I had asked this very question yesterday and that it had been answered. The question I asked yesterday was if Mr. Vanasse had made his historical report, and the answer I got had reference to that. Does the minister admit that that is frank dealing with this House? Now, I want the answer to that question as to whether Captain Bernier did submit a report, and if so, whether it has been brought down or will be brought down?

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say that Captain Bernier and Mr. Vanasse are preparing a report, which is to be submitted to the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Mr. Vanasse's report which has been brought down the report which is promised in the minister's report at page 67 when he says: 'A full report of the work which has been performed will be submitted by Captain Bernier as soon as possible.'

Mr. BRODEUR. The report which the hon. gentleman has in his hands is a report of the former expedition.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I repeat my question: Has this report from Captain Bernier, promised at page 67 of the minister's report, been received, and if so, when can we expect it?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have just said that Mr. Vanasse and Captain Bernier are preparing a joint report.

Mr. FOSTER. It will take in this?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, I understand that one reason why that expedition was sent north year after year was to look after and keep under surveillance the waters of the north on behalf of the Customs Department. Has the Minister of Customs published as yet any report from Captain Bernier or other officers as to what has been done with reference to that, if anything ?

Mr. PATERSON. As I understand it, the expedition of the 'Arctic' was to assert our sovereignty over those waters. In my judgment there is no better way of doing that than by requiring those who go there and engage in trade to submit to the fiscal laws of the country. I believe that those in command of the expeditions were clothed with full authority as customs officers, and I am informed that they received toll and tribute as such from both Scotch vessels and American vessels. I think two customs posts were established and something like $1,200 collected. But we do not attach so much value to the receipts as we do to the fact that our supremacy in those northern waters has thus been acknowledged.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister any detailed report in that respect——

Mr. PATERSON. I dare say we have in the department.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be interesting if the minister would get that information.

Mr. PATERSON. I should think it likely that we would have such a report, and, if desired, I will bring it down.

Mr. FOSTER. I would be much obliged if the minister would do that at his convenience. Now, I want to say a few words with reference to the expense of this expedition. As I understand, it was started at the instance of the Minister of the Interior for the purpose of asserting our authority in the northeastern waters. I emphasized that, as I thought every member would. Well, that was one reason of the expedition being sent out. Of course, it is not supposed that this vessel patrols these waters and exacts customs duties. The customs duties are exacted by the permanent posts of the mounted police who act as customs officers under the authority given them. They are the constant representatives of sovereignty in these waters. But there was a purpose, one without which that expedition would not have been undertaken. As I understand it, the idea, at first, was not to buy a vessel. To buy a vessel of this kind is very costly and, after the special use for which she has been purchased has been served, she will bring very little if you sell her, and she will be a constant bill of expense if you keep her. The vote for this expedition was put through without much discussion for national reasons. An understanding was reached between the leader of the opposition and his friends on the one side and the government on the other that such an expenditure was necessary. The understanding was on the basis of the hiring of a vessel. I am sure that the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) will substantiate that. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of that time had another idea. He bought a vessel, a vessel of doubtful parentage, an unwieldly vessel and one of little use for any other purpose than cruising through ice floes. He bought her in Germany, I think, and paid for her

$70,000. As she was not designed for more than a moderate rate of speed, it took thirty-six days to get her across, and when she got into port $10,000 was added to the price. Then, it was found that extensive repairs were necessary. Altogether, when she was ready to receive supplies, she had cost the government $93,-112. In the arrangement made between the two sides of the House, it was understood that expenses would be kept down to a not unreasonable figure. But, Sir, when this vessel came to be supplied, extravagance burst out in a most inexplicable way. We have had that shown over and over again, and the country knows the facts. Never in the history of any department was seen such reckless, uncontrollable extravagance as was shown in the furnishing, equipping and provisioning of this steamer. In 1903-4, as I have said, the purchase, repairs, supplies, wages and miscellaneous ran up to $93,112.42. In 1904-5, just after the vessel had been fully repaired, there were repairs again to the extent of $31,055. Then, supplies to the amount of $112,050.50 were put inside of her. Wages were paid to the extent of $16,-928 and there were miscellaneous expenditures of $1,678, making the cost in 1904-5 $161,713.11. In 1905-6, there appears to have been a balance of purchase money—which I never could understand, but which may be explainable—$5,000. With repairs of $4,456, supplies, wages and miscellaneous for further amounts, the total expenditure that year was $38,314. In 1906-7, there were repairs again of $4,748.26, and other expenses making a total of $32,697.70. In 1907-8, the expenditure has amounted to $22,622, and, of course, she is not yet fitted out for the expedition for the current year. Altogether, $348,459.70 has been expended on this vessel in the four and a half years during which we have been in possession of her. The question naturally arises: What has been done as compensation for that expense? Is that expense properly balanced by the work of placing these patrols in position and flagging these islands—for, of course, there has been no discovery of new islands, and this vessel has not gone further north than other vessels have gone and are able to go. I think there is only one answer to that.

For a time, it was indefinite what the government proposed to do with this vessel. For a time, it was proposed that Captain Bernier should be sent on this vessel on a search for the north pole. To find the north pole is a laudable ambition, no doubt. For hundreds of years adventurous spirits have had the ambition to sit on the north or south pole. But for Canada to contemplate even for a moment the fitting out of a vessel to catch the north pole—which may be evasive and shifting as these islands are—to think of Canada, with her requirements for the development of her resources, going into a scheme of that kind, especially when there are rich private individuals who undertake these expenditures for the love of the discovery, would be going further than this parliament has sanctioned or will sanction. But in these days of using funds for other than the purposes specified by parliament, what security have we that the Minister of Marine, confabbing with Captain Bernier and perhaps with the hon. senior member for Halifax on an expedition to the north pole next year, and filch from some other vote, as the minister has done in other cases, a sufficient amount to cover the extraordinary expense.

Now, I would be glad if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would give us some connected narrative, if he can, of what has really been accomplished by this vessel. He is asking for $50,000 to send her out again, and the committee is asked to exercise its judgment as to whether this money should be spent. How can it exercise such judgment unless it knows what the results of previous expeditions have been. I should await with great interest, as I am sure the committee will, the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) with reference to this matter.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the policy of the government in patrolling these northern waters is pretty well known. There seems to be some difference of opinion concerning that policy, however. The hon. member (Mr. Foster) seems to doubt whether it would be advisable for Canada to exercise jurisdiction——

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. minister will allow me to interrupt him, I would like to say that I never expressed such dissent. On the contrary, when the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) was speaking a little while ago, I assented to what he said in every particular. Now the minister (Mr. Brodeur) has commenced his explanations by another misrepresentation of facts.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman recognize that the government should assert its jurisdiction over these northern waters.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister could have been glad of that for any of these years.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, but how could we assert our jurisdiction that Canada had some rights over these islands without sending an expedition up there to assert our jurisdiction? Americans were bringing goods in there to suply the natives, and was it not advisable for Canada to take means to assert our jurisdiction over that country and to compel foreigners to pay duties on their goods? Now my hon. friend says that the government did not adopt the proper means. How could we go there except

in ships ? Could we go there on snowshoes ? I see no other way of asserting our authority over those sections of the country except by sending a naval expedition. If I remember aright, when my hon. friend was Minister of Marine and Fisheries he also equipped an expedition into those regions, and why should this government be blamed for following his precedent ? The hon. gentleman stated that we had sent a very expensive expedition. But I can show that in the expedition which he organized himself he paid more for provisions than we paid for provisions for the Arctic. He was less economical than the present government. Now this question presented itself in the beginning of 1905, how we should proceed to survey those northern waters. A previous expedition had been sent up there under the command of Mr. Low, who had recommended the purchase of a boat. The hon. gentleman has given the figures of expenses during the last three years, until the 2nd of December, 1907. Well, the total amount expended during those three years, including the purchase of a boat, was $348,459. Now we have the report from Mr. Low written at the beginning of 1905, from which I read this :

> Owing to the impossibility of purchasing the 'Discovery' or any other boat which would be suitable for the purpose of an Arctic cruiser, a ship has to be built, and such a ship can only be built at Dundee, Scotland. . . . At least a year will be required to build this ship. During the season of 1905, while the new ship is being built, another may be chartered to carry on the necessary work.

Now what is the estimate made by Mr. Low? For one expedition during a year in those northern regions, Mr. Low stated it would cost $336,500 But during the last three years, under the good administration of this government, we have spent only $348,459. No better boat could be found than the boat we purchased. Now the hon. gentleman, in order to make a personal attack upon myself, says that I have stolen out of the appropriation for ice-breaking a sum of money which I used for the trip to Great Britain. Well, Mr. Chairman, I had to go to Great Britain and to Europe for different purposes, one of which was the ice-breaking service. This question had been before parliament for many years, and I decided that it was necessary to visit the different places in Europe where these ice-breakers were built. The hon. gentleman however says that it was almost a crime on my part to take out of that vote the money for my travelling expenses. I suppose no one could believe that my hon. friend himself would be guilty of such a thing. I think he stated yesterday that the vote for contingencies was the only vote out of which it was proper to take money for travelling expenses. Well, I have recently consulted the Public Accounts, and I find that in 1886-7 the hon. gentleman spent $465 for travelling expenses ; in 1887-8, $1,175 ; in 1888-9, $300 ; in 1889-90, $400, in 1890-91, $1,566; in 1891-2, $1,198; in 1892-3, $1,429 ; in 1893-4, $525 ; in 1894-5, $1,531. In one year this economical gentleman spent over $1,500 in travelling expenses. Now what were my expenses out of contingencies as a Minister of the Crown ? In 1904-5, the first year in which I was minister, I spent $200 in six months. In 1905-6, I spent $691, whereas this economical gentleman had spent in some years $1,175 and $1,566. In 1906-7, my expenses were $554. Now my hon. friend says it is a crime to steal from the ice-breaking vote the travelling expenses of the minister made in that connection.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman might allow me to put in a caveat. He has gone on record as saying that I said it was a crime.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, the hon. gentleman said it was a steal. I will leave out the word crime, if he objects to that. Well, the hon. gentleman has been guilty of the same thing, he has also been stealing from a vote from which he had no right to take money. I find that in 1890-91 he took $954 as travelling expenses out of a vote for commercial agencies. Let him consult that vote for commercial agencies and he will find that what I am saying is correct. Now there is no more provision made in that vote for travelling expenses than there was in the vote for ice-breaking. Why, I thought it was impossible for any man, according to my hon. friend to spend more than $10 a day. Here is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) who spent $954.08 in one month. He went to Washington, was away from the 4th to the 9th of April, just five days, and he spent $105.97. Perhaps he had a pass to go there; he must have had a pass over one part of the road. This is very extravagant. The hon. gentleman, in 1891-2, 'stole' once more from the vote for commercial agencies $692.58. In 1992-3 he charged $954.33 for travelling expenses to London, but that is not the only case, when he was Minister of Finance, in which some one was guilty of 'stealing' from one vote and applying the money to another purpose. The Auditor General's Report of that year shows that Sir John Thompson took money out of 'unforeseen expenses' for a trip. The vote for 'unforeseen expenses' is not designed for travelling expenses. It is a vote to provide for paying gratuities. My hon. friend has stated that there is only one place out of which we should take travelling expenses and that is out of the vote for 'contingencies.'

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, the total expenditure upon the 'Arctic' has been given as $348,459. That is a very large amount of money to be expended on a boat from which this country has, as far

as parliament knows, derived no benefit. There is no report, at any rate, from any of the officers who are sent on that ship, as far as parliament is concerned we know absolutely nothing with respect to what was done in the interest of the people of Canada. The amount that I have stated is the expenditure to the 31st March, 1907, but if the hon. minister will look at the Auditor General's Report, page P—34, he will find that only a small amount was paid to each of the officers and men of the crew of that ship. I believe that a report of the expedition has been prepared by the men who were engaged in the trip, but without that report we are not justified in passing this estimate of $50,000. What evidence has this House that the balances due when the vessel arrived in Quebec in October last have been paid ? We have not that information, and it is the duty of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to provide it.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Is the hon. gentleman not aware that the minister placed those papers in the possession of the opposition and that they have them now?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. No, that is not correct.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I understood the minister to state that they were handed to the hon. member for North Toronto, although not officially laid on the table.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I asked the hon. member for North Toronto this morning if he had the papers and he said he had not.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Was the hon. gentleman not in the House when the papers were brought in and handed to the hon. member for North Toronto?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. They were not a complete file and they were returned to the minister. We have a right to have those papers tabled and made a part of the record of this House so that we can go to the table and see them and make copies of them. But the minister refuses to place the return before the members of this parliament. There was spent altogether on that vessel last year up to the 31st March, 1907, something like $33,900, and there must have been spent since she came back from the northern waters probably as much more, and we have a right to all the information in the possession of the minister in regard to that expenditure. The Auditor General deals with bills as they are sent in. He would naturally assume that bills sent over from any department of the government of Canada would be correct. But from my knowledge of the present Auditor General, an honest, upright man, he would not allow any bill to be paid unless he was absolutely sure that it was correct. But did the Minister of Marine and Fisheries believe that the accounts of his own department were right? No. He must have assumed that there was something wrong, for we find that he sent to the city of New York for a large number of high-priced accountants to look into the accounts of his department. He made no bargain with them, even as to their board, while in Ottawa, but seems to have decided to pay them whatever they might ask. Did they find any mistakes either in the accounts of the 'Arctic' or in any other branch of the department's expenditure? We have a right to know that. But the minister has not given us the report. He says it is ready. Then why is it not tabled? Is the minister dumb that he will not answer why he refuses to table that report? He stated here this morning that he would table the report as soon as the Speaker was in the chair.

Mr. BUREAU. That is the reason.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I am ready to cease speaking and allow the Speaker to take the chair. But why did not the minister table the report before he asked us to vote this item ?

Mr. BUREAU. It was not ready.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. But it is ready now, and I will take my seat and give him an opportunity to table the report if he wishes to do so. He still persists in keeping the members of this House all Saturday until twelve o'clock at night merely because of his own stubbornness.

Mr. BUREAU. It is your own fault.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Why, we have declared over and over again that we are ready to have the Speaker take the chair and give the minister an opportunity to place these documents on the table of the House. But the hon. minister says: Pass the item and I will place this report on the table.

Mr. BUREAU. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. A. A. McLean) is making a statement that is incorrect and unfair to the minister. The minister made no such statement as: Pass the item and I will lay the report on the table. The minister has explained why he did not publish the report. It was because the Speaker was not in the chair. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. A. McLean) knows why the Speaker is not in the chair—it is because of the obstruction of the hon. gentleman and his friends.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The statement I made is correct. Not only did the minister say what I have stated, but the same was said by other hon. gentleman on that side. It was stated in my own hearing.

Mr. BUREAU. No, no.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bureau) has no right to

dispute the statement of an hon. gentleman as to what he heard.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The hon. member (Mr. Bureau) has not been in the House, so that may excuse him.

Mr. BUREAU. I have been here all the time the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been here.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I think the hon. gentleman was not here when the minister made that statement. Now, what benefit will accrue to Canada from these trips to the north? He wrote the name of the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries on an iceberg up there, he also wrote the name of Mr. Préfontaine upon another cake. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Wm. Roche) well says that these may be submerged some day. I do not see what good there is in writing these names upon cakes of ice that are liable to be submerged; you might as well write them upon the shifting sand. However, they might as well be engaged in writing their names upon cakes of ice as in doing anything else. We have asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for a return of what these gentlemen have done. Although the first expedition came back two or three years ago, the report of Mr. Vanasse, the historian of this trip, has never yet been tabled. I have in my desk the reports of the Marine Department for all the years since that vessel returned from her first trip, but the report of Mr. Vanasse is not found in any of them. To-day the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is pressed about this matter, he is asked by the member for North Toronto for a return in reference to many matters not included in the report of Professor Vanasse, and the minister sends over to the member for North Toronto a report written in French by Professor Vanasse, which has never been published by the government of Canada. Now, the minister states that the trip of the 'Arctic' was necessary to enable him to assert the jurisdiction of Canada in these northern waters. They sent to Sweden and bought a ship which they called the 'Arctic.' But before the 'Arctic' was ever thought of, men had gone from Ottawa overland to those northern regions. They took possession of the land there on behalf of Canada; they went up there overland and they came back overland. Therefore I do not see any necessity for sending a naval expedition up there on the ground that it was necessary to assert our jurisdiction over that territory.

Mr. A. M. BEAUPARLANT (St. Hyacinthe). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend who has just sat down read more than he spoke upon the question which we are now discussing. It was also the case with my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who for two hours this morning quoted profusely from reports and blue-books. It is already apparent that Sunday will be much welcomed by the opposition in order to be released from the very regrettable position it assumed a couple of days ago. When one of the stalwarts of the opposition—at least from the view point of loquacity—the hon. member for North Toronto is showing such symptoms of exhaustion, it is evident that our friends opposite not only have run short of arguments, but of their most fantastic utterances as well. When devoid of arguments, abuse is the weapon. This reminds me of a case in which the attorney for the defence, finding himself destitute of the necessary requisites to pile up all the disagreeable utterances that he wished upon his colleague for the prosecution, took them ready-made from the very paper which was being sued and read them to the court.

Mr. PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation.) Would my hon. friend allow me to ask him what case he is now referring to?

Mr. BEAUPARLANT. (Translation.) My hon. friend being a layman, I must do him the favour of acquainting him with the fact that in so far as jurisprudence is concerned, that is on points of law that have been decided upon, it is only a case which has been reported that can be cited. For the time being, it is a striking analogy with the system put forward by the opposition that I have just quoted and not a point of law. The right of free speech before parliament and before the legislatures is too strongly intrenched among the principles of the Liberal party to clash with my convictions when exercised properly; but such right naturally calls for a corresponding responsibility, and whoever exercises it should do it in a judicious manner or otherwise the responsibility rests upon him.

On what point have the two parties come to a variance in this matter? Certain documents were called for by the hon. member for North Toronto from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries when this item was brought up before the committee on Thursday night. As a matter of daily occurrence in the House the minister answered that he hadn't all the documents to make the return complete and that his officers had not posted him on all the facts, and that he could not at that moment give all the information on that item. And the minister then promised to lay them later on on the table, adding that he was not trying to evade inquiry in these items but rather that he wished they would be dealt with one by one afterwards. Such is the position as I find it clearly stated in the minister's own words which I find at page 4142 of the unrevised 'Hansard':

Mr. BRODEUR. These are several resolutions each composed of several items, and if the House would give me the opportunity of explaining these items, I would be willing to leave one item of each resolution for further

discussion, so that we might make some progress.

Who was it that opposed such a reasonable proposition? It was the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) himself who being intimately acquainted with the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries should have readily acceded to his request. And in what language did he raise his opposition? I find the following words in his remarks at page 4143: 'Je préférérais sieger ici sans desempare, jusqu'à demain aprèsè midi, plutot que decéwer sur ce principe.' This is the starting point of the strange proceedings which we have been witnessing in this House for nearly 48 hours now. The minister had stated his reasons which according to me were absolutely legitimate and for which at all events he is responsible, and responsibility that he does not try to shirk, the matter being of common practice before the Housè. The opposition it seems to me should have accepted those reasons, and therefore from that very moment, the responsibility rests upon itself for the discussion that has been going on since Thursday night. I believe it is commonsense to state that whoever rejects a reasonable proposition assumes the responsibility of the consequences that that refusal involves. The courts of justice which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and other members of the opposition follow never refuse to postpone a case once or twice and oftener still, so long as good reasons are adduced. And it is not always the party that is in the wrong that asks for such an adjournment.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) The hon. member seems to have made a special study of the grievances which he complains about. I believe he is thoroughly informed on the constitutional history of the country. I would like to hear him relate what took place before the union. He might very well tell us what history says about Papineau's refusal to vote the estimates when representing Lower Canada.

Mr. BEAUPARLANT. (Translation.) I take my hon. friend's interruption in good part, and I must take it as it is given out with some gratefulness, since he answered his own question in mentioning the circumstances of that occurrence, but for other reasons. While asking for a piece of information, he has himself communicated some information to us. And I don't believe it is necessary to go so far back to settle the present situation. The debate as it is spreads out already in a much exaggerated manner. If my hon. friend will allow me, I will cite him a much more recent authority, and that is his own opinion. Had I under my hands yesterday's 'Hansard.' I could read to him his own statement on the opportunity of his friends' attitude on this question.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) I will observe to my hon. friend that I put a question to him, not to criticize his remarks but to seek information. I admit that he is not obliged to give it to me. I understand also that the discussion has assumed a large range, the extent of which I protested against. He lives in a community where these questions are always thoroughly discussed and examined, St. Hyacinthe having large schools and a well posted population.

Mr. BEAUPARLANT. (Translation.) I will satisfy my hon. friend's demand which is very pertinent indeed and in answer I will tell him that in fact I read somewhat closely Mr. Turcotte's 'Canada under the Union,' which deals with that question. I will add also that I live in a very much enlightened community on questions of that character, St. Hyacinthe having a well-read population. It has numerous and important schools, and it is a great advantage for me to live among people whose society is for me a source of knowledge. Without going into any details, I may say to my hon. friend from L'Islet that I have never seen in any author in history or in constitutional law concerning the political situation in Canada that any parliament or assembly had been paralyzed in its normal functions for forty-eight hours, although such good reasons as were adduced by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries had been given.

When the hon. member for L'Islet interrupted me I was going to say that the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Owen) had also noticed the awkwardness of the present situation; but he did not in any direct way lay the blame for it on one party more than on the other, owing, I suppose to the fact that his political friends are at fault. I did not rise to defend the Minister of Marine, who does not need my assistance nor anybody else's, and I state here that a moment ago, when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) had monopolized the time of the House for two hours, that it was with a great deal of satisfaction—which did not surprise me, however—that I saw the minister get up and, after 48 hours without sleep, handle the hon. gentleman the way he did and put under his eyes the record of his expenses when he was a minister, expenses that were far larger than those of the Minister of Marine which are being discussed so savagely. I notice that the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has taken, at least to my knowledge, a very small part in this discussion. His attitude seems to me to be a repudiation of his colleague's standing on this question.

I will close by giving my friends opposite my opinion on the result which their conduct will have. This obstruction that they do without any reason is, they must

find out very useless and this is why. To the point of parliamentary proceeding, they should know that the government could not and will not give in; that we are the majority and that we are ready to face them as long as it will be their pleasure to keep the same attitude. Therefore, in this regard their efforts are useless.

In the second place, if the opposition thinks by its abuse of the hon. Minister of Marine to hurt him in the public opinion, it has made a big blunder, because the victim of such vituperation rises rather than falls in the public estimation. This is the result which the opposition will attain. As it is diametrically opposed to what it had in view, it follows that all this hubbel is absolutely useless. It is aware of that fact and consequently they cannot be acting seriously.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. It seems to me a pity that we should be here at the middle of the day without a leader of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM. Where is the hon. gentleman's leader?

Mr. W. WRIGHT. We do not need a leader just now. Who is to blame for this prolonged discussion? The government think they can dictate to the House as to what business shall or shall not be done. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has provoked more criticism than any other department of the government; and notwithstanding this fact the government, in the absence of necessary information, insist upon our proceeding with the estimates of this department in preference to taking up any other business. The opposition have been accused of trying to dictate to the government. It is not our intention to try to dictate to the government, but the Department of Marine and Fisheries has come in for a good deal of criticism in the past, and it would have been the part of wisdom if the government had withdrawn the estimates of that department until the papers were brought down. If the report of the trip of the 'Arctic' has not been laid on the table the fault lies with the minister, because I feel sure that it has been in his possession for the last six months. We also asked for a certain return which is of importance to us in the discussion of these estimates. It was brought down in such an incomplete condition as to be of no practical use and handed over to a member of the opposition. What report have we of Capt. Bernier's trip last year? What islands did he take possession of? What amount of money did he collect from whalers and sealers? I do not think we should try to convey the idea that these northern lands do not belong to us. If, any one is to go up there to command such an expedition I do not know of any man who is better fitted to do it than is Capt. Bernier. I believe that the government have deliberately arranged this matter with the view of compelling the opposition to take the course that they have taken. I think that they have an object, and I was at a loss to understand what the intention behind it was until the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross) let it slip out last night that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was being made a martyr of. The intention apparently is that they may be able to go down to a certain province and say that we are attacking him on account of his nationality. I disclaim any such intention. It is a matter of utter indifference to me as to what his nationality is. We will take up another department which is not under the control of a man of his nationality and criticize it as severely. We find that there is another boat which has been under construction at Sorel for two or three years, and which was intended for this particular purpose. I think we should know for what purpose that boat is being constructed and when she will be ready to go into commission. The name of this boat is the 'Rouville,' and we have spent $85,000 on her up to date. We are entitled to know whether the 'Arctic' is to be duplicated, or what work this new boat is to undertake. Is this boat intended for the work of patrolling these northern waters?

Mr. BRODEUR. The only boat that the department intends to send is the 'Arctic.'

Mr. W. WRIGHT. What is the 'Rouville' to do?

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Rouville' is under the control of the Northwest Mounted Police, but last year she was employed for the purposes of pilotage.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. I presume that the Northwest Mounted Police will use her in conjunction with the other boat patrolling these northern waters. Is that the intention?

Mr. BRODEUR. The Northwest Mounted Police have two stations established in Hudson bay, and the patrolling that we did last year was in the more northern regions.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. When this new boat is completed we will have two boats doing what one was doing previously. I would like to know what taking possession in the name of Canada means. As near as I can understand from Capt. Bernier it means that he plants a post on some of these barren lands up there and then covers it with something and that is supposed to be taking possession in the name of the Canadian government. I think we are fairly entitled to the latest report of Capt. Bernier in regard to the trip of last year, and we ought also to have some statement from the government as to what lands he purposes visiting this year and as to their policy generally in regard to that northern country and some facts and figures in regard to its resources. I do not think we are asking too much in asking for this information before this vote

is passed. But it seems to me that the government have an underlying plan to hold back a certain portion of this information in order to induce the opposition to raise objections which the government may construe into an attack on the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for use in the elections. With regard to the supplies purchased for the 'Arctic,' from personal knowledge of the prices of many of these things I can say that there have been overcharges for a great many of them. It has been asserted, moreover, with what measure of truth I cannot say, that these Arctic expeditions have afforded merchants in Montreal and Quebec a favourable opportunity to dispose of unsaleable goods. I think we are entitled to know how many of these supplies are for the Esquimaux while the expedition is among them, and what the amount of money expended for this purpose will be; but this information is withheld. Then, we should be informed how much more we shall have to pay for the expedition of 1907 in addition to the partial statement of expenditures contained in the Auditor General's Report. When we inquire for these things, we are treated either with silence or with an explanation that is no explanation. When the returns are ordered by the House, they ought to be laid on the table within a reasonable time; but when the minister brings a pile of papers and puts them on his desk to show the opposition that they are completed, and does not lay them on the table. I think we must come to the conclusion that he does not intend that we shall have these returns in time to intelligently discuss the estimates. With regard to the suggestion which has been made that we should pass one item of these estimates and let the rest stand, the fact that the minister has been accustomed to take money voted for a specific purpose and apply it to some other purpose, may be taken as evidence that he would do the same thing again if we allowed any vote to be passed without having the information we are asking for. It is of no particular importance to the government whether we pass one item or another to-day. It would equally suit their convenience to have the estimates of another department passed, and to allow the estimates of the Marine and Fisheries Department to stand for a few days until we get all the returns. But the minister will not permit this because his pride or his vanity has been touched; so that we are being detained here all this time simply because of the pride of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. If that is the case, the country can easily come to the conclusion whether it is wise to continue this debate or not. So far as I am personally concerned, I have no great interest in it one way or another. If we are compelled to sit here till Saturday night, I would rather do business than discuss an item on which we have not sufficient information. I believe there are other ministers ready to proceed with their estimates while this minister is getting his returns completed. What prevents us doing this? Simply the pride of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who says, Somebody has said something that displeases me, and therefore I will not go on. That is a most unjustifiable position for any minister to take, and it would be a graceful act on the part of the Prime Minister to have the consideration of these estimates postponed until all the papers required shall be laid on the table. It would not take a great deal of yielding on his part to allow the Speaker to take the chair for five minutes while the hon. gentleman lays the report on the table, We can then resume the discussion of his estimates. There is no disposition on the part of members of the opposition to prolong the debate. Give us the information to which we are entitled and we will then go on with the business of the House. The minister is not dealing fairly with the members of the House in deciding that because one member—I think that is what he said—used language displeasing to him, he will not give us proper facilities for carrying on our work in this House.

Mr. CLEMENTS. So far as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) and his staff personally are concerned, I have no fault to find with them. I have been treated courteously by these gentlemen. But after looking over the return moved for by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) covering the bills of the expert accountant, K. Falconer, I can frankly say that any member who is careful of the interests of his constituency cannot fail to utter a protest against expenditures of this kind. As to this long discussion and its political effects, I believe the opposition will get credit throughout the Dominion for what they have done. The accounts of the 'Arctic' and the 'Montcalm' have been discussed by me in my own riding, and I believe that the electors, regardless of politics, regard these matters very seriously. However strong a supporter of the present government a man may be, he can hardly wish to cast his vote in favour of an administration that will make such expenditures as these. Now, I came into the House under somewhat peculiar conditions. I had the privilege which many hon. members have not had. I was given my nomination with the understanding that I was to support what I thought fair and just in the House regardless of my political leanings. I have never yet cast a vote in this House in favour of the government's view on any motion. But I believe I can justify every vote I have cast. Mr. Chairman, if in my explanations I wander a little from the subject under discussion, I trust I may be pardoned. I desire to say—and possibly I am the only individual who would feel free to make such a statement—

that had I been here when the measure for supplying seed grain in the new provinces was before the House, I would have opposed the view taken by both the government and the opposition and would have voted against spending a dollar in this manner. Personally, I regard this seed wheat fund as one of the greatest corruption funds ever known in the Dominion. And, when you advertise to the world that this Dominion of Canada must make a public appropriation to supply seed for the farmers of those provinces, I think that is one of the worst advertisements you could give the country. I have had some experience with farming in the Northwest, and I believe there is ample seed grain there for the use of the farmers. And the farmers would have had no trouble in getting it. Had this government wanted to do something for the farmers, they could have done much better by bringing in legislation avowedly to assist them——

Mr. TALBOT. I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, what connection the remarks the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) is now making have with the subject before the chair.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I was just coming to the point. And I told the Chairman, in beginning, that I wanted to make a few explanations first.

Mr. TALBOT. I call your attention to the matter, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is no doubt about the rule. The moment the point is raised, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) must speak to the point before the chair.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I shall endeavour to confine my remarks then, to the item under discussion. Now, for the sake of putting it on 'Hansard,' I wish to quote some of the bills of this expert accountant, Mr. Falconer. I may explain that, like many others in this House, I am first of all a Canadian. I believe in this government employing Canadians. Only the other day I protested against the Department of Marine and Fisheries even buying launches in the United States. I believe these should be bought in Canada and by public tender. In the same way, I believe there are enough expert accountants in this Dominion to do the work needed by this government without going to other countries for them. Now, I find that on November 30, 1906, this expert accountant brought down a bill of $9,445.24, with a special item for ship channel of $917.22. December 31st, there was an account of $6,093.73; January, 31, 1907, $6,481.34 and ship channel $367.22 ; February 28, $5,008.93 ; March 30, $2,921.67—a total of $31,235.35. Looking over this return, I find that a great many of these bills are not certified, and those that are certified are certified by Mr. Falconer himself, which seems to me a very strange thing. I think that of all the speakers we have heard on this subject, the one whom I would most heartily congratulate is my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. W. Jackson), who, I think, put the case very ably indeed. I hope his remarks will be taken into serious consideration by the government. Now, here is the itemized account for November :

Now, I understand that an auditor regards seven hours as constituting a day. We find: Services, 256 days, $7,638; per diem allowance, 83 days at $5, $415; for subsistence, 124½ days, at $4, $498; and 55 days at $3, $165, making a total of $1,078. Now, transportation is down for $599 ; stenographers, $79 ; telegrams, $42 ; stationery, $7.35. That, I suppose, was certified to by the deputy minister. Now, here is an account which does not seem to be certified to at all. W. B. Richards, 73½ hours at $75 per day, $905; this is money which he received on his monthly account. J. M. Gunn, 11½ hours at $75, $123; W. F. Russell, 91 hours at $50 a day, $794. Geo. E. Fawcett, 47½ hours at $50 a day, $396. K. Falconer, 338½ hours at $40 a day, $2,201. L. R. Acton, 184 hours at $30 a day, $913; F. H. Leland, 36 hours at $30 a day, $186; Geo. Pare, 118 hours at $25 a day, $421; M. L. Cooley, 181¼ hours at $25, $657 ; J. A. Marvin, 128 hours at $20, $371; S. Kettridge, 163 hours at $15, $353; J. J. Moorman, 49½ hours at $15, $109; A. B. Murray, 69 hours, 4 hours of travelling, at $15 a day, $152; L. D. Come, 14 hours, 9 hours travelling, $15 a day, $39.50. M. V. Finucane, one-half hour at $3.50, 25 cents; E. McGibney, 8½ hours at $3.50, $4.13; E. C. Moulton, 9½ hours at $3.50, $4.75; J. Meikle, 2 hours at $3.50, $1; S. E. Burton, 4 hours at $3.50, $2. That is just a sample of the accounts which I want to see published. Now, I think that when the electors of this country size up a bill such as this they will conclude that the government were not justified in paying it. I cannot help thinking that if the whole service in the Marine Department were paid in proportion, the men would get a great deal bigger salaries than they are getting now. I may point out that in my riding there is a lighthouse keeper who only gets $450 for a whole year, and he makes nothing to live on outside his salary. Now, coming to a few more of these accounts, here is a charge for subsistence. W. B. Richards, 6 days at $5, $30; W. F. Russell, 12 days at $5, $60; G. E. Fawcett, 9 days at $5, $45; J. Falconer, 56 days at $5, $280; L. R. Acton, 40 days at $4, $160; F. H. Leland, 9 days at $4, $36; George Pare, 19 days at $4, $76; M. L. Cooley, 33 days at $4, $132; H. A. Marvin, 23½ days at $4, $94; S. Kettridge, 30 days at $3. $90; A. D. Moorman, 9 days at $3, $27; J. J. Murray, 12 days at $3, $36; L. Cote, 4 days at $3, $12. Now, I want to appeal to the House in all fairness whether such bills as these

ought to have been passed by the Marine Department. I am sure the people will not justify them. Now, here is another charge for transportation: W. B. Richards $36.50; Kenneth Falconer, $56.55; W. F. Russell, $27.80; F. X. Leland, $31.25; Geo. Pare, $6.85; S. Kettridge, $14.75; J. J. Moorman, $13.90; H. H. Petze, $13.90; H. Hipwell, $13.90; F. B. Whittet, $20.55. Now, here is a detailed statement of transportation for week ending January 5: Railway fare, Montreal, to Ottawa, $4; week ending January 12, one-half fare return Ottawa to Montreal, $1.75; seat 50 cents; one-half return and seat, Montreal to Ottawa, $2.25; Ottawa to Montreal, $3.50; seat, 50 cents; week ending January 19, railway fare Montreal to Ottawa, $4; week ending January 26, Ottawa to Montreal, $4; Montreal to Ottawa, $4; Ottawa to Montreal, $3.43; week ending January 31, Montreal to Ottawa, $4. Now, what were they doing travelling so much, and why should the electors of this country be asked to pay that exorbitant sum for transportation for these gentlemen in addition to everything else they were getting from the government?

I hope that the minister will assent to the wishes of the opposition and allow the committee to rise instead of keeping us here until midnight. I had occasion a short time ago to refer to the course of action which had been pursued by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) with particular reference to my own constituency, and I heard it stated around the House afterwards that hon. gentlemen opposite would make it hot for me in my constituency when election time comes on. The Minister of Agriculture said that he would be glad to go down to my riding. I invite him to come down at any time. We will take care of him there and I am quite sure that he will not make a vote for the policy which he attempted to carry out. If he does go down and attempts to explain the item which is at present under discussion, instead of securing support there will be 4,000 or 5,000 of a majority of the votes of the electors of West Kent polled against him. They are not hidebound; they consider these matters upon their merits and I am perfectly satisfied to take my chance with the electors of West Kent when the time comes for us again to submit ourselves to them. I again appeal to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to agree that the committee shall rise and report progress.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend from West Kent has made several appeals to the Minister of Marine to answer the pertinent questions that he asked. Instead of the minister remaining in his place and answering these questions he has left the chamber. Therefore I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion negatived.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Mr. Chairman, I venture to think that when we calmly consider the position that this House has occupied for the last forty-eight hours we will hardly find it a subject of much congratulation for ourselves as members and I do not believe it will be a source of great pride to this country. I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has left his place, for I intend, in the few observations which I shall make to the committee, to address myself particularly to him. I desire to do so in his presence for this reason, that, taking the view that I do of this case, which, to my mind, is a very simple case after all, a tempest in a teapot, the one man who is to blame for the whole difficulty is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I suppose there are some principles of constitutional government on which we will all agree. I suppose that every hon. member of the House will agree that the great function of parliament is the granting of supplies, and that the peculiar duty of the opposition is to rigorously scrutinize the disposition made of the people's money, because, while theoretically it is our duty alike on each side of the House, we know that practically it must be the opposition which will undertake the duty of looking after the expenditure of public money and that it will be so long as human nature is what it is. I think it will be borne out by the constitutional law in saying that there are at least two grounds upon which we can object to this item. The opposition would have the right to say that the government had lost the confidence of the people and that therefore we will not place a single dollar in its hands. Then the opposition might well say that owing to his general misconduct, or to his conduct in regard to a particular matter, we lay down the principle that no more money shall be granted to the minister until he either clears his skirts of the charges made against him or until he has done all he can to bring down the information that the opposition is demanding. The opposition is called upon to vote the sum of $50,000 for the purpose of patrolling our northern waters. I think it must be admitted by the government side as well as the opposition that the Minister of Marine and Fishies has been asked for certain information and that he has not brought it down. Surely when members of the opposition can appeal to such authority as I have in my hand, when we have the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) saying that:

> The opposition want certain information, they are entitled to it and must get it.

No person on the other side of the House can blame members of the opposition if

they insist on having this information before a single item is granted. It is true that it was afterwards suggested that some other item might be passed in connection with this department, but I think that what I have already said is an answer to that. The opposition is objecting to one single dollar being put in the hands of the minister until he has purged himself of contempt in refusing to bring down information which the right hon. First Minister says he should bring down. We would be stultifying ourselves; we would be unworthy of the position we occupy, we would have no justification for refusing to pass this item if we passed another item giving money to the same minister. But we are quite willing at the same time, as has been offered over and over again, to grant any money that may be required by any other department.

I am sorry that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not in his place so that I could appeal to him as a lawyer, recognizing the constitutional right of the opposition to object to a single dollar being voted until we are provided with the information which the Prime Minister says we are entitled to. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is the man who is to blame for all that has happened in the last two days. The department over which he presides had, prior to his incumbency, become so demoralized, that the right hon. leader of the House stated that he had brought in the present minister in order that he might bring order and honesty into it; but what have been the fruits of the hon. gentleman's administration? Can any hon. gentleman suggest any improvement that the hon. minister has made since he took charge of that department? It may be asked why the opposition are not willing to vote money to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Without saying anything unkind, I might refer to the discussion which took place in this House some two years ago in regard to the supplies which had been purchased for the steamer 'Arctic.' In 'Hansard' of 1906, on page after page, from page 3208 to page 3227, you will find that the minister stated to this House repeatedly that the enormous quantity of supplies purchased had been purchased on the responsibility of Captain Bernier, to whom the government had assigned the duty of making out the list. He said the government took the responsibility of those purchases, because the department had carried out the wishes of Captain Bernier. We had an investigation of the matter in the Public Accounts Committee, where evidence was given under oath, and the requisition of Captain Bernier was produced; and all I can say is that if the statement made repeatedly on the floor of this House by the minister was true, then a terrible amount of perjury and forgery was committed on that occasion, because there was an absolute contradiction between the statement of the minister in this House and the evidence given under oath before the committee. If that took place only two years ago, are members of the opposition to be blamed to-day when the minister asks for a vote of $50,000 for another Arctic expedition, if we decline to let the item go through until he gives us complete information as to how he proposes to dispose of the money? The department being in the deplorable state which the right hon. First Minister admitted two years ago, one might reasonably have expected some improvement under the present minister; but we have yet to learn that he has called up for sentence any official of his department for any of the wrong-doing that has cost this country so much money. And now one can hardly imagine anything more childish or more calculated to bring this House into public contempt than to have the minister folding his arms and saying: Rather than consent to bring down the returns which have been ordered by this House, I will keep the members here forty-eight hours or more just to soothe my ruffled pride. This can be done only at the physical and mental cost of members on both sides of the House. Surely it would be better that the minister should recognize that the minority have some rights and also some powers, one of which is the power to prevent the voting of the supplies. I appeal to the minister, as he is now present, whether it would not be better to lay aside his pride for a moment, and let us proceed with the public business.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. Until a short time ago, I felt that I should not take part in this debate. My sympathies perhaps were not as strong as some others.' But when I saw the recent vote, my eyes were opened and I saw where the real obstruction was. I had felt rather inclined to think that, perhaps, our own friends were partly to blame in this matter. But when I found the government benches declare, by such a majority as we had a few minutes ago that they were prepared to do the blocking, and oppose the rising of the committee, I felt it my duty to protest. And I rise for the purpose of protesting against the waste of public money and the time of members of this House. Let me read the item under discussion, for we have wandered so far from it that many hon. members seem to have lost sight of what we are talking about—

To provide for the maintenance of vessels employed in patrolling the waters in the northern portion of Canada, also for establishing and maintaining police and customs ports on the mainland or islands as may be deemed necessary from time to time.

Now, if I understand the case, the members of the opposition are asking to have vouchers produced to show what has become of the public money. We met here in November. The government should have been

prepared to meet the House, and should have had their vouchers ready. We are now on the eve of the month of March, and practically, we have done nothing. We have been spending two or three days over one item, and I presume that the government intends that in a few weeks from now we shall rush through fifteen or sixteen millions some evening, as we did last year. But that is not business. I understand that the difficulty arises over a question of the board of the experts brought here to regulate the books of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It appears that about $47,000 was spent to get these books in proper order. They must have been in a fearful condition before that. And they must be in a fearful condition still, when it takes the minister three days to find vouchers for board paid to people in this city. I presume the people who boarded these men are still in the city and within half a mile of where we stand. Why cannot the minister send out, and, inside of half an hour, get from these parties a proper statement of how much these men paid for board ? An hon. member in this House declares that he boarded with three of these people and that they did not pay more than $1 a day for their board. But we are asked to allow $3, $4 and $5 a day and that without vouchers shown. I wonder if the whole department is being run in this way. I notice one item in the Auditor General's Report with regard to these experts,—page P—78 :

Travel of expert and staff: New York to Ottawa, Montreal to Ottawa, &c., 18 men, $1,533.14.

That is an average of about $85 apiece. Now, I understand that the Pullman fare from Ottawa to New York—and I presume it is the same from New York to Ottawa—is $22. So we see this is exactly in the same proportion as the board—let these people pay $22 and charge $85 ; let them pay $1 a day for their board and charge $4 or $5. Is it any wonder that the members on this side of the House find fault or that the people of the country are finding fault ? The obstruction of hon. members on the other side will be resented in the country. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) thinks he is a dictator, an absolute monarch. We read in the Scriptures, I Kings xviii ; 17.18 about the great King Ahab :

' And it came to pass, when Ahab saw Elijah, that Ahab said unto him, art thou he that troubleth Israel? And he answered, I have not troubled Israel; but thou and thy father's house, because ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord and thou hast followed Baalam.'

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I rise to a point of order. We have sat here for forty-eight hours, and I do not think it relevant to quote Scripture to obstruct the business of this House.

Mr. TAYLOR. The government needs it very badly.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I insist upon my point of order.

Mr. FIELDING. I venture to submit that the question is not a question of order, but a question of propriety—the propriety of Scripture being quoted by the hon. gentleman, and the right of these gentlemen to monopolize Scripture.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. I thought I was quite in order in giving an example of a dictatorial monarch ruling over an abject people. And he asks us if we have troubled Israel, and our answer is that we have not troubled Israel, but ' thou and thy father's house have done so.'

Mr. TALBOT. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Chisholm) be good enough to tell us where the comparison comes in ?

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. We are told we have no rights in this House.

Mr. TALBOT. Then you are the abject people.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. And we are being accused wrongfully of obstruction. We are not the obstructors but hon. gentlemen opposite are. I am sorry to think that the Scriptures are being ruled out of the House. Has it come to this in Canada, and by the government ?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend (Mr. Thos. Chisholm) is not right. I did not support the point of order.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister objected.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I thought the point was not well taken But I said that I thought it unseemly for the hon. member to quote Scripture in the cause of the opposition. But then we are told that a certain person can quote Scripture to serve his own ends.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. I presume the difficulty is that we have not had prayers for two or three days. Are prayers to be ruled out altogether ?

Mr. FIELDING. That may account for a good deal of it.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. I think the Minister of Finance understands the situation. Let me point out that the obstruction is not in this House alone, but in the Public Accounts Committee, and by hon. gentlemen opposite. Of course, they say they are not guilty, but whoever heard of a prisoner at the bar confessing his guilt if he thinks he can face out the evidence ? But the fact is that these hon. gentlemen control the evidence and they refuse to give us the vouchers to which we are entitled. Why, in

every fraternal society original vouchers are produced for the audit. The same is true of every township and county council. Surely, in this the highest body in the land we must demand vouchers also. Now, I wish to refer to another point. Here is the 'Eastern Chronicle' of Friday, February 28:

Letter from Sir Hibbert Tupper.
Vancouver, British Columbia,
February 14, 1908.

My dear editor,—Fair play is a jewel. Your issue of February 7 has an article headed 'comparisons.' In this, you say:

'Then again, Messrs. Tupper and Thompson represented Canada on the Behring Sea Commission in Paris in 1892-3. Each of these gentlemen was accompanied by a private secretary and they also had with them a messenger. These economical Conservatives on this occasion incurred a bill of $22,355.04, and it is worthy of remark that Tupper was also the agent of the British government, and in addition to the sum of $6,816.54, including the above figures for himself and private secretary, the British government paid all his expenses as such agent.'

A short time ago, I was annoyed to read that a minister of the Crown at Ottawa, who was being 'heckled' over his own bill of expenses, had gone out of his way to make a misleading and incorrect statement on which your remarks were based. I at once wrote as follows:

Dear Sir,—I have read with surprise your answer on page 1799, unrevised 'Hansard,' for January 23, 1908. The note respecting my expenses as agent is entirely incorrect. I was not 'also agent.' I was agent for Her Majesty only in this matter, and I did not act as Minister of Marine with regard to the $4,428.95. Canada, by agreement, paid the expenses of Her Majesty's agent. England paid me nothing for expenses or otherwise. England paid her own officers directly through the English accountant. None of it came through me. As a matter of fact I lost my sessional indemnity through my office as agent, and received no compensation in money either from the English or Canadian government, nor did I ask it.

On whose authority, therefore, I ask you, was the misleading statement made?

I have as yet received no reply to my letter, but observe that the misrepresentation is doing the work it was doubtless intended to do.

Yours faithfully,
CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Mr. TAYLOR. We expect a reply from the minister who made that statement. There has been no rake-off by the Conservative party; if there has been a rake-off, it has been by members of the government.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has no right to apply the words 'rake-off' to any member of the House.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Galliher). I think while possibly you may apply that term generally, when you direct it to any members of the House, it is not in order.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I appeal from your ruling to the Speaker.

His Honour the Speaker takes the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. The ruling of the Chair is that it is unparliamentary to apply the term 'rake-off' to any particular member of the House. And from the ruling of the Chair an appeal is made to the Speaker. I rule that the ruling of the Chair should be confirmed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. We appeal to the House.

House divided on the question of confirming the ruling of the Speaker.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Adamson,	Lefurgey,
Armstrong,	Macdonald,
Aylesworth,	McCool,
Barker,	McIntyre (Perth),
Barr,	McIntyre (Strathcona),
Beauparlant,	McKenzie,
Bergeron,	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Black,	McLean (York, C.),
Boyce,	Marcile (Bagot),
Boyer,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Brodeur,	Michaud,
Bureau,	Miller,
Caldwell,	Northrup,
Carney,	Oliver,
Caron,	Pardee,
Cash,	Paterson,
Chisholm (Huron),	Pickup,
Clare,	Pringle,
Clarke,	Proulx,
Clements,	Roche (Halifax),
Copp,	Roche (Marquette),
Devlin,	Ross (Cape Breton),
Dubeau,	Savoie,
Dugas,	Schaffner,
Fielding,	Sifton,
Finlay,	Sinclair,
Fisher,	Smith (Nanaimo),
Fortier,	Smith (Oxford),
Foster,	Sproule,
Gauvreau,	Staples,
Graham,	Stewart,
Greenway,	Talbot,
Hughes (Victoria),	Templeman,
Hunt,	Tolmie,
Jackson (Elgin),	Turcotte,
Jackson (Selkirk),	Turriff,
Johnston,	Watson,
Lake,	White,
Lapointe,	Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Wilson (Russell),
Lavergne (Drummond & Arth.),	Wright (Muskoka)—84.
Lavergne (Montmagny),	
Law,	

NAYS:

Messieur

Lewis.—1.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) has not voted.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has not voted.

Mr. BEATTIE. I am paired with the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dyment).

Mr. TAYLOR. I have a standing pair with the chief whip of the government who is not in the House at present.

Mr. FIELDING. How would my hon. friend have voted?

Mr. SPEAKER. I declare the ruling of the chair sustained.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thought the government supporters wanted exercise.

And the House having again gone into committee.

Mr. FOSTER. By the kindness of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries I have been handed the report of the historian. I have in my hands an undiscovered and unknown treasure. It is embalmed in a language with which I am not sufficiently well acquainted in the script to read fluently. It is written en francais and whilst I am very anxious to know what is in it and very anxious that the House shall know I shall have to ask the intervention of the assistant clerk's kindly voice to act in my stead and read this for the benefit of the House. I know of no man more capable of doing that than the assistant clerk and I have very great pleasure in handing this over to him with the request that he will unfold it in English to us so that we may know the contents of the report of the historian. I see no other way of getting at the kernel in the nut unless the assistant clerk cracks the shell.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think that document has been brought before the House in the regular way, but I would be very glad to bring down a copy. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was so anxious to see the report of the historian that he would not wait for a copy being made and I thought I would show him the original in order to let him see that the document existed notwithstanding the fact that I had assured him that there was such a document. Since we have been on this question perhaps I may call the attention of the hon. gentleman to a little incident that happened last night. He stated that I had 'stolen' from an appropriation a certain amount of money and that I had applied this money to another purpose. As a matter of fact the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well the circumstances. There was an appropriation for an ice-breaker. I was going to go abroad also with the view of looking into the question of the ice-breaker and an amount of money was taken out of the ice-breaker vote to pay my expenses. My hon. friend stated that it was a bad thing to do, that it was a 'steal'; that was the language that he used in regard to me. He said I had 'stolen' money from that appropriation and applied it to another purpose. I called his attention this morning to the fact that perhaps he was guilty of the same thing some years ago. The hon. gentleman, in 1890-91 got $954.08, not out of civil government contingencies, not out of the vote for which travelling expenses should generally be taken, but he got that money from the commercial agencies vote. The commercial agencies vote does not admit of money being taken out of it for travelling expenses any more than the vote for ice-breakers. The question was brought up in the House at the time, by my hon. friend who is now the Minister of Customs, and I desire to draw the attention of the hon. member for North Toronto to the fact. I will quote to him what he then said and perhaps he will find, after I have quoted these remarks, that the expression that I had 'stolen' is not a very proper one. In 'Hansard' of the 18th March, 1892, I find the following:

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). At page B—91, I see that $1,400 of unforeseen expenses are charged to commercial agencies. What was the expenditure for the trip to Jamaica?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; the West India islands trip, and also the Washington trip. The expenses of the trip to Washington this year are also charged to commercial agencies.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is not the intention of that vote, is it?

Mr. FOSTER. The intention of the vote was never thoroughly carried out, though it is at present. But as we had not a surplus in the strictly proper appropriation, I thought it just as well to take the money out of that vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that while the expenses of the Finance Minister to Washington are charged to commercial agencies, those of Sir Charles Tupper are charged to miscellaneous charges. How is that?

Mr. FOSTER. It really makes very little difference, I suppose, to what they are charged as they all come out of the same pocket.

I hope the hon. gentleman will withdraw the word 'stolen'.

Mr. FIELDING. I think we should abolish 'Hansard'.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think we have yet reached the stage in this House where it can be successfully argued that two wrongs make a right. If it was wrong in the one it was wrong in the other, but because a case is cited to the House of a similar thing having been done before it does not make it any better or any worse. If it was wrong then it is wrong now. I hold that it was.

Mr. FIELDING. Would 'Hansard' show that when attention was called to it by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) then said it was wrong?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going to hide behind the issue, of course. I am going to meet it exactly as it is. I find in the first place, from a very cursory examination of the pages of 'Hansard,' that there were very sharp criticis at that time and that these critics, if my memory does not leave me in this matter, belonged to the Liberal party and were considered to be good representative Liberals and to be embodying and reporting Liberal doctrine. I notice that one of them is Mr. Paterson, of Brant. If I am not wrong this Mr. Paterson, of Brant, who, in 1892, so strongly denounced that method of taking away from one vote and devoting it to another purpose, is at present the Minister of Customs in this cabinet and is the colleague of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Now, when so strong an exponent of Liberal doctrine in the matter of Liberal appropriations in 1892 sits alongside the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in 1907 and allows the Minister of Marine to take thousands of dollars out of a vote for an entirely different purpose and use that towards a purpose for which it was not intended, I am led to the conclusion that either the former strong critic of that kind of transmigration from one vote to another has lost the edge and vigour of his criticism, or that he has a colleague alongside of him who is a little too strong-headed to be swayed by that old Liberal doctrine. So I think it is clear that the Minister of Customs has gone back on the principles of 1892 and allows in 1907 his colleague to do what he declared to be absolutely wrong at that time. I stand in a different position. In 1892, under the stress of circumstances, having no surplus, I was obliged for the time being to take a small amount of money out of one vote and apply it to an allied purpose. I declare now that this is not an absolutely proper method of treating appropriations. I stand absolutely on that ground. I am much older now than I was then. The act, although it was not a criminal one, might have been done in a very different way, and I am quite prepared to say that in the years that have passed between 1892 and this I have taken a step forward, and I regret very much to say that the Minister of Customs has taken a step backward. But I am not going to allow the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to get me to defend, even in my own action of ten or fifteen years ago, what I think now to be wrong and what I have condemned in him. I hope I am wiser than I was then, and now I am anxious for my hon. friend the Minister of Customs to give us the reason for his backsliding in this matter.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not think that I have done any backsliding in the matter I never expressed any opinion on the subject. I have not been guilty, as far as I know in the House, of having been caught in the most flagrant manner doing a certain thing and then getting up and using such strong language as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has in characterizing what he says was a perfectly legitimate operation when he did it himself. I have not seen 'Hansard,' but I think as I heard the hon. gentleman read it that what was done by me on that occasion was, when the matter came up, to mention the fact and ask the hon. gentleman if it was correct to do that. That is all. I did not say: You have stolen it. I simply asked the question whether it was right or not, and when he made the frank confession and said that it was perfectly right and perfectly proper because it all came out of the same pocket and that there was no harm in it I did not pursue the subject. I think the hon. gentleman ought to rise in the House and apologize in the most ample manner for the language which he has used. I should feel that I was called on to apologize if I had so characterized an hon. member of this House for having done what I had done myself. I would consider that I was entitled to lose in a large measure the respect of the House if I were to rise and denounce another member for a transaction of that kind as if he had stolen money. There is no one among us who does not commit errors, but these things can be straightened out among hon. gentlemen. If the hon. gentleman would say, I did the same thing myself, and I am sorry that I used that word and desire to withdraw it, he could no doubt rehabilitate himself in the estimation of hon. members, but until he does that, I hold that he stands in an equivocal position.

Mr. FOSTER. When I was going out before the lunch hour the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was reading a list of travelling expenses incurred by myself during my incumbency of office. I listened attentively to him, and while I have not the figures before me, so far as I remember them, the hon. minister attempted to make them appear as very extravagant. I think that the list, when conned, will just show the reverse. The expenditures made by myself for travelling expenses while I was in the cabinet ran along generally from $400 to $600 a year, in some cases running up to $1,500 a year; I think there were probably two years in which this was the case. There were two cases in which the minister criticised my diversion of moneys voted for one purpose to a different purpose. One of these was the vote for commercial agencies. I do not look on that as a diversion at all, as I was deputed to visit the West India Islands to establish commercial agencies there. I took the trip, taking my private secretary with me. We went to New York, took our passage, paid for our passage, and visited every one of the West India Islands

in a tour which consumed some two months, going down as far as Trinidad, holding conferences with the governments and the boards of trade in almost every one of those islands and returning to Ottawa. The expenses for that trip were something like $950. Previous to that time we had not commercial agencies. It was a theory of mine to establish them, and it was put in practice when I was a minister. I established several agencies during that trip. Therefore, I have no hesitation in standing by that use of the vote. The other list of expenses read by the minister were for the purposes of the trip to Washington, for which it appears that a certain amount was taken from the vote for commercial agencies.

Mr. BRODEUR. And unforeseen expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. The vote for unforeseen expenses can be properly used in that way. For my part, I would make no strong criticism against the using of that vote for a mission in which a minister was suddenly called away on the business of the country. That was the reason we went to Washington, and the money, I understand, was taken partly from the vote for unforeseen expenses and the balance from the vote for commercial agencies. Whether it was proper to take any of the vote for commercial agencies for that purpose is a debatable question. The best way to provide for travelling expenses is out of the vote for contingencies. If, however, during the course of the year an unexpected trip is made which cannot be provided for out of contingencies, then I think the vote for unforeseen expenses might be used if there is any; if not, some other means might be found.

Mr. PATERSON. You did not think so at that time.

Mr. FOSTER. At that time I suppose I defended the vote against the criticism of my hon. friend.

Mr. BRODEUR. If my hon. friend will read 'Hansard,' he will find that he said that it did not make any difference out of what vote it came, because all the money came out of the same pocket.

Mr. FOSTER. The vote was:

Department of Finance and Treasury Board —contingencies, $9,000.

This is what was said:

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that last year the very large amount of $5,400 was spent in travelling expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; the expenses last year were heavy, as shown on page B—90. I will mention the chief items. There are travelling expenses of the deputy minister who went home to England in connection with the raising of the temporary loan. There are also the travelling expenses of the assistant inspector and inspector of savings banks, who have to travel through all parts of the Dominion. The expenses of the superintendent of insurance are also included, though they are not an ultimate charge on the consolidated fund, being paid by the companies themselves. Then, there are the travelling expenses of the minister himself, which this year are very large.

I was Minister of Finance at that time.

Mr. DAVIES (Prince Edward Island). The hon. gentleman does not anticipate another trip to the West Indies?

Mr. FOSTER. No. I do not think the expenses are extravagant when you consider the number of miles travelled and the length of time occupied.

The fact of the matter is that after the explanation there was no criticism of the expenses to the West India Islands, as there was not any reasonable ground for it, and they appeared to have been taken out of the contingencies of my own department, the Department of Finance. Then Mr. Paterson says:

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). At page B—91, I see that $1,400 of unforseen expenses are charged to commercial agencies.

It would seem from that, that that sum was treated as an unforeseen expense, and the charge was ticketed as for commercial agencies. So that there evidently was not a vote for commercial agencies. I had a different opinion when my hon. friend read it.

Mr. BRODEUR. There was a vote for commercial agencies, and the money was taken out of that vote.

Mr. FOSTER. I would take it that the vote was in the first place for unforeseen expenses, and a portion of that was set aside for commercial agencies. Whether there was an independent vote for commercial agencies against which the expenses of the Washington trip were charged I do not know. Then Mr. Paterson asked:

What was the expenditure for the trip to Jamaica?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, the West India Islands trip and also the Washington trip. The expenses of the trip to Washington this year are also chargeable to commercial agencies.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is not the intention of that vote, is it?

Mr. FOSTER. The intention of the vote was never thoroughly carried out, though it is at present. But as we had not a surplus in the strictly proper appropriation, I thought it just as well to take the money out of that vote.

Whether 'that vote' means the vote for unforeseen expenses or the vote for commercial agencies, I do not know, and I do not propose either to condemn myself or to exculpate anybody else until I look into it and see what the votes were. When I do that, I will put before the House the exact state of affairs.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is more than that.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I will read more :

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that while the expenses of the Finance Minister to Washington are charged to commercial agencies, those of Sir Charles Tupper are charged to miscellaneous charges.

If they are charged to miscellaneous charges, I do not see that that is an improper charge. The debate continues:

Mr. FOSTER. It really makes very little difference what they are charged, as they all come out of the same pocket.

Now, there is not quite enough to go upon for the minister if he desires to put me in the same box with himself.

Mr. BRODEUR. But I think the time has come when my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) should withdraw the expression of 'steal' which he has applied to my action.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me quote a little further:

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of course, it is public money, and in that respect it does not make any difference. But the vote for commercial agencies was intended to facilitate our foreign trade.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) thought at that time that it should have come out of the proper vote, and I think he was right.

Mr. FOSTER (reading): These items are perfectly correct then?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That was not the object of the vote. The object was to establish new lines of trade, and the Finance Minister should not lose sight of that.

Mr. FOSTER. That is very true.

Now, I have cleared that up, so far as I can to show how that vote stood. This is what I stated last night—page 4246 of 'Hansard':

The minister came down to the House, and I dare say he explained to the House that he proposed to carry on an investigation in his department as to the best methods of accounting, asked the House for a vote for that purpose, and was voted $25,000. Then the minister was on fair ground. He spent the $25,000, and then, instead of coming to the House for a supplementary vote, he deliberately took more than $25,000 out of a vote for an absolutely distinct purpose——

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend (Mr Foster) is making a mistake. The discussion in which he charged me with having stolen a certain sum of money from one appropriation to be used for another purpose was with regard to my travelling expenses, and not with regard to the accounts of the experts.

Mr. FOSTER. I read this as I find it:

——took more than $25,000 out of a vote for an absolutely distinct purpose, the ship channel vote, to implement the special vote of $25,000. I ask any minister of the Crown whether he recommends that as the policy to be pursued. Such a policy strikes at the very root of parliamentary appropriations. The minister had no right to steal from another vote in order to implement an extravagant administration of the idea embodied in his first vote.

This is as strong an expression as I used. The minister attempted last night, and again to-day, to imply that I had accused him of stealing the money. But that is entirely foreign to my statement. But I am frank to say that I might have used a word which would have been less offensive than the word 'steal.' I might have used 'transfer.' But the meaning I had was exactly the same meaning if I had used the word 'transfer' from one vote and used the money for a purpose distinctly not provided. If the minister objects to it, I will take it back frankly and fully. Looking at it, now that it is in print, it does appear to be a little too strong. If I were to go over it again, after cool moments, I would say 'transfer' instead of 'steal.' But my hon. friend knows that I did not use the word in the offensive sense of taking the money for his own uses out of a vote, but of taking a sum of money directed to one vote and applying it to another—appropriating it wrongly. I am willing to stand by my statement, but to offer an apology for a too strong word, though applied in the right sense of the case. Now, I think I have made the case clear by the explanation I have given.

Mr. DEVLIN. This is my fourth session in this House, and I have never seen the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in such a position as that in which he has been placed before us this afternoon. We members from the province of Quebec are charged with trying to raise racial prejudice in our province because we come to the support of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) in the case before the House. We take that position because we know that the minister is too honest a man and his honesty is too well known throughout the country for such suggestions to be made against him. It was extremely painful for us on this side to hear such expressions as were used yesterday—accusing the minister of having 'stolen' money from one appropriation for the purposes of another. I congratulate the hon. member for North Toronto on the frank statement he has made that, in a cooler moment, he would have used more appropriately the word 'transferred.' I would like to see the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in the same spirit, withdraw the expressions he used with regard to the hon. minister.

Mr. SPROULE. I said the management of the department was rotten.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. gentleman said that certain furniture had disappeared

from the Speaker's apartments. Will he not say that he made that statement in the heat of debate?

Mr. SPROULE. I stated that parties were employed by the department whose board was charged at $5 a day when they only paid $1 a day, and we had no vouchers. I showed that this was in line with the purchase made by Merwin and Brooks where they got profits of 250 per cent. I said that these cases proved that the management of the department was rotten. I think that was the most offensive word that I used, if any was offensive. As to the furniture for the Speaker's apartments —I do not remember using the word 'furniture,'—but I think I said 'supplies.' I said that I was credibly informed that certain articles had disappeared, and asked whether they had been given away as souvenirs or what had become of them. I did not say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) had given them away. I feel something like the Ethiopian speaker—a celebrated orator, like my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin). His oratory usually won for him great applause. But on one occasion he appeared before his audience with a strangely significant patch on his face. He said, 'It is only right that I should make an explanation to this intelligent audience how I appear in this condition. As I generally speak where I am known, my reputation assures me of a favourable reception and great applause in addition boquets are usually showered until my platform is usually strewn with boquets like a boquet garden.

Mr. DEVLIN. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPROULE. I am going to take back a statement if the hon. gentleman will allow me.

Mr. DEVLIN. I think the time of the House is too precious to be spent in listening to stories.

Mr. SPROULE. The orator proceeded: Last night I spoke where I was not known. I aroused great enthusiasm, so that the people went out to buy bouquets. But the bouquet man was not to be found, so they purchased other things, including some eggs, and proceeded to throw them around promiscuously, one of which, unfortunately, struck me where you see this patch. And I have a two-dollar bill in my pocket that says that the hen that laid that egg was not healthy. I say that the department that 'laid these eggs' is not healthy.

Mr. DEVLIN. That is a very good story, but very badly told. Now, to come back to the member for North Toronto. When he, in order to prevent money being voted for necessary purposes, is obliged to come into the House and charge the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with theft——

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. I have not, in the sense conveyed by the words of the hon. gentleman, charged the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or any other gentleman in this House with theft. I object to that term, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule is that the statement of an hon. member must be accepted.

Mr. DEVLIN. I bow to the ruling of the chair, and I beg to refer to 'Hansard,' page 4246, where I find these words used by the member for North Toronto:

> I ask any minister of the Crown whether he recommends that as a policy to be pursued. Such a policy strikes at the very root of parliamentary appropriations. The minister had no right to steal from another vote in order to implement an extravagant administration of the idea embodied in his first vote.

I also quote from 'Hansard' at page 4123:

> More than that, according to the information we have—and all the information has not yet been brought down—the minister himself is in the habit of drawing large sums and keeping them in his own pocket for months and using them for his own purposes, and when called to book by the Audit Department, making a refund.

Now, I call the attention of the member for North Toronto to the fact that he distinctly charges the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with stealing.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to that. I am going to follow this hon. gentleman or any other who adverts upon that language in the sense he has done. I have told the House to-day what I meant by that statement. If the hon. gentleman will quote all my words instead of only a part, I will not object, but by the way he quotes my language he makes it appear that I have charged the minister with personal theft. I object to that manner of reading my remarks. I ask the ruling of the chair with reference to that and will every time that this statement is made.

Mr. BRODEUR. In order to make every thing clear I suppose the hon. gentleman will have no objection to withdraw the expressions he used concerning me in the quotation that has been read?

Mr. FOSTER. I have made a frank statement to the minister and I told him, as he well knows, that the word was too strong, and that in my cooler moments instead of using that word I would use the word 'transfer.' That is as far as I can go.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend charges me with having taken some money from the public chest and used that money for months for my own purposes, leading the public to believe that I used the money for

my own purposes when in point of fact I used it for public purposes. I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw that also.

Mr. FOSTER. That came up again, and again I said that that expression as it stood was a little too strong, and that all I meant to say was that the minister took a certain amount of money, much more I think than he had intended to expend and that months afterwards he refunded that money. I said that during that time it remained somewhere, either in his bank account or in his pocket. That is what I meant by saying for personal purposes.

Mr. DEVLIN. Do I understand then that the hon. member for North Toronto withdraws the expressions used in his speeches during this debate charging misappropriation of funds by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries? If he does not, then I am forced to go on. The hon. member for North Toronto seems to feel very keenly the way his words have been understood. He does not like it to appear that he used the word 'stealing,' nor the word 'theft.' I would ask the hon. member for North Toronto to consult some of the legal gentlemen sitting near him and get their definition of the word 'theft,' and whether the word is not implied in the expressions he has used with regard to the action of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in taking money from a vote from which he had no right to take it and putting it into his pocket.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. I ask for your ruling whether, after an hon. gentleman has explained the sense in which he used the phrase and declares that it was not intended to mean personal theft, and in that sense has withdrawn the phrase, if it is still in order for an hon. gentleman to attempt to establish the very thing the hon. member for North Toronto has denied?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Here is what Bourinot says on the subject:

> Whatever a member says in explanation—whether relating to the words or the meaning of his speech—is to be taken as true and not afterwards called in question. The words which he states himself to have used, are to be considered as the words actually spoken; and the sense in which he says they were uttered, as the sense in which they are to be taken in the debate. If a member disavows the use of words attributed to him, and objected to, the matter must end.

That is my ruling.

Mr. DEVLIN. I accept your ruling, and I have nothing further to add, except to congratulate the member for North Toronto for having so generously withdrawn all charges against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) said something a little while ago that prompts me to take a little part in this discussion. I understand that the hon. gentleman said that the criticism that is being made here is directed against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries because he is a French Canadian and comes from the province of Quebec.

Mr. DEVLIN. At no time in this House have I said that the charges made against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries were made against him because he comes from the province of Quebec. What I did say was that it would be cowardly on the part of hon. members coming from Quebec if we would see one of our colleagues attacked as the minister has been in this House without at least having the courage to stand up in his defence.

Mr. BERGERON. I heard my hon. friend mention the fact that it was insulting to Quebec. It will be found in 'Hansard' when 'Hansard' is printed. That is not a fair way of discussing this matter.

Mr. DEVLIN. I do not wish it to be put in 'Hansard' when I did not use such language.

Mr. BERGERON. I am obliged to take the word of my hon. friend, but I am sure that 'Hansard' will show that those are the words that he used.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman is obliged to accept the word of the hon. member for Wright. It is not a question of 'Hansard.'

Mr. BERGERON. I do, but when 'Hansard' comes out to-morrow I am sure that I will see that I am right. There is no question that there are grave suspicions about the Department of Marine and Fisheries, whether that department be administered by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries or by some one else. We know that about $50,000 has been expended for the purpose of introducing a new system of accounting in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The country will be astonished to learn that this department, which has been organized since confederation, is in such a state that it costs $50,000 to put the accounts in proper shape. I need not mention some of the details which I have heard, nor need I repeat the statement that money has been paid for expenses which have never been incurred, that men have been paid $4 a day for their board when they only spent $1. Vouchers which were to be put before the House have not been produced, and that is the cause of the delay in passing this item.

Mr. BRODEUR. This firm have presented claims for a large amount of money, but I have refused to pay that sum of money in view of the fact that they have not produced proper vouchers.

Mr. BERGERON. Of course, I take the answer of my hon. friend, but there is one thing he did not deny, and that is that the arrangements between my hon. friend and Falconer were verbal arrangements made on the street, I understand.

Mr. BRODEUR. Where did my hon friend hear that statement?

Mr. BERGERON. I heard it in the House, and it was not denied.

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, nobody takes that statement seriously.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend said that it was made like any other arrangement you might make with a notary or a lawyer or a doctor. If it is true that no other arrangement was made with Falconer, it will take a long time for members sitting on this side of the House to grant the moneys which are denied to the department, because that shows a great deal of carelessness on the part of my hon. friend. What has been the result of this accounting by Mr. Falconer? Notwithstanding the fact that these men have been employed to provide a new system of accounting in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, are the books of the department not kept to-day in the same way as they were before? Last night the minister made some insinuations to the effect that some one was not satisfied. Did he mean that some one in the department was not satisfied, and that some one in the department had prompted this criticism? There has been no change there, and I would like to know from my hon. friend if there has been any difference in the method of keeping the books of the department?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, there has been.

Mr. BERGERON. Well then, I would be very glad to hear my hon. friend explain it in a moment. These are some of the reasons which have forced hon. members on this side of the House to criticise so severely the passing of the hon. gentleman's estimates. I know it is tiresome, but he used to be on this side of the House, and we all remember——

Mr. BRODEUR. I can stand it; I have not slept more than two hours in two days and two nights, but I can stand it.

Mr. BERGERON. I know that my hon. friend will not plead sickness; I know that he is a fighter; but I also remember—and I have reason to remember it, because I was then in the chair as Deputy Speaker—that he criticised us very severely for hours from this side of the House. It is quite legitimate for the opposition to criticise severely the expenditures of that department. I am not blaming my hon. friend alone. Of course, he has the constitutional responsibility of having succeeded other ministers of the department. In 1896 the fisheries branch of the department cost $427,251, while in 1906 that branch cost $968,702, an increase of 127 per cent in ten years.

Mr. BRODEUR. What about the revenue now?

Mr. BERGERON. That is another part of the question.

Mr. BRODEUR. What is it?

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend can treat that part of the question later on. I am calling the attention of the committee to one part of the question. Lighthouse and coast service in 1896 cost $466,658; last year, $2,530,308, or an increase of 443 per cent. Take ocean and river service; in 1896 it cost $181,452; last year, $1,013,083, or an increase of 458 per cent. Altogether the work of the department cost in 1896 $1,074,761, and in 1906 $3,437,932, or an increase of 1028 per cent. For about four hours last night we had under discussion the expedition of the 'Arctic,' and I think that a great many people will agree with me in expressing the belief that that expedition has been useless compared with the amount of money that it has cost.

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose the hon. gentleman will be fair enough to admit that since 1896 there have been transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries the St. Lawrence ship channel and the hydrographic survey, which in themselves are costing more than $1,500,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What my hon. friend said is perfectly true. My hon. friend would like to convey the idea that that immense increase of over 1028 per cent is due to the transfer of these services. But let me tell him how much the Department of Public Works has cost the country, although this work has been transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

In 1896 the cost of the Department of Public Works was $1,299,769. Since that time a portion of the work of the Public Works Department has been transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries; but notwithstanding that, the cost of the Department of Public Works last year was $7,484,716, or an increase of 476 per cent over the cost of that department under the previous administration. I would be very glad if my hon. friend would explain in detail the reason of that enormous increase. The hon. gentleman does not want to hear about the 'Arctic' expedition. It was said in a confidential way to a member of the opposition that it would cost about $10,000, and we are to-day up against an expenditure of half a million dollars for that business. According to the revelations which have come out, under oath, at the Public Accounts Committee, this is a useless and reckless expenditure, showing the people of Canada that they

cannot be too inquisitive when the Department of Marine and Fisheries is asking this House to vote more money. Although my hon. friend is not responsible for this, it has been proved before the Public Accounts Committee that middlemen have made as much as 187 per cent profit on supplies which they have sold to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Are we not justified in being inquisitive before we grant any money to that department ? I am sorry for my hon. friend, because we are of the same blood. He accuses the hon. member for North Toronto of trying to injure his health, of wishing to make him sick. There is no such idea in the mind of the hon. member for North Toronto or in the mind of any other man on this side of the House. We are doing a duty, and it is a painful duty; it is no pleasure to any man to sit here for fifty or sixty hours. If my hon. friend laid on the table every possible letter, account and voucher required to enlighten the House when he puts his estimates before us, they would all have been passed long ago. There is no use of thinking that one side of the House can bulldose the other side. This is a serious matter; it is not a matter of hard-headedness; it is a matter of duty. Unless the leaders of the two sides can come to an understanding, which could be done without reflecting on the honour of any one, we shall separate to-night at twelve o'clock, and commence again on Tuesday afternoon. I may say that certain papers, after having been demanded for the last two days, were put on the desk of my hon. friend from North Toronto, and they were in French. I have always been strict in asking that every document laid before the House should be printed in both languages. While I have demanded that on behalf of the French minority, it is equally important in the interests of the English majority, that all these documents should be in English, as a good many of the hon. gentlemen here cannot read French. The hon. minister should know that he cannot carry his estimates unless he puts before the House all the papers required to discuss those estimates in an intelligent way. I call upon my hon. friend to grant what is asked—to lay before the House all the accounts, vouchers and papers required; and if he has not the papers relating to the item before the committee, let that stand, and let him take an item that is not contentious.

Mr. FIELDING. We offered that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, another department.

Mr. BERGERON. Anything that will bring the matter to a conclusion.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend made an offer which is fair and reasonable. His suggestion is that we should take up some items which are not contentious and let this stand. I suggested many hours ago that we take any two or three items of a non-contentious character in the minister's department, and after passing those, close the sitting. That is a good suggestion of my hon. friend, and we will be glad to accept it.

Mr. BENNETT. Last night the whole defence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for this extraordinary expenditure for expert accountants was based upon the statement that there were certain places where articles were manufactured for the department, and that it was necessary to have the services of these accountants in establishing a proper system of book-keeping in order to ascertain the cost of these articles. Now, what happened in Ontario two years ago in connection with the accounts of the Central prison ? Mr. Hanna, on coming into office, found a condition of things that was assuming serious proportions. He at once secured the services of a first-class accountant in the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, in the United States; and in the public accounts of Ontario for the year 1907 will be found at page 15 this item :

Thorne, L. E. C., services as accountant at $200 per month, $2,350; travelling expenses, $48.65; total, $2,398.65.

What were the capabilities of this gentleman, Mr. Thorne ? They were such that he had been the accountant of a concern at Port Huron, opposite Sarnia, which had an output of $1,200,000 a year; and by that means he became known to Mr. Hanna. Compare that with the bagatelle productions at Sorel. For that expenditure of $2,398 the province of Ontario got a great deal more service than this government got from these accountants at a cost of $50,000. The members of the opposition in the local House thought they saw a scandal in the employment of this accountant, and called for an investigation by the Public Accounts Committee. The report of that investigation will be found in the journals of the Ontario legislature. The examination was conducted by Mr. A. G. Mackay, now leader of the opposition, and what was he able to establish ? Utterly unable to show that this Mr. Thorne was not a competent man, but dazzled by the immense knowledge he showed of the intricacies of all kinds of book-keeping, Mr. Mackay was forced to ask such innocent and childinsh questions as the following:

Q. Are you a British subject?—A. No, sir.
Q. Have you taken the oath of allegiance?—A. No, sir.
By Mr. Mackay:
Q. If you remain in the service of this province, do you intend to take it?—A. I may. I do not know that I intend to remain in the service of the province very long.

Further on Mr. Mackay, when he found that he could not attack the knowledge of this gentleman as a first-class book-keeper, took a new line and asked this question :

Q. It is due to ask you, is it true that you keep an American flag floating over your desk in the office?—A. No, I did once, for nearly a week—a little flag about that long.
Q. Did you have any one make any objection to it?—A. No, I never did.
By Mr. Hanna:
Q. How high was it?—A. About an inch or an inch and a half.

That expenditure in Ontario was an honest expenditure under an honest government; while the reason this payment of $50,000 to these imported accountants is looked on with suspicion is that nobody believes that they were ever paid this sum, but that a great part of it went to some person at present unknown.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister has not yet answered the question of my hon. friend as to the purpose to which this money is to be devoted.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WHITE. I did not intend taking any part in this debate, but after having seen the government so persistently refuse to bring down the information to which the opposition are entitled, I think it is necessary that I should say a few words in support of the position taken by this side of the House in vindication of our constitutional rights. We have made the government an offer which they had no reason to refuse. We offered to go on with the estimates of any other department and let the estimates of the Department of Marine and Fisheries stand over until the minister brings down the information we require and to which we are entitled. That request having been refused, I submit that we are perfectly warranted in upholding the sound constitutional principle that the House should not be asked to vote any supplies, concerning which essential information is not given.

Mr. FIELDING. Just before six o'clock a suggestion was made by an hon. member of the opposition that we should suspend the consideration of this item and pass one or two non-contentious items of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and then close the sitting. I only wish to say that if my hon. friend opposite is disposed to adhere to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Beauharnois, we shall be very happy to accept it.

Mr. SPROULE. I have only to say that we have been making an endeavour for quite a length of time to do otherwise; that is, to get such information as we want, and then to dispose of all the items, which we could do in a very short time.

Mr. FIELDING. I only wish to intimate our willingness to accept that suggestion.

Mr. SPROULE. I desire for a moment to show what is said by parliamentary authorities. I am quoting from 'Todd's Parliamentary Government in England' :

The member of the administration who is charged with the duty of representing the particular department on behalf of which the grants are proposed, first explains to the committee whatever may be necessary to satisfy them as to the general expediency and propriety of the class of estimates under consideration, and then proceeds to propose each grant in succession.

I wish first to draw attention to the fact that we have not a minister here to-night to make an explanation, nor his deputy, who is usually at hand to give information which the minister could not be expected to have. Therefore parliament is not following the well-understood practice, both in England and in Canada, in voting Supplies. At the commencement of this debate I put the question whether any other member of the cabinet was prepared to take his place. To that I got no reply. It was the usual practice for a minister to have in his hands a synopsis of the estimates he proposes to the House, why the money is wanted and how it is to be expended ; also what disposal was made of the money voted for the same purpose in the previous year. It is the duty of the opposition to make all such inquiries so as to satisfy themselves that the expenditure was properly made and that there is a good reason for voting a further amount. In none of these respects has the usual practice been followed in regard to the item under consideration.

We have been twitted with holding up this House. We said, and we repeat, we do not want to be over-exacting. Let the minister give us what information he can give. Sir Richard Cartwright, when a minister in this House, used to give us all the information he had, and when he had no more he threw himself upon the generosity of the House. And no man ever got his estimates through more easily. The same may be said of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). That right hon. gentleman seems to take special care to inform himself of the affairs of his department. I sometimes do not know whether the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has not the information or whether, having the information, he does not wish to give it. He seems to depend upon jollying the House along, giving comparatively no information. I sometimes think he could give us ten times as much if he desired. I do not want to do him an injustice——

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is mistaken. I have never refused information. It has sometimes happened that when we are discussing one item and information was desired concerning another I have asked hon. gentlemen to postpone their questions until the officers connected with the service could be present and I could have the information at hand.

Mr. SPROULE. We are supposed to be in the hon. minister's items for the last time. It looks as if we were to be jollied along as we were last year. Of course, I accept the hon. gentleman's statement that he does not intend to deny us any information. But I do not see how he can escape the other horn of the dilemma, which is that he has not the information, and that is not very creditable to a minister of the Crown. Contrast him, for instance, with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). We ask that hon. gentleman one question and he will talk for an hour—he seems to be a perpetual stream of information. If there is any obstruction of his estimates it comes from himself, but it is obstruction which is, in a way, creditable, as he shows a willingness and ability to give us information. But from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries we receive but the merest modicum of information. I would advise that hon. gentleman to take a day off and with his deputy go over the book prepared for his use in getting his estimates through. But it is because we do not get the information to which we are entitled that we are unwilling to allow his estimates to go through. Though I am not authorized to speak for any but myself, yet I think I speak the wish of every hon. member on this side when I say that if the minister will give us the necessary papers and let us have time to examine them we can make short work of his estimates. We do not want to delay him, but we want to do our duty. And we are prevented from doing it by the government and its friends, who render practically nugatory the functions of an opposition in this House.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before entering on the subject directly before the House, I desire to refer to a statement made a short time ago by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) replying to a statement made by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). The hon. member for Beauharnois was mistaken in the statement he made. What the opposition did offer was that if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) would allow his estimates to stand then the Minister of Agriculture or some other minister could proceed with his estimates, pass a few items and let the committee rise, but on no account would the opposition agree to allow any small item of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to pass until the information was brought down.

Mr. FIELDING. My statement did not pretend to report anything said by the opposition generally. I referred to a statement made, shortly before six o'clock, by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), a distinguished member of the opposition, and what he said was exactly what I said a moment ago, and in that statement he proposed what we were willing to accept.

Mr. HENDERSON. I quite agree that that is exactly what my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) said and understood, not having been in the House, that that was the proposition made in the early part of the debate by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I only regret to say that he was labouring under a mistake. He did not understand exactly the proposition that was made and consequently the Minister of Finance should not desire to take any advantage of what was said by the hon. member for Beauharnois because he thought that he was repeating what had been offered before. As a matter of fact he was not. It was distinctly understood that on no consideration could any minor item of the estimates of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries be taken up and allowed to pass even if he did allow the larger item to stand. Why? Because these items are all associated with each other. Every item in the estimates of the minister is associated with that one item in regard to expert accountants. That permeates the whole department, because the money that was expended for that purpose was money that was expended on other branches in connection with the minister's department. Consequently it was impossible that the opposition could accept the proposition that one or two minor items should be allowed to pass and that the committee should then rise.

Mr. FIELDING. He did not claim to be repeating anything; he made the statement for himself.

Mr. HENDERSON. I beg now to say that he was simply repeating what he understood was a proposition that was made before. I am quite sure that the hon. member for Beauharnois would corroborate what I say if he were in his place now. My hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. White) read some speeches that were delivered some years ago in reference to an expedition to discover the North Pole, and amongst other speeches was one which was delivered by myself. I was not then ashamed of it; neither am I now. My proposition was that an expedition should be fitted out to go in search of the North Pole that would not cost this country one dollar. We are spending $800,000 or $900,-

000 every year for immigration. I simply said that we might take $100,000 out of the vote for immigration, give it to Capt. Bernier to fit up a boat and that if Capt. Bernier discovered the North Pole it would advertise Canada more throughout the known world than all the money that we spend year after year for immigration.

A good deal has been said of what becomes of all the money. In the ten years ending with 1896 the total revenue from taxation was $287,931,372. Ten years later the total taxation of Canada amounted to $430,399,933, or an increase of $142,468,561. In 1906 the taxation on tobacco alone was $1,832,000 more than it would have been under the tariff of the previous government. In the late revision of the tariff there was added to the duty on raw sugar what would have produced $343,811 more than if that increased taxation had not been added. I give these two items as an illustration of how the taxation of the country is being gradually increased. In the five years ending with 1896 the average taxation under customs duties was $19,625,000; for the next five years it was $24,659,000, and for the next five years, ending 1906, it was $39,479,000. For all purposes, for the three different periods I have named the average taxation was, for the five years ending 1896, $27,000,000; for the five years ending 1901, $34,000,000, and for five years ending 1906, $52,000,000. These figures show the enormously increased taxation that has been imposed upon the people year after year. The people apparently have submitted to it. What they will do when they come to understand it better——

Mr. TALBOT. I rise to a point of order. I would like you, Mr. Chairman, to decide whether the hon. gentleman has the right to go over all this rambling about taxation for the last 25 years. Is it pertinent to the question before you?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman is enlarging upon the subject.

Mr. HENDERSON. Very well, I will not further proceed with it because I had just got through with that part of my discourse. If the hon. gentleman had raised the point of order a few minutes before he might perhaps have interfered with my address. What becomes of all this money? I am going to give the expenditure as a whole and then I shall come down to a few items of expenditure. In the five years ending 1896, when the Conservative party went out of power, the average expenditure was $37,000,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman has the idea of sending a vessel to the North Pole?

Mr. HENDERSON. If the hon. minister will read the speech which I delivered here a few years ago, he will find exactly what my views with respect to that question were. In that speech I did not advocate sending an expedition to the Hudson bay and to the islands to the north of that bay. What I advocated was the sending of an expedition through Behring strait, through the Arctic ocean and back by way of Greenland, with a view to discovering the pole. That was the purpose with which I delivered that speech. I stand by that speech yet, and would be glad to see the minister make a grant of money for carrying out that idea. One consideration I had in view was that if a Canadian navigator discovered the North Pole, he would plant the British flag there and take possession in the name of the King of every bit of land that lay between the Pole and Canada as now known. But I protest, in the name of the people of Canada, against the extravagance and waste indulged in by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in connection with the expedition he sent out. To give an illustration, I may say that eighty suits of blue pilot cloth and eighty-seven dozen shirts and drawers were purchased for thirty-four men. Does the hon. member for Bellechasse think that a proper expenditure?

Mr. TALBOT. If the hon. gentleman were only fair and would use a little common sense, he would know that they were bought for the crew.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not endowed with that amount of common sense which the hon. member for Bellechasse thinks he possesses.

Mr. TALBOT. We will lend you some.

Mr. HENDERSON. I appreciate the offer, but I would not appreciate the sense very much.

Mr. DEVLIN. For what period of time were these articles obtained?

Mr. HENDERSON. I understood that the 'Neptune' was to go out during the year and furnish additional supplies. Bear in mind that this was not to be a three-year cruise, but just an expedition for twelve months.

Mr. BRODEUR. No; it was for three years. My hon. friend has only to consult the investigation which took place. I see that my hon. friend is quoting from a pamphlet issued by the Conservative party.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the time of the House would be better occupied in discussing the item under consideration.

Mr. HENDERSON. It appears that the eighty-seven shirts and drawers were not sufficient for a crew of thirty-four men, for they had to come back in fifteen or sixteen months.

Mr. DEVLIN. Were they bought for the crew or for distribution at different ports?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not aware that the Minister of Marine was sending out an expedition to distribute charity to the people of that northern country. If it was his intention to give these goods away to the Indians or the Esquimaux, he should have first asked the consent of this House to spend the money of the country for that purpose.

Mr. DEVLIN. Does not the hon. gentleman know that a great many of them were for distribution at the Northwest Mounted Police posts?

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not know that, nor do I think it is correct. The Northwest Mounted Police are supplied by the government under a different department. We find here an item of eighty sleeping bags at $25 each. There were thirty-four sailors, and they managed to crawl into eighty bags. There were five hundred Havana cigars at ten cents each—good brands.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. There were no cigarettes?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes; there were five thousand cigarettes.

Mr. DEVLIN. Does the hon. gentleman smoke?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, I have smoked for over fifty years.

Mr. DEVLIN. Cigars?

Mr. HENDERSON. No; I do not smoke cigars.

Mr. DEVLIN. Then the hon. gentleman is not a judge of the quality of the cigars.

Mr. HENDERSON. If the hon. gentleman wants to treat me to a cigar, I will never refuse. If he comes around some day with a fine cigar, I will give him my opinion of it.

Mr. DEVLIN. If my hon. friend will come out now, I will do so.

Mr. HENDERSON. I shall be very glad to accompany my hon. friend after I get through; and if he has five, or ten, or five hundred cigars, I shall be very happy to assist him in smoking them. But I will say this: Don't offer me a cigarette, because I agree with the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) that cigarettes are poisonous.

I am going to make this statement and I am going to make it with a full consciousness of what I am saying. I do not blame the Minister of Marine or the minister of any other department for the extravagant wastefulness that is going on or for all the scandals that had been perpetrated in this country during the last four or five years. I do not blame the head of the department or even the men who are under him so strongly as I do the right hon. gentleman who is at the head of the government of Canada. I have often heard it said in the country that you cannot point to any wrong doing of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. Hon. gentlemen say 'hear, hear,' but who is the man who controls the whole lot? Who is the man that, if he held up his little finger, could stop the whole machinery of iniquity?—the right hon. gentleman. The right hon. gentleman can dismiss these men from office and if he does not he must be held directly responsible for the extravagance and waste which have been going on in this country for the last eight or ten years. Mr. Chairman, I have to thank you and the hon. members in this House for listening to me. This is a debate that will be remembered by the people of the country for a long time. the reports of this debate will go out into the country, they will be read and the people will wonder what it all means. To my mind it is an eye-opener and the results that will flow from the discussions that have taken place here during the last few days will be for the weal or woe of this government and hon. gentlemen will have to take the consequences.

Mr. STAPLES. The constituency which I represent is made up largely of industrious and intelligent farmers, who expect me to inquire very closely into the public expenditures of this government, and I believe I shall have no trouble in justifying to them the course taken by the opposition on this particular item of $50,000 to pay the expense of maintaining certain vessels to explore the northern waters of Canada. In this connection I want to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a question. On page P—60 of the Auditor General's Report there is an account relating to a snag boat which has been constructed on the Red river near the city of Selkirk. I would like to know if that boat comes under the jurisdiction of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BRODEUR. It certainly does not come under this vote.

Mr. STAPLES. Does it come under the hon. minister's department?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think so.

Mr. STAPLES. I would suggest that a portion of this appropriation be expended in equipping that boat in order that it may patrol the waters from the Red river going up through the chain of lakes and eventually down through the Churchill river, in order that we may get valuable information regarding that particular country.

Mr. BUREAU. It is refreshing to see that the hon. member for North Toronto

(Mr. Foster) has decided to turn a new leaf. This afternoon he apologized to the Minister of Marine for having treated him rather harshly during this debate, and to-night as an indication, possibly, of the sense of the injustice he has committed and of his obligation to make some reform, he gives another indication of his change of mind by appearing in a new suit of clothes. Let us hope he has discarded the old one completely and that his change of disposition has become equally permanent. There is an old saying that the tailor makes the man. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on his tailor. He has worked a reform in our hon. friend which no amount of argument could accomplish. When driven to the wall by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), who showed that the hon. gentleman had two weights and two measures in this discussion, he did not try to justify what was quoted against him by the hon. minister from the 'Hansard' of 1892, but instead he called on the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to explain how it happens that he has also changed his mind and is now approving of the expenditure of public money on one purpose out of an appropriation voted for another, which method he had formerly so strongly condemned.

The explanation has been given that when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) left to attend the imperial conference, as we were in the midst of a session and no money had been voted to defray the expenses in connection with that conference, the minister took upon himself, perhaps on the advice of his officers—who, the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) says, are part of the administration and who often give advice to ministers upon which they are obliged to rely—took from the appropriation for ice-breakers the sum of $2,000. The minister did use some of that money for the purposes of the ice-breaker service, for he has told us that he went to Germany to investigate this subject. This was a necessary preliminary to beginning the building or purchase of ice-breakers. These facts are known to the House. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who is an old parliamentarian and who has been a minister and knows the questions with which a minister must deal, criticised the minister severely. I am glad that he has withdrawn part of the language he used. He has withdrawn the word 'steal' as applied to taking money from one appropriation to use for the purpose of another. He has withdrawn also the charge made against the minister in the heat of debate that he had used money for his personal purposes, but it was a conditional withdrawal. At the same sitting on February 27, according to 'Hansard,' the hon. gentleman, after being charged by the minister with making a vicious attack upon him—and I think it may be so characterized, because the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), when he came to his sober senses, found he had gone a little too far. But still he said he could prove this thing and was going to prove it. He said:

I may have said in the heat of debate more than I would otherwise have said, but the essence of what I said I will prove. It may be a little too strong to say he was using it for his own purposes, but I will say that it is not used for public purposes and it is kept by the minister in his own pocket or private account.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. The explanation was made and accepted at the time. And if I understand the ruling given by the chairman, nobody has a right to receive it and to quote from 'Hansard' to bolster up his argument. He must accept the statement. He cannot do indirectly, what he is not allowed to do directly.

Mr. BUREAU. I accepted his statement. I congratulated him on having made it. Surely I have the right to quote from 'Hansard'——

Mr. SPROULE. I ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman, as to whether the hon. gentleman can bolster up his arguments by going again over the same subject.

Mr. FIELDING. If it were a question of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) meant, I would agree. But surely the hon. member (Mr. Bureau) has a right to read from 'Hansard.' Of course if he undertakes to give an explanation which involves a refusal to accept the statement of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), there would be something in the point.

Mr. SPROULE. For what purpose is he reading it except to show that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) said what he did not mean?

Mr. FIELDING. Whatever his purpose, that has not appeared, and if he quotes correctly from 'Hansard,' he is within the rules.

Mr. BUREAU. The statement having been read, is read. I do not see what harm is done——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule is clear.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) did not dispute the words of his explanation, which was accepted by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. But that acceptance surely would not deny the hon. member (Mr. Bureau) the right to quote his statements as made.

Mr. SPROULE. But it would deny him the right to bolster up an argument contrary to the ruling of the chair.

Mr. FOSTER. There were only two statements I made. One is that the statement in which I used the words 'steal'—not in the sense the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) tried to make the House believe I used it. I explained that and gave the word I would substitute for it. That settled that. And, even if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bureau) reads from another place in 'Hansard'—for he says I repeated the statement—my explanation applies to that in the same way. It is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who stated he was satisfied with that. After the minister made his statement, it was taken up by the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin).

Mr. BUREAU. I claim the floor, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FOSTER. I am speaking to the point of order.

Mr. PATERSON. It has been decided.

Mr. FOSTER. But the Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau) does not propose to stand by the decision.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Wright endeavoured to put another meaning on my words, and now the Solicitor General, declaring that he accepts the statement, still refers to the matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER—I suppose the hon. gentleman understands the rule.

Mr. FOSTER. If he understands it, that is all right.

Mr. BUREAU. I made the statement that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries brought to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Foster's) attention the view he took of these matters in 1892, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) tried to show that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) thought otherwise. Let me explain how he did it. That is one of the great acrobatic feats of the member for North Toronto—to shift an answer by asking a question. I would call the attention of the committee to 'Hansard' of 1892, volume 1, column 285. A question came up on this item:

Department of Finance and Treasury Board —contingencies, $9,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The intention of the vote was never thoroughly carried out, though it is at present. But as we had not a surplus in the strictly proper appropriation, I thought it just as well to take the money out of that vote.

There is no pretense that there was anything that could be applicable to anything that the hon. gentleman was going to do.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that while the expenses of the Finance Minister to Washington are charged to commercial agencies, those of Sir Charles Tupper are charged to miscellaneous charges. How is that?

Mr. FOSTER. It really makes very little difference, I suppose, to what they are charged as they all come out of the same pocket.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of course it is public money, and in that respect it does not make any difference. But the vote for commercial agencies was intended to facilitate our foreign trade.

Mr. FOSTER. The items are perfectly correct, then?

I ask the hon. gentleman where is the change in this position. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs does not answer that he has grown older. This is just sixteen years ago but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) says: I have changed my mind; I said that in a moment of weakness.

Mr. FOSTER. I said no such thing. The hon. gentleman is attributing words to me that I did not use and I require that he shall take them back.

Mr. BUREAU. The hon. gentleman says—

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for your ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A statement made by an hon. member must be accepted.

Mr. BUREAU. I am willing to take the hon. gentleman's statement. If he did not use the words he conveyed that impression and that is what he intended to do. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs stands to-day exactly on the same ground as that on which he stood at that time. He said: It is public money, you expended it, you accounted for the money, we are satisfied that whether it comes under the heading of contingencies or under another heading it is all right. But, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) does not adopt the same language to-day. That hon. gentleman has sent through the press the statement that he has made. He has become indignant over the fact that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, about to leave on a six months trip, has taken $600 or $900—I forget which—for his expenses, that in doing this he has committed a crime, that he has applied money to that purpose which was voted for another purpose, and that as a matter of principle and because of their rights under the constitution they will refuse to vote this estimate to my hon. friend. But what have these hon. gentlemen done and said? They have done and said exactly the same thing. If remorse has come to the soul of the sub-leader of the opposition and if he has made up his mind to retract I cannot say as much for the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). That hon. gentleman is not so particular about his charges. He makes the statement that things disappeared from the Speaker's apartments

at the time my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was Speaker of this House. When asked what has disappeared, how does he know, on what does he base his statement, he says that they are based or mere rumour and that he has been credibly informed. I think that any hon. member who makes a statement based on mere rumour or credible information ought to be ashamed to make known the names of the persons on whose authority he makes this accusation or to disclose the documents by which he has so credibly informed himself. If we were to proceed on the same theory, if we were to listen to all the rumours we hear on the street and inside of this House, if we were to come here and make statements against hon. gentlemen opposite there would be a fine state of things. We have heard about a trip that the hon. member for North Toronto made to Washington, and I have heard that the three ministers who went upon that journey got into a wrangle as to how the expenses should be divided up amongst the three of them. Whether that is so I do not know. I do not know what reason there was for refusing the demand of the hon. member for North Toronto for such a division. Perhaps it was that the hon. gentleman spent less than the others.

Mr. FIELDING. Whatever other difference we may have in this House, I think we will all agree that it is not desirable that we should sit on the Sabbath. No doubt there will be opportunity in the following days to take up and discuss these questions and I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) to yield the floor in order that I may move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. We will now just have time to get to our homes before Sunday.

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House adjourns may I ask if the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will now lay on the table of the House the return that was ordered on the 8th December and which he said to-day he had with him ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think I will lay the papers on the table on Monday. It is getting late.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.55 p.m., Saturday.

INDEX

FOURTH SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT, 1907-1908.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remarks or debate; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B.C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Conside; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-west Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques-Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y.N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

ADAMSON, Mr. A. J., *Humboldt.*

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s (B. 82) 1°*, 1732 (i); in Com., 4996 (iii); on Senate Amts., 10511 (iv).

Northern Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 7) 1°*, 231 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8583 (v).

Timber Limits, Leasing, of, &c., Com. of Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2276 (ii).

ALCORN, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward, Ont.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4401 (iii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv), 8552 (v).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5955; Section of House of Commons Act (read) 5955 (iii).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1843 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 80) 1° m., 1671 (i); 2° m., 5228 (iii).

—— B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7890 (iv), 11753 (vi); in Com., 11812, 11840, (amt.) 11846, 11927 (vi); in Com., 12939 (vii); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 13254 (vii).

Immigration Agent A. G. McDonald, Payments *re* Placing of Immigrants (M. for cor.*) 4773 (iii).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12402 (vii).

ALCORN, Mr. G. O.—*Con.*

McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants, &c. (Ques.) 8617 (v).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7231; on M. for 3°, 7222 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9498 (v).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11998 (vi).

Ry. Connections, &c. (remarks) 434 (i).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9969; (relief to settlers) 9985 (v).

Indians, Ont and Que. (land sales) 12735 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (patrol boats) 4750 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (obstructions) 3213; (tidal services) 3215; (wrecks) 3202 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5528 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cumberland) 10865 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10899 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8530 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax, customs) 7163; (Halifax, military) 7144; (Shelburne) 7177 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph armoury) 7680; (Kincardine) 7699; (Kingston gun shed) 7701; (London military) 7708; (North Bay) 7713 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Museum) 1498 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8594 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte) 12092 (vii); (Point Edward) 5713; (Stanley island pier) 5722 (iii).

ALCORN, Mr. G. O.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—I.C.R. (St. Cyrille diversion) 12757 (vii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10544 (vi).

AMES, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Accountants, Payments to by Dept. of Justice (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

Advertisements for Tenders of Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).

Albert Development Co., Control of Coal Lands (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

All-Red Line, Mr. White's Duties in England (Ques.) 694 (i).

Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Emplymt. in Customs, Montreal, Charges against (Ques.) 1347 (i).

Boyle Concession, Memorials from Dawson Legislature (Ques.) 509, 562, 681 (i).

Census Map, Publishing of (Ques.) 4406 (iii).

Central Ry. of Canada, Charter Grant, Deposit *re* (Ques.) 4767 (iii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10744 (vi).

Cloutier, J. E., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 8380 (v).

Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 5469 (iii).

—— Agency of M. McKenzie and J. H. Moss, Applications, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

—— Held by F. E. Keniston, Cor., Papers, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

—— Name and Address of Agents *re* Applications, &c. (Ques.) 5789 (iii).

Coal Lands, Applicants, Names, Price, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3434 (ii).

Coal Lands in Alberta and Sask., Total Area sold, &c. (Ques.) 9278 (v.)

—— Royalty Fees, &c., Sale or Lease of (Ques.) 11019 (vi).

Coal Lands, Disposed of by Govt., Original Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 3232, 3480 (ii).

—— Purchase Price, &c., on Section 16, 20 and 21, &c. (Ques.) 10512 (vi).

—— sold, or assigned, &c., since March, 1907 (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

—— Sale of through J. W. Bettes, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6242 (iv).

—— sold by P. E. Lessard (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

—— Sale by McGivern & Hayden (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

—— in Sections 2, 4, 9, 15, 17 and 28, First Applicants, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).

—— in Section 13, First Applicants, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3851 (ii).

AMES, Mr. H. B. —*Con.*

Coal Mining Privileges in Sections 11, Applications, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 3850 (ii).

Coal Mining in Sask. and Alberta, Returns made to Govt., &c. (Ques.) 10257 (v).

Customs Frauds, in Montreal, Complaints *re* Compromises (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9558 (v).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers (M. for ret.) 1132; (reply) 1196; Amt. neg. (Y. 51; N. 86) 1201 (i).

Documents, Original, Examination of by Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 3853 (ii).

—— Production to Members, on M. for Sup., 1775, 1806 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11817; (amt.) 11821 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11137; in Com., 11189, 11423 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4678 (iii); in Com., 10761 (vi).

Favoured Nation Treatment, Conventions *re* Commercial Relations, &c. (Ques.) 846 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1408 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Products enjoying benefit of Minimum Tariff, &c. (M. for ret.) 851 (i).

—— Correction of Question *re* Sir Charles Tupper's Expenses, 1424 (i).

—— Favoured Nation Clause; and Foreign Powers, &c. (Ques.) 845 (i).

—— German Surtax, Effect, &c. (Ques.) 844 (i).

—— Imports from U.S., Exclusion of, &c. (Ques.) 845 (i).

—— Preferential Tariff, Names of Countries, &c. (Ques.) 844 (i).

Fishing Privileges granted in Clearwater, &c., Lakes, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

—— on Lesser Slave Lake, Date of Lease, Protest, &c. (Ques.) 6398 (iv).

Gaetz Brothers, Payments to (Ques.) 10514 (vi).

G. T. P. Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10772 (vi).

G. T. P. Prohibition Zone, Reduction of, &c. (Ques.) 516 (i).

Grazing Leases, Application of Messrs. Woods, Fleck and Finnie (Ques.) 238 (i).

Homestead Application of Mr. John C. Haddock, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 181, 11197 (vi).

Homestead Entries in Man., &c., Total Acreage (Ques.) 6929 (iv).

Homesteading in Section 18, Extension *re* Allowance, &c. (Ques.) 8381 (v).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Hough, Campbell and Ferguson, Sales of Lands to, &c. (Ques.) 364, 568 (i).
Immigrant Bonuses, Increase to Agents, &c. (Ques.) 3429 (ii).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4673 (iii).
Lake Megantic Public Works, Total Cost to date, &c. (Ques.) 11299 (vi).
Land Grants to Rys., Selection, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 4766 (iii).
See 'Rys.', &c.
Lands leased by Govt. in Section 11, Twp. 8, Original Grantee, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).
Land Patents, Section 8, Twp. 53, &c., Occupation of Present Owner, &c. (Ques.) 3430 (ii).
McGuire, ex-chief Justice, Superannuation of, &c. (Ques.) 10514 (vi).
Mining, Surface or Timber Rights, on Section 8, Applications, &c. (M. for copies*) 3850 (ii).
Montreal Examining Warehouse, Valuations, Reps., Cor., Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).
Patent and Proprietary Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 2°, 10553 (vi).
Peace River Colonization and Land Development Co., Surveys, Reps., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
Quarantine Lands, Sask., Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 3481 (ii).
Ry. Charters and Land Grants, Renewals of (Ques.) 9271 (v).
——— Amounts and Names of Cos. (Ques.) 9271 (v).
Railway Land Grants in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Total Acreage, &c. (Ques.) 6920 (iv).
See 'Lands.'
Ry. Subsidies in Land, Areas for 1892-6 (Ques.) 8613 (v).
Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4662 (iii).
See 'Documents.'
Robbins Irrigation Co., Amount expended to Date (Ques.) 4763 (iii).
——— (M.) for Papers, 5210 (iii).
St. Andrews Rapids Improvements, Land Grant to Great Falls Power Co. (Ques.) 238 (i).
Sessional Paper No. 167b, brought down April 26 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).
Sessional Paper No. 207 *re* Fishing Leases (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9538 (v).
Dom. Lands (surveys) 9996 (v).
Marine (ice breakers) 1895 (i).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dominion arsenal) 7434; (Montreal, barracks) 7408; (Montreal examining warehouse) 7424; (Montreal, post office) 7410; (Montreal, station B) 7419; (Montreal, station C) 7420; (Nicolet) 7428; (Pointe St. Charles) 7419; (St. Rochs) 7439 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 11693 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 11686; (Madawaska) 11696 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. Lake Ainslie) 11228; (McPherson's Cove) 11229; (Margaree) 11229; (Middle River) 11229; (New Glasgow) 11257; (Oyster Pond) 11258; (Parker's Cove) 11258; (Parrsborough) 11259; (Porter's lake) 11260; (Port Hilford) 11267; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hood) 11268; (Pugwash) 11280; (Round Hill) 11281; (Tancook island) 11230 (vi).
Taché, J. C., Emplmt. in Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 8180 (iv).
Timber Berths, Leasing, &c., Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2269 (ii).
Timber Berths, 1046, &c., Original Applications (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).
——— No. 1100, Area, &c. (Ques.) 364 (i).
——— No. 1168, Area, &c. (Ques.) 363 (i).
——— No. 1279, Applications, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).
Timber Lands, Sale or Lease subsequent to Ret. of April, 1907 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3580 (ii).
Timber Leases, *re* Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8711 (v).
Timber Licenses in Man. and N. W. Ters., Renewals, &c., Total Areas, &c. (Ques.) 691 (i).
Timber Licenses issued in Man. and N. W. T. during 1896-7 (Ques.) 2396 (ii).
Timber Limits, Disposal of Ques. of Priv., *re* Mr. Turriff's Charges, 2309 (ii).
Timber Permits to Settlers *re* cutting, in Twp. 39, Range 11 (Ques.) 11495 (vi).
Water-power Privileges in Alberta, &c., Sale or Leases (Ques.) 8378 (v).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10535 (vi).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E., *Lambton, East.*
Absinthe and Brandy Importations, Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 689 (i).
Address, The, 335, 366; (amt.) 380; Neg. (Y. 54; N. 103) 505 (i).
Advertisement for Tenders, for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4735 (iii).
Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3878 (ii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

'Arctic' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4030 (ii).

Atlantic Steamers Mail Service, Cost per Annum (Ques.) 5656 (iii).

Barlow, Dr. A. E., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ques.) 5205 (iii).

——— Payments *re* Temagami District, 5787 (iii).

——— Survey *re* Temagami District (Ques.) 5473 (iii).

Bayfield, &c., Ret., Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).
See 'Docks,' &c.

Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 6104 (iv).

Brock, Mr., Emplymt. *re* Geological Survey (Ques.) 5204 (iii).

Budget, The, 6046; (M.) to adjn. deb., 6054; rsmd., 6062 (iii).

Campaign Literature, sent by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10343 (vi).

Canada and France Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6164, 6196 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., Action of Govt., Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 2795 (ii).

——— Removal of, Action by Govt. since 1896 (Ques.) 2167 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 6223 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).

——— Par. in Montreal 'Gazette,' 13081 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5124 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11371 (vi).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9168 (v).

Cold Storage Shipments, Number for year ending March 1, 1908 (Ques.) 6403 (iv).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 11314 (vi).

Customs Officers at Niagara, Fort Erie, &c., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 6980 (iv).

Daley, Mr. R., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ques.) 5204, 5473 (iii).

Digby to Westport Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iv).

Docks, Piers, &c., constructed at Bayfield, Grand Bend, &c., Cor., &c., *re* (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).
See 'Bayfield,' 'Grand Bend.'

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, 1878 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8645 (v); in Com., 12971 (vii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5023 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Dowling, Mr. D. B., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ques.) 5206 (iii).

——— Emplymt. by German Development Co. (Ques.) 5564 (iii).
See 'German.

Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4584 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4585 (iii).

Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails, &c. (Ques.) 7731 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3605, 3637 (ii).

Fruit and Dairy Divisions, Separation of, &c., (Ques.) 2166 (ii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10554 (vi).

German Development Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10580 (vi).
See 'Dowling.'

German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 689 (i).

Geological Survey Department, Total Expenditure from 1896-1908 (Ques.) 6402 (iv).

Geological Survey Yacht, Use of (Ques.) 11231 (vi).

Grain Inspection in 1906, Total Expenditure, Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

Grand Bend Pier, Final Estimate of Chief Engineer Lafleur (Ques.) 8892 (v).

Grand Bend Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 5085 (iii).

——— Ret., Delays, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).

G. T. R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12062 (vii).

G. T. P., Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10772 (vi).

——— Supplies to Prince Rupert via American Routes (remarks) 9025 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10375 (vi).

'Graphite,' Cost of Publication, Total Value, &c. (Ques.) 5081 (iii).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6651 (iv).

Hay and Straw Embargo by G. B., &c. (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Immigrant Passages to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies (Ques.) 5468 (iii).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. for Sup., 11022 (vi).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13127 (vii).

Indian Lands and Islands owned by Indians, Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 5078 (iii).

——— Number of Acres sold since 1896, Total Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

I. C. R., Concrete Pipe, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 6640 (iv).

—— on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4428 (iii).

Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, Permission *re* (Ques.) 5079 (iii).

'Lady Evelyn' Str., Date and Place of Wintering, &c. (Ques.) 7936 (iv).
See 'Rimouski.'

Literature, &c., distributed through Mails (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9095 (v).

Mail Matters, Fradulent Weighing, Inspection of (Ques.) 4827 (iii).

Mail Matter mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 2214 (ii).

Mail Service in B. C., Improvements *re* (remarks) 3754 (ii).

Mail Steamer, Purchase of (Ques.) 4827 (iii).
See 'Lady Evelyn.'

Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 689 (i).

Meat Inspection Act and Packing Houses, Cor., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 4589 (iii).

Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities of, &c. (Ques.) 9274 (v).

Montreal Post Office, Extra Clerks, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9113 (v).

Newspapers, Postal Arrangements, &c.(Ques.) 6460 (iv).

North East Harobur Wharf, Total Length (Ques.) 11019 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10850 (vi).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii).

Postal Arrangements between U.S. and Canada, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 3885 (ii).

—— on Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).

—— (remarks) 3040 (ii).

Postal Note Business, Commission, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 9279 (v).

Postal Rates on N. S. Weekly Newspapers, Tel. *re* (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Postal Regulations *re* Weekly Newspapers, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5201 (iii).

Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy (Ques.) 352 (i).

—— (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).

—— (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 7257 (iv).

—— Improvements in, &c. (Ques.) 8891 (v).

—— Irregularities in Western Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).
See 'Rimouski.'

Postal Service Printing, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ques.) 5472 (iii).

Postal Service Return, Inquiry for, 4832 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10705 (vi).

Post Office Returns, Number, &c. (Ques.) 6405 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Change of Plans *re* Height of Span (Ques.) 5202 (iii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4969 (iii).

—— (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10640 (vi).

Red Head Wharf, N.S., Total Expenditure (Ques.) 11019 (vi).

Returns, Inquiry for, 2024 (ii).

—— Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4664 (iii).
See 'Documents.'

Rimouski, Dredging, &c., *re* Landing of Str. 'Lady Evelyn,' &c. (Ques.) 7727 (iv).
See 'Lady Evelyn.'

Rimouski Mail Contracts, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda' (Ques.) 8176 (iv).

Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office (Ques.) 11297 (vi).

Royal Mint, Amount of Silver and Gold Coins, &c. (Ques.) 8612 (v).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. Blain) in Com., 4580 (iii).

St. Joseph's Wharf, Ont., Tenders, &c., *re* Construction (Ques.) 8890 (v).
See 'Bayfield,' &c.

Sandy Cove, N.S., Mail Service, Tender *re* (Ques.) 8891 (v).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3786 (ii); in Com., 12622 (vii).

South Huron, By-Election, Amounts paid Returning Officer, &c. (Ques.) 9270 (v), 11935 (vi).

Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 2391 (ii).

Steamship Subsidies and Subventions, Total Amount paid for five years, &c. (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 671 (i); (dairying, &c.) 10399 (vi); (census, &c.) 674 (i); (exhibitions) 10577 (vi); (fumigating stations) 12879; (Meat and Canned Foods Act) 12894 (vii); (seed branch) 5560 (iii); (Year Book) 678 (i).

Canals (Port Colborne) 10312 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 623; Mines (salaries) 646 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8873 (v); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 651 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9227 (v).

Geological Survey (oil borings) 13163 (vii).

House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10504 (vi).

Indians—Generally (destitute, &c.) 5762 (iii); Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12748

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, rents, &c.) 5039; (aids to navigation) 5040, 5774; (Thunder Bay Ice-breaker) 5041 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson bay patrol) 4030, 4133 (ii).

Marine, &c.—Public Works (ship channel) 5035 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5749 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5764 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2942; (wrecks) 3149, 3209 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors) 9094; (stamps, &c.) 9111 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10872; (Victoria immigration) 10875 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886, 10887 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg hospital) 10966 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7135 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Markham) 7711; (North Bay) 7712, 7812; (Renfrew) 7825; (St. Mary's) 7826; (Sarnia) 7829 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11009; (lighting) 11011 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 7282; (Knowlton) 7290; (Lévis) 7295 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8586; (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. John) 12020 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Gore's Landing) 12101 (vii).

Railways (extra clerks) 10343 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5552 (iii), (supplies) 10193 (v).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10375 (vi).

AVERY, Mr. M., *Frontenac.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5123 (iii).

Hawkeye, Mr., Emplymnt. as Returning Officer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7251 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5529 (iii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2489, 2662 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B. (Minister of Justice) *North York, Ont.*

Accountants, Emplymt. and Payment by Dept. of Justice (Ans.) 3233 (ii).

Admiralty Jurisdiction Act Amt. (B. 122) prop. Res., 2881 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4835; 1°* of Bill, 4867 (iii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Anti-Cigarette Bill: *See* '*Tobacco.*'

B. C., Appeal Court (B. 165) prop. Res. 8185 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8465; 1° m., 8466 (v); 2°*, in Com., 10863 (vi).

——— M. to withdraw Res., 7992 (iv).

Badgley Island, Trespass of T. H. Jackman, Claims *re* (Ans.) 2218 (ii).

Belgian Syndicate, Commission *re* Investigation (Ans.) 842 (i).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. (B. 142) 1° m., 6054 (iii); in Com., 6520 (iv).

Binder Twine, Purchasers' Names and P.O. Addresses (Ans) 9715 (v).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3467 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 12909 (vii).

Brantford Stove Works Strike, Interpretation of Criminal Code (remarks) 9027 (v).

——— Cor. with Justice Dept. (Ans.) 10016

C. P. R. Taxation Cases, on Inquiry for Ret., 5049 (iii).

Cigarette and Tobacco Restraint Bill: *See* '*Tobacco.*'

Cimon, Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District (Ans.) 2978 (ii).

——— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence (Ans.) 2545 (ii).

——— Payments to *re* Travelling Expenses &c. (Ans.) 2978 (ii).

——— Residence *re* District (Ans.) 2218 (ii).

Civil Service Commission, Instructions to Judge Cassels, on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7505 (iv).

See '*Marine.*'

Criminal Code (Ry. mortgage) Amt. (B. 212) 1° m., 12919; on Senate Amts., 13316 (vii).

See '*Ry. Act.*'

Dominion Elections Act Amt. (B. 115) 1° m., 4566 (iii); 2° m., 7835 (iv), 11755; in Com., 11796, 11827 (vi), 12919; 3° m., 13229; on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13238; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) 13255; on Senate Amts., 13579 (vii).

——— (B. 115) Adjnd. debate, 11707 (vi).

Doukhobors, Tels. *re* Pardon by Justice Dept. (Ans.) 6983 (iv).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws, &c. (remarks) 7624 (iv).

Drysdale, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Accepting Appmt. (Ans.) 4768, 5084 (iii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5486 (iii).

Essex County Junior Judgeship, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 1940 (i).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. (B. 116) 1° m., 4576 (iii); in Com., 8401 (v).

Forbes, Mr. Justice, Personal Status, Apptmt., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., &c., 899 (i).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*
Forbes, Mr. Justice, Professional Status, &c. (Ans.) 3840 (ii).
——— Qualifications *re* Apptmt. (Ans) 2390 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 1861 (i).
Fraser, A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel for Purchase of Sussex St. Property (Ans.) 3478 (ii).
——— Payments *re* Legal Services, &c., (Ans.) 2979 (ii).
Gillis, Release from Penitentiary, (Ans.) 510 (i).
Govt. Officials as Political Partisans at Elections (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11903 (vi).
See 'St. Vincent de Paul.'
G. T. P., Commissions issued to Inspectors (remarks) 9716 (v).
——— Liquor, Prohibition of Sale, on Inquiry for Ret., 2024 (ii).
——— Madawaska Right of Way (remarks) 12661 (vii).
——— Policy *re* Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).
Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).
Japanese Immigration Acts, Disallowance of (Ans.) 6642 (iv).
Judges Salaries in Man. and Ont. (B. 206) prop. Res., 12392; in Com. on Res., 12551; 1° m., 12554; in Com., 13048 (vii).
Judges in Quebec Prov., Insufficient Number, Pets. from Bar (Ans.) 842 (i).
Juvenile Delinquents (B. 190) 1°*, 10915 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12399 (vii).
Kun, Agnes B., Release of (remarks) 9580 (v).
——— Letter laid on Table, 9710 (v).
Lacoste, Sir Alexander, Amount of Pension, &c. (Ans.) 1935 (i).
Legal Agents in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ans.) 4768 (iii).
——— for Govt. in P.E.I., Names, &c. (Ans.) 4764 (iii).
Lord's Day Act Violations at Ottawa, *re* Horse Racing on Sunday (remarks) 3753 (ii).
MacIlreith, Mr. R. T., Payments to for Legal Services (Ans.) 696 (i).
McGuire, ex-Chief Justice, Superannuation of (Ans.) 10514 (vi).
Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Delay in giving Judgments (Ans.) 2594 (ii).
Man. Appeal Act: *See* 'Winding-up Act.'
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt of Counsel, for Commission, on M. (Mr Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7360 (iv).
——— Counsel Fees (Ans.) 8838 (v).
AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Letter of Instruction to Mr. Watson laid on Table, 7621 (iv).
See 'Civil Service.'
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Opinions of Dept. of Justice, on M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).
Montreal Circuit Court Judges, Increase in Salary (remarks) in Com. on B. 206, 12553 (vii).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11990 (vi).
Northwest Territories Act Amt. (B. 210) 1° m., 12650; 2° m., in Com., 13051 (vii).
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of (Ans.) 516 (i).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals released since 1896, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2825 (ii).
——— Ret. (remarks) 9579 (v), 13081 (vii).
See 'Blunden.'
Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. (B. 166) 1°*, 8604 (v); 2° m., 10690; in Com., 10691 (vi).
Prisoners released, &c.: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'
Queebc Superior Court, Apptmt. of additional Judge (Ans.) 1288 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 206, 13048 (vii).
Ry. Act Amt. (B. 28) M. to wthdrw., 3579 (ii).
Railway Act (Commission, Ass't Chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4966 (iii).
Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10637; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 11590; Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) moved in Com., 11632 (vi).
Ry. Act (mortgages) Amt. (B. 204) 1° m., 12549; 2°*, in Com., 13046 (vii).
See 'Criminal Code.'
Revised Statutes, Completion of French Edition, &c. (Ans.) 6983 (iv).
St. Louis, Mr. H., Emplymt. in Justice Dept. (Ans.) 1347 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Officers and Municipal Elections (Ans.) 2791 (ii).
——— Holidays for Officials (Ans.) 2792 (ii).
Saskatchewan Legislature Acts, Reports *re* (Ans.) 6401 (iv).
——— Disallowance of (Ans.) 6644 (iv).
School Statutes, *re* Saskatchewan Prov., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to adjn., 6858 (iv).
Shepley, Mr. G. F., Payments to (remarks) 1112 (i).
Sudbury Court Judges, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 12413 (vii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Supreme Court Act Amt. (B. 121) 1° m., 4826; 2°*, in Com., 5497 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Justice (Dominion Police) 5509; (Exchequer Court) 5505; (printing, &c.) 5508 (iii); Supreme Court (contingencies) 12917 (vii); (registrar's uniform) 5507 (iii). Penitentiaries—B.C. (land purchase) 12918 (vii); Generally (maintenance) 5515 (iii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 12918 (vii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint (B. 173) 1° m., 9021 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 10693; 3°*, 11235 (vi); on Sen. Amts., 13044 (vii).

Winding-up Act (Man. Appeals) Amt. (B. 102) 1° m., 3477; 2°* in Com., and 3°*, 3933 (ii).

——— (B. 144) 1° m., 6142 (iii); 2°* in Com., 6523 (iv).

Yukon Concession Cases, Appeal from Supreme Court (Ans.) 10301 (vi).

Yukon Sunday Observance Law and Instructions to N.W.M.P. (Ans.) 565 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 841 (i).

BARKER, Mr. S. *East Hamilton.*

Address, The, 519, (amt.) 530, Neg. (Y. 50; N. 96) 552 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4712 (iii).

Atlantic Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Bank of Hamilton incorp. (B. 56) 1°*, 1207 (i).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4387 (iii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7671 (iv).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6521 (iv).

British Columbia Bank incorp. B. 49 (Mr. Sloan) on M. for 2°, 1470 (i).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5888 (iii).

Civil Service Employees, 1905-6-7, Dates of Apptmts., &c. (M. for ret.*) 558 (i).

Coal Lands, O.C., Regulations, &c., *re* Disposal (M. for copies*) 4246 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1162 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1793 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com.., 11837, 11851; (amt.) 11865 (vi).

Dom. Elections, Forms, Writs, Instructions, &c., issued in 1907 (M. for copies*) 555 (i).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Fire Extinguishers File, Cor. quoted by Min., Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7775 (iv).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8133 (iv).

G. T. P., Eastern Limit Mountain Section, Establishment of (Ques.) 9265 (v).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12361 (vii).

——— and National Trans. Ry., Disputed Questions (Ques.) 6235 (iv).

——— Protests *re* Land Acquisitions (Ques.) 6640 (iv).

——— Ry. Sections B and F, Contracts, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5211 (iii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3706, 3743 (ii).

Hillsborough Bridge Contract, Claims of M. J. Haney, O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3042, 3690 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 768 (i).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6519 (iv).

Moncton Car Shops, Lease, &c., O.C., &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11995 (vi).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) 5056 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Burning of Papers, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4072 (ii).

Petit Rocher Breakwater, Incomplete Return (remarks) 5726 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3138 (ii).

——— Meetings, &c. (remarks) 1441 (i).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, &c., Extravagant Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7148 (iv).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, ref. to in debate on Address, 519 (i).

——— Commission's Report (remarks) 3901 (ii).

Quebec and N.B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13293 (vii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3780 (ii).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5833 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Welland (Port Maitland piers) 5682 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4072 (ii).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7716 (iv); Ottawa (Mint) 1477; (Museum) 1492 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 12019 (vi).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. (amt.) 921 (i).

BARR, Mr. J. *Dufferin.*

Address, The, 276 (i).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4525 (iii).
See 'National.'

Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10350 (vi).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6208 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5100 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11361 (vi).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Members (remarks) 13539 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11831 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute, Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5012 (iii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co's. B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13209 (vii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3611, 3647 (ii).

Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) in Com., 13508 (vii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6272 (iv).

Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip for Services (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10501 (vi).

Inland Revenue Seizures, 1906-7 in Cornwall, Toronto, Ottawa, &c. (Ques.) 3846 (ii).
—— (M. for ret.*) 3851 (ii), 4247 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7236 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9491 (v).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13501; in Com., 13502 (vii).

Office Specialty Co., Fittings, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4696 (iii); in Com., 10858 (vi).

BARR, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Patent and Proprietary Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 2°, 10553 (vi); in Com., 12624 (vii).

Posters, Prohibition of Indecent Bills, Enforcement of Tariff Regulations (Ques.) 6161 (iv).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4978 (iii); in Com. on Res., 3907 (ii).
—— (wires, &c.) Amt. (B. 43) 1° m., 840 (i); 2° m., 5212 (iii).

Ry. Tracks, Crossing by Water Mains, Application to Board (Ques.) 1109 (i).
—— (M. for ret.*) 1294 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3768 (ii); in Com., 12608 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (seeds) 12893 (vii); (seed branch) 5504 (iii); (Year Book) 677 (i).

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 978 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8876 (v).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9227, 9450 (v).

House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10504 (vi).

Immigration (agents) 9869 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4082, 4151 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 10297 (v).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5511 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Vernon) 10872; (Victoria immigration) 10881 (vi); Man. (Dauphin) 8520; (Emerson) 8534 (v); (Winnipeg hospital) 10958 (vi); Ont. (Dom. renewals) 7483; (Glencoe) 7488; (Guelph armoury) 7682 (iv); Ottawa (Mint) 1452, 1481 (i); Sask. (Battleford) 8577 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 12097 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11088 (vi).

Telephone Wires, Applications to cross Ry. Tracks (Ques.) 690 (i).
See 'Railways,' &c.

Wheat Transportation from N. W., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2198 (ii).

BEATTIE, Mr. T., *London.*

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6489 (iv).

Moir, Private, Shooting at Wolseley Barracks (remarks) 7322 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12600 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Militia (provisions) 12151 (vii); Public Works—Generally (armouries) 10895; Man. (Winnipeg hospital) 10966 (vi).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6124

BEAUPARLANT, Mr. A. M., *St. Hyacinthe.*

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. (B. 161) 1° m., 7307 (iv).

Exhibitions, Amount of Subsidies paid to (Ques.) 4406 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 4356, 4372 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4171 (ii).

BELAND, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*

Anthracite Coal, Quantity imported from U.S., and other Countries (Ques.) 1510 (i).

Cotton, Raw, Imported from U.S. in 1905-7, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution (ques. of priv.) 3486 (ii).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2579 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Distribution to Members (remarks) 605 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3552 (ii).

Pulp Wood, Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4808 (iii).

Pulp Wood, Exported to U.S., Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Rehm, Fred. and Frank Patent Relief (B. 110) 1°*, 3896 (ii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*

Adams, Lake, Construction of Dam, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5798 (iii).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).

Architects on Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4014 (ii).

—— Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4143 (ii).

Badgley Island, Trespass by T. H. Jackman, &c. (Ques.) 1937 (i), 2217 (ii).

Binder Twine Seizures, Payments to A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).

Birnie and Noble, Advances to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).

Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging (Ques.) 4244, 5083 (iii).

—— (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 190 (i).

Canadian Timber used in Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11208 (vi).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Canadian Towing and Wrecking Co., Payments *re* Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).

'Castle,' Tug, Removal of Wreck, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 6641 (iv).

Chicoutimi Dredging, Tenders *re*, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iv).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11397 (vi).

Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) 5623 (iii).

—— Investigations, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Power, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7599 (iv).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1048

See 'Travelling.'

Committee Meeting, Rep. in Toronto 'Globe,' Ques. of Priv., 2382 (ii).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1151 (i).

—— Production of Originals, Announcement *re* (remarks) 1425 (i).

——Production in Committees, 1427 (i).

—— taken from Pub. Accounts Com. (remarks) 2305, 2308 (ii).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Surrender of Title (remarks) 3850 (ii).

—— Commission to Mr. Ryan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).

—— Protests *re* Sale (remarks) 10918 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11830, 11859 (vi), 12995; on M. for 3°, 13247 (vii).

Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).

Dredging Contracts, O.C. *re*, Inquiry for, 6853, 6927 (iv), 8696 (v).

—— Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com., 5924 (ii).

—— Renewal without Tenders (remarks) 6633 (iv).

Dredging at Fort William, Amounts paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c. (Ques.) 8839 (v).

See 'Boone,' &c.

Dredging at Midland, &c., Tenders *re*, Advertisements for (remarks) 7195 (iv).

—— O.C. *re* Renewal, &c., 6741 (iv).

See 'Midland.'

Dredging in Quebec Harbours, 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3240 (ii).

Dredges registered in Canada, &c. (Ques.) 11497 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4677 (iii): in Com., 10767 (vi).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Eclipse Co. of Ottawa, Payments to (Ques.) 6461 (iv).

—— Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7469 (iv).

Fisheries Regulations, Violations of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5782 (iii).
See 'Birnie,' &c.

Foresters Order, Charges in 'Le Canada,' Ques. of Priv., 6005 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3614 (ii).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 654 (i)

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 980

—— Report from Mr. Birnie (remarks) 5729 (iii).
See 'Birnie.'

'Golspie' Str., Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1084 (i).

G.T.Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res 2254 (ii); in Com., 12062 (vii).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12676 (vii).

Griffith Island, Georgian Bay, Sale of, &c (Ques.) 1508 (i).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims against Dept. of Agriculture (Ques.) 5791 (iii).

Holland River Dredging, Contract with Lake Simcoe Dredging Co. (Ques.) 2980 (ii).

—— Divisional Engineer, &c. (Ques.) 4767 (iii).

—— Name of Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 3037 (ii).

Hunter, Mr. J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Pub. Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1459 (i).

Inspector of Public Works, Apptmts. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5678 (iii).

I. C. R., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4423 (iii).

Johnston, Mr. W. J., Extra Remuneration, Leave of Absence, &c. (Ques.) 5201 (iii).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 640, 1037 (i).

Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4003 (ii).

—— Investigation, Defalcations of Mr. Roy, &c. (remarks) 10741 (vi).

—— Investigations, Evidence (remarks) *re* Printing, 10916 (vi).
See 'Sorel.'

Matchedash Bay, Dredging at Fesserton Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 566 (i).

Midland Dredging Co., Statement *re* Mr. McMullen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5714 (iii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Midland Harbour Dredging, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3239 (ii), 8893 (v).

Midland, Tiffin and Victoria Harbours, Expenditure *re* Dredging, 1907 (Ques.) 8181 (iv).

—— Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3428 (ii).

Midland Towing and Wrecking Co., Contract *re*, Cor. (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).

Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations (Ques.) 5650 (iii).
See 'Georgian Bay,' &c.

Office Specialty Co. and Eclipse Mfg. Co., Amounts paid to (Ques.) 3039 (ii), 4244 (iii).

—— (M. for ret.*) 3242 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 3581 (ii), 5785 (iii).
See 'Eclipse.'

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10335 (vi).

Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging (Ques.) 11496 (vi).

Otonabee Power Co., Amount of Payment *re* Horse-power (Ques.) 5471, 5656 (iii).

—— Incorrect Answer (remarks) 5566 (iii).

Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to (Ques.) 2792 (ii).

—— Inspector Telford, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 3038 (ii).

Owen Sound Public Building, Contract *re* Extension (Ques.) 3039 (ii).

—— Inspector, Apptmt. of Mr. Foster (Ques.) 3039 (ii).

—— Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie (Ques.) 3039 (ii).

Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 8617 (v).
See 'Dredging,' &c.

Port Colborne Elevator and Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).

Postal Service, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7259 (iv).

Pound-net Licenses, Granted in 1905, Cor. with A. E. Dyment, &c. (M. for copies*) 2795 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration re M. J. Haney's Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2747 (ii).

Prohibition Vote in Quebec (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Production of Original Documents (remarks) 1383 (i).

—— on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 2160 (ii).

—— Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3082 (ii).

Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Public Works Estimates, Preparation of, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5924 (iii).

Public Works in Harbours and Rivers, Ont., Tenders, Amounts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).

Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., Notice of Amt., 3751 (ii).

Registrar of Grey County, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Telford) 11303 (vi).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4667 (iii).

See 'Documents.'

St. John, N.B., Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co., &c. (Ques.) 11700 (vi).

——— Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 11496 (vi).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8562 (v).

Sorel Public Works, Investigation *re* Pay Rolls, &c. (Ques.) 4767 (iii).

———Allegations against Mr. Roy (remarks) 8295 (v).

——— Final Rep. (remarks) 10794 (vi).

——— Irregularities *re* (remarks) 5408 (iii).

——— Ref. to Judge Cassels (remarks) 7938 (iv).

See 'Marine,' &c.

'Speedy' Str., Purchase, Services, &c. (Ques.) 565 (i), 3844 (ii).

Stoney Lake, Damage Claims (Ques.) 5565 (iii).

Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 5564, 5649, 5786 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10584, 10615 (vi).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 12224; Trent (Buckhorn dam) 12227 (vii); (surveys) 10338 (vi); Welland (Port Colborne) 12211 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5678 (iii); (surveys) 12210 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 980; Printing and Stationery (salaries) 612; (Ass't. Dep. Min.) 1459 (i), 5699 (iii); Public Works (salaries) 639 (i), 5699 (iii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Fisheries (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5759 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lime Kiln crossing 13323; (pensions) 13324 (vii); (salaries) 4756 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (dredging plant, &c.) 4754 (iii); (Hudson Bay patrol) 3989 (ii); (patrol boats) 4750; (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752 (iii).

Marine (hospitals) 5782 (iii).

Militia (salaries and wages) 12147 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1079 (i), 5766 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2947, 2952; (obstructions) 3211; (removal of obstructions) 3156; (wrecking plant subsidies) 3221; (wrecks) 3151, 3295 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5512 (iii).

Post Office (boots for letter carriers) 8878 (v); (North Bay inspectors) 13152 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings, B.C. (Chilliwack) 13338; (Cranbrook) 13338 (vii); (Cumberland) 10865; (Fernie) 10866 (vi); (Grand Forks) 13338; (Greenwood) 13338 (vii); (Ladysmith) 10867; (Quesnel) 10868 (vi); (Revelstoke) 13339 (vii); (Vernon) 10872 (vi), 10339 (vii); (Victoria immigration) 10874 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings, Man. (Dauphin) 8519 (v); (Elmwood) 13335 (vii); (Emerson) 8534 (v); (Neepawa) 13336; (Portage la Prairie) 13336 (vii); (Selkirk) 8550 (v); (Souris) 13336 (vii); (Winnipeg hospital) 10959 (vi); (Winnipeg warehouse) 8571 (v).

Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Grand Falls) 13328 (vii); (St. John, military) 7186 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Antigonish) 7122; (Bridgewater) 7135; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax customs) 7162; (Inverness) 7172 (iv); (Parrsboro') 13327 (vii); (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv); (Wolfeville) 13327 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Dom., renewals) 7467; (Glencoe) 7489 (iv); (Mitchell) 13332; (North Bay) 13332; (Park Hill) 13332; (Peterborough) 13332; (Port Arthur) 13332; (Sarnia) 13333; (Seaforth) 13332; (Simcoe) 13333; (Sudbury) 13333; (Tilsonburg) 13333; (Uxbridge) 13333; (Walkerville) 13333; (Waterloo) 13333 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (improvements, &c.) 5707 (iii); (Mint) 1458; (Museum) 1489 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7183 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaskaville) 13329; (Grand Mère) 13329 (vii); (Grosse Isle) 7290 (iv); (Joliette) 13329 (vii); (Knowlton) 7290 (iv), 13329; (Lachute) 13329 (vii); (Lévis) 7296 (iv), 13329; (Magog) 13329; (Megantic) 13330; (Plessissville) 13330; (Point St. Charles) 13330; (Roberval) 13330; (St. Thérèse) 13330; (Shawenegan) 13330 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Battleford) 8577; (Edmonton) 8579 (v); (Estevan) 13336 (vii); (Humboldt) 8585 (v); (Lethbridge) 13336 (vii); (Maple Creek) 8600 (v), 13337 (vii); (Medicine Hat) 8601 (v); (Moosejaw) 13336 (vii); (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601; (Saskatoon) 8603 (v), 13337; (Strathcona) 13338 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (North Thompson River) 13352; Que. and Ont. (generally) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Lower Newcastle) 11695; (St. John) 12013 (vi); (St. John improvements) 5708 (iii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11207; (Baddeck) 11219; (Barachois) 11224; (Bay St. Lawrence) 11224; (Big Lorraine) 11224; (Breton Cove) 11224; (Charlos Cove) 11225; Church Point) 11225; (Cow Bay) 11225; (vi); (dredging) 13341 (vii); (McPherson's Cove) 11229; (Parrsborough) 11259; (Port Hood) 11277; (Port Joli West) 11279; (Pugwash wharf) 11280; (Round Hill wharf) 11282 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Georgian Bay survey) 13326; (Lakefield) 13350; (Meaford) 12103; (Michipicoten) 13350; (Midland and Tiffin) 12103 (vii); (Point Edward) 5714 (iii); (Port Arthur, &c.) 12144; (Port Colborne) 12146; (Rainy River) 12136; (Roche's Point) 12136 (vii); (Tiffin dredging) 5709 (iii), 13351 (vii); (Tobermory) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse à la Barbe) 12028; (Batiscan) 12029; (Bic) 12030; (Bonaventure) 12036; (Cap St. Ignace) 12030; (Chateauguay) 12030; (Clarke City) 12031; (Lake Aylmer) 12032; (Lake Megantic) 12033; (Lake St. Francis) 12033; (Lake St. John) 12033; (Lavaltrie) 12033; (Lotbinière) 12033; (Malbaie) 12034; (Matane) 12034; (Nicolet) 12034; (Notre Dame de Portage) 12034; (Ouelle Rivière) 12037; (Piché Point) 12035; (Richelieu) 12038; (Rivière du Lièvre) 12037; (Rivière du Loup) 12036; (Rivière Maskinonge) 12037; (St. Alphonse) 12041; (Ste. Anne de Monts) 12041; (St. Francis) 12041; (St. Louis) 12040; (St. Maurice) 12041; (Saguenay) 12040; (Yamaska dredging) 12043 (vi); (Yamaska river) 5708 (iii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13321 (vii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay surveys) 12145 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5552 (iii).

Sussex Street Property Purchase, Payment to Jos. Riopelle (Ques.) 3844 (ii).

Tenders, Advertisements, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7478 (iv).

Thessalon Post Office, Charges *re* Postmaster (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).

Tiffin Dredging, Tenders *re* Owen Sound Dredging Co. (Ques.) 8892 (v).
See 'Dredging.'

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2730 (ii).
See 'Documents.'

Travelling Expenses of Minister at Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii)
See 'Colonial.'

Trent Valley Canal, Holland River Dredging, Advertisements, &c. (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).
See 'Holland.'

Vautelet, Mr., Payments to, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Victoria Harbour, Tenders *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 8893 (v).
See 'Dredging, &c.'

Wiarton Dredging, 1907, Tenders, &c., (Ques.) 6236 (iv).

——— Payments to Mr. Bowman, &c. (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

Winfield Basin Dredging, Tender, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 6461 (iv).

Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster L. C. Smith, Interference in Elections, on M. for Sup., 2888 (ii).

Yarmouth, N.S., Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 11500 (vi).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4722 (iii).

Architects on Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7125 (iv).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 10921 (vi).

Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 3038 (ii).

——— Lease to McIntyre and Robert Syndicate (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13475 (vii).

——— Water-power, Copy of New Lease (remarks) 946 (i).

——— (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— Inquiry for Copy, 1740 (i).

Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 2392 (ii).

——— Commencement of, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 7212 (iv).

Budget, The, 5357 (iii).

Campaign Literature (French) distributed in Prov. of Que. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10352 (vi).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6162, 6173, 6203 (iii); in Com., 6426 (iv).

Canada and Germany Treaty (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10601 (vi).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12867 (vii).

Canadian Newspapers, Drawback *re* American Surtax (Ques.) 5203 (iii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12842, 12848 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6870 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12882 (vii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11251 (vi).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re*, &c. (Ques.) 685 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10744 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10717, 10727; in Com. on Res., 11360 (vi); in Com., 12177 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Translation into French (remarks) 6222, 6925 (iv), 11312 (vi), 13477 (vii).

Civil Servants, Increases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vii).

Clerks of Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1044 (i).
See 'Intercolonial.'

Côté, Boivin & Co., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ques.) 12650 (vii).

Cotton Strikers, Disputes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3492 (ii).

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. *re* Salaries (remarks) *re* Conc., 12504 (vii).

——— (translators) 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10245 (v).

——— Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8897 (v).
See 'Hansard.'

Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Michel des Saints, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 9474 (v).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1180 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 1849 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 80 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 1682 (i).

——— B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 4573 (iii); on M. for 2°, 8681 (v); in Com., 11824, 11831, 11857 (vi), 13010 (vii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5013 (iii).

Dredging in Ont. and Quebec, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 9276, 10008 (v).

Dredging in St. Lawrence, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 2896 (ii).
See 'Riviere la Graisse.'

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13278 (vii).

Farnham Post Office, Vote *re* Improvement of (Ques.) 6399 (iv).

Fort William Terminals Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6223 (iv).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

French Canadian Ministers, Attack *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4200 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 1223 (i); in Com., 3582, 3636 (ii).

——— Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13083 (vii).
See 'Can. and France.'

French Translation of Govt. Statutes, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3179 (ii).

Gaudette, Victor, Employmt. by Govt., Payments to (Ques.) 515 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3634 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10312 (vi).

——— Rep. of (remarks) 12836 (vii).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2238 (ii).

Halifax Garrison, Discontent *re* Pay, &c. (remarks) 5660 (iii).

'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9128 (v).
See 'Debates.'

Immigration from France and Belgium, Premiums paid to Clerical and Lay Agents, &c. (Ques.) 6922 (iv).

Ingonish Island Lightkeeper, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 8618 (v).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6901 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 835 (i).

Intercolonial Conference in London, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 13225, 13511 (vii).
See 'Colonial.'

I.C.R., Employees Provident Fund Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4577; in Com., 4995 (iii).

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Change of Name to Govt. Rys., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6246 (iv).

——— Ste. Monique Gates, Number to be made (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

——— Sunday Cars, Instructions *re* (Ques.) 10734 (vi).

——— Talbot, Mr. Evariste, Employmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6400 (iv).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 968 (i).

Judges of Man. and Ont., Salaries (B. 206) (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13048 (vii).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12401 (vii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

'Labour Gazette,' Cost of Printing, &c. (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Lacas, Mr., Payments to, by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11248 (vi).

'Le Soleil, Par. *re* Voting by French Members, Ques. of Priv., 7992 (iv).

Letter Carriers, Contract for Boots, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).

MacIlreith, Payment to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7178 (iv).

Manchester, Dr., Misappropriation of Moneys of Mr. Walter Dick (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Appmt. of Counsel for Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7327 (iv).

——— Investigation by Minister, &c. (remarks) 6636 (iv).

——— Mr. Perron's Duties (Ques.) 10743 (vi).

——— Officers under Suspension (remarks) 6847 (iv).

——— Proceedings, &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).

——— Translation of Evidence (remarks) 11204 (vi).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3026 (ii).

Matane River Fishing, Complaints (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7252 (iv).

Montreal Post Office, Addition, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 6922 (iv).

——— Defalcations, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 7197 (iv).

Monuments to McGee and Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13352 (vii).

New York Central Ry., Complaints *re* Discrimination (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).

Nicolet Post Office, Completion of, Postmaster's Name, &c. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

——— Emplymt. of Mr. S. Rivard (Ques.) 11702 (vi).

Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).

Notre Dame du Portage, Expenditure *re* Wharf (Ques.) 6400 (iv).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4701 (iii).

Order Papers, French and English Editions (remarks) 6853 (iv).

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

——— Emplymt. *re* Nicolet Post Office (Ques.) 11702 (vi).

——— Issue of Pass to travel on I.C.R. Express (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 138 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 8610 (v).

Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, &c., released since 1896, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2854 (ii).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii).

Patent Medicines Bill, Govtl. Intention *re* (Ques.) 356 (i).

——— (remarks) 608 (i), 2594 (ii).

——— Committee of Inquiry (Ques.) 3899 (ii).

——— (remarks) *re* Apptmt. to Com., 10689 (vi).

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7933 (iv).

Priv., Ques. of, Par. in 'Citizen' *re* Pamphlet by Jesuit Priest, 10427 (vi).

Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid before and after Adjustment (Ques.) 8616 (v).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3142 (ii).

Quebec Judges, Additional, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 206, 13048 (vii).

——— Apptmt. of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 12190 (vii).

——— Apptmt. to Superior Court (remarks) 11825 (vi).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6225 (iv).

Ques. of Priv., Anti-Catholic Article in 'Leader,' 8604 (v).

Railway Act (commission, ass't chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4965 (iii).

——— (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10638; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. for 3°, 11608 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13286 (vii).

Restaurant of H. of C. and Senate, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Joint Com., 13224 (vii).

——— on 1st Rep., 13510 (vii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 3319 (ii), 13081 (vii).

Ricard, Mr., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

Rivière à la Graisse, Dredging, &c., Expenditure (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

——— inquiry for ret., 2896, 3689 (ii).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 686 (i).

Rivière du Loup Post Office, Improvement to Grounds, &c. (Ques.) 6399 (iv).

——— Postmaster, Resignation and Salary (Ques.) 6399 (iv).

Ross Rifle, Correction of Mr. S. Hughes Speech, Ques. of Priv., 9126 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9332 (v).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis, Revenues, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).

——— Expenditure and Collections, &c. (Ques.) 1935 (i).

——— Expenditure by Public Works (Ques.) 3479 (ii).

Ste. Anne de Sorel Lighthouse, Destruction of Trees, &c. (Ques.) 7731 (iv).

St. Fulgence Pier, Paymaster's List, Signatures, &c. (Ques.) 1115 (i).

——— Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1130 (i).

St. Helen's Island Sale (remarks) in Com. on B. 218, 13417 (vii).

St. Laurent Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 895, 1121 (i).

St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

Sabourin, Maj., Cor. between Lt.-Col. Malette and Dept. (M. for copy*) 3434 (ii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4580 (iii).

School Statutes, Saskatchewan Province, on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to adjn., 6862 (iv).

Sorel Irregularities, Allegations against Mr. Roy (remarks) 8296 (v).

——— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet (remarks) 6988, 7099, 7938 (iv).

Soulanges Canal, Floods at Valleyfield (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).

——— Investigation *re* Charges against Overseer (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3756 (ii).

Sudbury County Court Judge, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 12413 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Archives) 671; (census and statistics) 673 (i), 12879 (vii); (exhibitions) 10601 (vi), 12889; (live stock) 12896 (vii); (Year-Book) 678 (i).

Canals—Generally—(additional remuneration) 13174 (vii); (salaries) 10325; (statistical branch) 10318 (vi).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672; (slope walls) 5663 (iii).

Canals—Soulanges (floods, &c.) 10339 (vi).

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12195; (Port Colborne) 12212 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5674, 5678 (iii); (surveys) 12208; (widening) 12211 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries, &c.) 637; Inland Revenue (salaries) 646 (i); Marine and Fisheries (Ass't Dep. Min.) 12915 (vii); (salaries) 977, 1014 (i); Militia (salaries) 8872 (v); Mines, 646 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8873 (v); (salaries) 8872 (v); Public Works (salaries) 643 (i), 12917 (vii); Sec. of State (salaries, &c.) 611; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9227, 9262 (v).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Surveys (oil borings) 13163 (vii).

Hydrographic Surveys (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 13169 (vii).

Immigration (U. S. labourers) 13169 (vii).

Justice—Administration of. Supreme Court (contingencies) 12917 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5775 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13152 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4200 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1907 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 10287 (v).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (Cotton strikers) 13156; (Marine investigation) 13169 (vii).

N.W.M. Police (pay of force) 8863; (salaries) 8863 (v).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1086 (i).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5514 (iii); (wrecks) 3187, 3201 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 12918 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 13339 (vii); (Vernon) 10876; (Victoria immigration) 10876 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10892; (repairs) 10886 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8528 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7111; (Bridgewater) 7136; (Halifax customs) 7155; (Halifax quarantine) 7171; (Inverness) 7172; (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7811 (iv); (Park Hill) 13332 (vii);

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (deptl. buildings) 13478; (heating) 13340 (vii); (skylights) 7816 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 7286; (Dundee) 7286; (Farnham) 7288; (Grosse Isle) 7289; (Knowlton) 7290; (Lachute) 7293; (Lévis) 7294; (Longueuil) 7305 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Edmonton) 13336; (Moosejaw) 13337; (Saskatoon) 13337; (Strathcona) 13338 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 13339 (vii).

Public Works Harbours and Rivers N.S. (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hood) 11268

Public Works—Marine (ship channel) 5035 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (gratuities) 5731 (iii).

Public Works—Telegraphs (Yukon) 13178 (vii).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—B.C. (Cape Beale) 5732 (iii).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10383 (vi); I.C.R. (Halifax accommodation) 5549 (iii); (supplies) 10336; Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10330; (extra clerks) 10345; (statistical branch) 10328; Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362 (vi).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry. on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 917 (i).

Toronto Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13417 (vii).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Officials, Passes, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).

Valleyfield, Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv).

——— Floods on Lake St. Francis, Damage, &c. (rearks) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).

——— (remarks) 7996 (iv).

——— Post Office Clock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7115 (iv).

——— Regiment Organization, Cor., &c., *re* (M. for copy*) 3434 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of (remarks) on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2519, 2679 (ii).

T. Lindsay Co., Amount of Goods purchased, &c. (Ques.) 8615 (v).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4581 (iii).

Ventilation of H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vii).

Votes and Proceedings, Correction in Names of Clerks, 13066 (vii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6120 (iii).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5127 (iii)

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6915 (iv).

Independent Bank Audit, Establishment of (Ques.) 11232 (vi).

Presbyterian Church Widows' and Orphans' Fund (B. 23) 1°*, 430 (i) ; in Com. 2788 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12598 (vii).

BLACK, Mr. J. B.. *Hants.*

Canada Temperance Act. Amt. (B. 187) 1°*, 10717 (vi).

Cigarettes, Sale and Prohibition of, on prop. res. (Mr. Blain) 5251 (iii).

Coasting Privileges, Prop. Res., on Order being called, 2795 (ii).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, Establishment of (prop. res.) 2562 (ii).

French Translation of Govt. Documents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3184 (ii).

Shad Hatchery, Windsor, N.S. (Ques.) 8894 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Round Hill wharf) 11282 (vi).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10697 (vi).

B

BLACK, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c. (remarks) 10277 (v).

BLAIN, Mr. R., *Peel.*

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup. 4717 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3355 (ii)

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5382, 5408 (iii).

Aud. General, Salary B. 208 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12645 (vii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10944 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4502 (iii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5945 (iii).

Bole Drug Co., Supplies furnished to Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).

Brampton Post Office, Repairs, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iv).

Braund, Samuel, Apptmt. as Inspector on Welland Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5674 (iii).

British Pensioners, Notice of Deductions, &c. (Ques.) 7501 (iv).

Bronze Coat-of-arms, Duty *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).

Campaign Literature franked by Depts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10356 (vi).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).

Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2768 (ii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11254 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10752 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of (prop. res.) 5087; on M. to resume debate, 5251 (iii).

——— Resolution of W.C.T.U. of Brampton (read) 7278 (iv).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 11347; in Com., 11368, 11655 (vi), 12166, 12183 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Number distributed (remarks) 6060 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5638 (iii).

Co-operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4556 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 11314 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members on M. for Sup., 1871 (i).

——— Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7761 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Documents, Instructions to Minister of Marine (remarks) 7810 (iv).
See 'Pub. Accts,' &c.

Dog-Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S. (Ques.) 1126 (i).

Dom. Elections Act. Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11834; (amt.) 11835 (vi); 12943 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act. Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11523, 11181 (vi).

Dredging Contracts, O. Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6777 (iv).

Eclipse Manufacturing Co., Payments to (Ques.) 3239 (ii).

——— Amounts paid to (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).

——— Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13272 (vii).

Falconer, Kenneth, Arrangement *re* Balance of Pay (Ques.) 10516 (vi).

Fire Extinguishers, &c., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7666 (iv).

——— Cor. on File, Custody of Documents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7761 (iv).

Fraser, Mr. A. W., Payments to, for Legal Services (Ques.) 2979 (ii).

Fruit (apples) Inspection, Complaints *re* (remarks) 2754 (ii).

Gatineau Point Bridge, Sums contributed by Govt. (Ques.) 355 (i).

Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) on Conc., 13568 (vii).

Govt. Employees and Provincial Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10989 (vi).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6256 (iv).

G.T.P., Accidents to Employees (remarks) 7447 (iv).

——— Accidents on Construction, Reports *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6655 (iv).

——— Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8748 (v).

Halifax Customs House, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 7211 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 3°, 4544 (iii).

Hogs slaughtered, Compensation, paid, &c. (remarks) 13085 (vii).

House of Commons Accountants, &c., Increase *re* Salaries under C. S. Bill (remarks) 13528 (vii).

Immigrants, Number entering Canada, Bonuses paid, &c. (Ques.) 5256 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6475 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

I.C.R. Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2454 (ii).

Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond (Ques.) 5792 (iii).

Inverness Public Building, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 5997 (iii).

'King Edward,' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour (Ques.) 13063 (vii).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11247 (vi).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4008 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) 7389 (iv).

——— Leave of Absence for Mr. Watson (remarks) 10918 (vi).

——— Rep. of Judge Cassels (remarks) 10915 (vi).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6892, 7228; (M.) to ref. to Com., 7226 (iv).

Midland Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5718 (iii).

Milford Haven Wharf, N.S., Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13503 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 5003; on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5059 (iii).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4697 (iii); in Com., 10849 (vi).

Opium Prohibition B. 205 (Mr. Lemieux) on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).

Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4106 (ii).

'Petrel,' Str., Supplies purchased, &c. (M for ret.) 7937 (iv).

Petroleum Bounty B. 192 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12644 (vii).

Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 10513 (vi).

Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation, &c. (Ques.) 8175 (iv).

Postmasters, Rural, Salary Increases, &c. (Ques.) 183 (i).

Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present agreement and previously (Ques.) 315 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation (prop. res.) 3070; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 103) 3145 (ii).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Public Works, Estimated Cost, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).
——— Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4952 (iii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps, Letter (read) 8694 (v).
Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4981 (iii).
Registrar of Grey County, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Telford) 11303 (vi).
Rolla L. Crain Co., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 3239 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).
Ross, Mr. D., Resignation as Member (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11106 (vi).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s (B. 98) 1° m., 3315 (ii); in Com., 4580 (iii).
St. Francis River, Melbourne Pier, Rock Removal, &c. (Ques.) 6918 (iv).
——— Piers at Richmond, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 6641, 6918 (iv).
St. Mary's Post Office, Construction (remarks in Com. of Sup., 12735 (vii).
——— Item *re* Expenditure of $658.03 (Ques.) 11937 (vi).
——— Total Cost (Ques.) 11019 (vi).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5547 (iii).
Seed Oats purchased in P.E.I., Incomplete Answer (remarks) 12551, 12661 (vii).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5445 (ii).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3785, 3818 (ii); in Com., 12611 (vii).
Speakers Expenses in House of Commons, Comparison, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
Supplies for Govt., Apptmt. of Purchasing Commission, on Amt. (Mr. Fielding) to prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5826; (amt.) to Amt., 5847, Neg. (Y., 46; N., 90) 5877 (iii).
Superannuation and Retirement Act, Payments under (Ques.) 7989 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (seed branch) 5504 (iii).
Canals—Carillon (dams) 12768 (vii); (statistical branch) 10323 (vi); Lachine (repairs) 5673; (slope walls) 5668; Welland (Port Maitland piers) 5674 (iii).
Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 624, 634; Public Works (salaries) 640 (i).
Excise (provisional allowances) 819; (travelling expenses) 816 (i).
Geological Survey (oil borings) 13166 (vii).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12739 (vii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5041, 5774 (iii); (Lime Kiln crossing) 13323 (vii).
BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (subsidies) 12263 (vii).
Marine (hospitals) 5783 (iii); (ice-breakers) 1901 (i); (Hudson Bay patrol) 3997 (ii); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4753; (patrol boats) 4749; (Sorel property) 4752 (iii).
Militia (annual drill) 5746 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5784 (iii); (seed grain) 2780 (ii).
N.W.M. Police (pensions) 8871 (v).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5522; (maintenance) 5510 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cranbrook) 10864; (Cumberland) 10865; (Vernon) 10870 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10887; (rents, &c.) 10981 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 10954; (Winnipeg military) 10973 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7112, 7118; (Bridgewater) 7137; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax customs) 7144; (Halifax Military) 7143 (iv); (Lunenburg) 13326 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10977 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7457; (Dom., renewals) 7468; (Glencoe) 7486 (iv); (Kingston) 10909 (vi); (Leamington) 7816 (iv); (Markham) 13331 (vii); (North Bay) 7813; (Owen Sound) 7817; (Renfrew) 7825; (St. Mary's) 7827; (Simcoe) 7830 (iv); (Walkerville) 13334 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives fittings) 5700 (iii); (rents, &c.) 10985; (repairs, &c.) 10981 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Chicoutimi) 7280; (Cookshire) 7281; (Grosse Isle) 7289 (iv); (Knowlton) 13329 (vii); (Magog) 7306; (Montreal examining warehouse) 7425 (iv); (Montreal pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii); (Montreal Post Office) 7411; (Montreal station C) 7422; (Nicolet) 7429; (Quebec citadel) 7430; (Que. arsenal) 7435; (Quebec drill hall) 7431; (St. John's) 7444 (iv); (Sherbrooke) 13330 (vii); (Sherbrooke drill hall) 7439 (iv); (Three Rivers) 13330 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baddeck) 11220; (Digby) 11226 (vi); (dredging) 13341 (vii); (Parker's cove) 11258; (Parrsboro) 11259; (Port Hastings) 11267; (Port Hood) 11269; (Portuguese cove) 11279; (Round Hill) 11285; (Tancook island) 11231 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Belle River) 12090; (Blanche River) 12091; (Brighton) 12133; (Port Credit) 12101; (Tobermory) 13351 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11079; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11106 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Marconi) 12143; (Yukon) 13179 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 10191 (v); (rolling stock) 5553 (iii), 12257 (vii).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Act) 12264 (vii).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Tenders, Advertisements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7475 (iv).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10699 (vi).

See 'Cigarette.'

Travelling Expenses of Min. to Col. Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3997 (ii).

U. S. Warships on Great Lakes, Inquiry *re* Armaments, &c. (Ques.) 7502 (iv).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4582 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6124 (iii).

Wharfs, Piers, Amount of Revenue collected, &c. (Ques.) 2391 (ii).

——— Expenditure *re* (M. for ret.*) 5800, 5802 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.) 5476 (iii).

——— Total Expenditure since 1895 (Ques.) 5078 (iii).

Wheat, Frozen, Shipping from Man. and N.W. (remarks) on M. to adjn., 825 (i).

Woollen Industry, Legislation *re* Relief (remarks) 12772 (vii).

BOLE, Mr. D. W., *Winnipeg.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of, Inquiry *re* (prop. res.) 3853 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7939 (iv).

Drug Contracts with Govt., Ques. of Priv., 5562 (iii).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* Frauds (read) on Debate on Dom. Elections B. 115, 7942 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 3993 (ii).

Winnipeg Bank incorp. (B. 19) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 2787 (ii).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W., K.C.M.G. (Minister of Militia and Defence), *Kings N.S.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4399, 4498 (iii).

British Pensioners, Notice of Deductions from Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 7502 (iv).

Canadian Patriotic Funds (B. 216) in Com., 13320 (vii).

Cavalry Brigade, Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec (Ans.) 9273 (v).

Cold Storage Co., Connection with: *See* 'N.B.,' &c.

Dom. Arsenal, Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re* (Ans.) 7991 (iv).

Dominion Camp Equipment Co., Incorporation of (Ans.) 3238 (ii).

Drill Shed, Lindsay, Date of Construction (Ans.) 1111 (i).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Eastman Rifle Match, Investigation *re* Accident (Ans.) 1125 (i).

Esquimalt and Halifax Garrison, Equipment, &c. (Ans.) 1293 (i).

——— Transfer to Canada (Ans.) 1288, 1293 (i).

Fortifications, Construction of, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6646 (iv).

Garrison Artillery, B.C., 5th Regiment, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5792 (iii).

Garrison Commons, Date of Sale, &c (Ans.) 354 (i).

See 'Ordnance,' &c.

Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c. (Ans.) 9713 (v).

Govt. Business (remarks) 12504 (vii).

Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, &c. (Ans.) 10015 (v).

——— Replacement of, by Imp. Troops (Ans.) 1288 (i).

Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip to (Ans.) 2161 (ii).

Insurance Commission's Rept., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 9337, 9461 (v).

Kentville Rifle Range, ref. to in Budget debate, 5290 (iii).

Lancaster Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1022 (i).

Lee-Enfield Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe (Ans.) 10014 (v).

——— Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 6645 (iv).

Military Camp in Eastern Townships, proposed Arrangements, &c. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Militia Allowances, Arrears of (Ans.) 9274 (v).

Militia—Board of Officers, Pay and Allowance, &c. (Ans.) 2165 (ii).

Militia Camps, Holding of (remarks) 9779 (v).

——— (stmnt.) 9835 (v).

Militia Dept., Attack *re* Boots furnished, Ques. of Priv., 10739 (vi).

——— and Civil Service Commissioner's Report, Statement in Com. of Sup., 12505 (vii).

——— at Quebec, Working Hours for Masons (Ans.) 10791 (vi).

——— Report (presented) 4494 (iii).

——— Threats *re*, &c. (remarks) 13584 (vii).

Militia, Apptmts. as Generals, Number and Qualifications (Ans.) 5086 (iii).

Militia Food Supplies, on Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).

Militia, Memorandum of General Lake (M.) *re* placing on Table, 12770 (vii).

Militia Pay, Arrears, Reasons for, &c. (Ans.) 8443 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Militia Permanent Corps, Apptmt. of Commission *re* Pay (Ans.) 1293 (i).

Militia Promotions, Names and Records, &c. (remarks) 352 (i).

Militia Stores, Inspection of (Ans.) 8181 (iv).

——Rural Battalions, Care of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5738 (iii).

Militia Supplies at Halifax, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 6406 (iv).

Minnedosa Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10890 (vi).

N.B. Cold Storage Co., and Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9306 (v).
See 'St. John.'

Niagara Camp, Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 2163 (ii).

Niagara Lands, Sale for Military Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13540 (vii).

Ordnance Lands—Toronto—Sale (B. 218) in Com. on Res., 13417 (vii).

Petawawa Camp, Training of Troops, &c. (Ans.) 5792 (iii).

Plains of Abraham, Lease to Ross Rifle Co. (Ans.) 1348 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3072 (ii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4894 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps (remarks) 8695 (v).

—— City Corps, &c. (remarks) 8386 (v).

—— Food supplied (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).

—— Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8855 (v).

—— Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance (Ans.) 7992 (iv).

—— Representation of Veterans (remarks) 7998 (iv).

—— Transportation of Troops (remarks) 8384 (v).

Rankin, Col., Resignation of (remarks) 11406 (vi).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 2025 (ii).

Rifles purchased from other Companies than Ross Co. (Ans.) 1123 (i).

Rifle Range at Charlottetown, Purchase Price (Ans.) 6233 (iv).

R.M.C., Investigation into conduct of Cadet Lancaster, on M. for Sup., 1022 (i).

Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re* (Ans.) 11495 (vi).

—— Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt. (Ans.) 5786 (iii).

—— Bayonets, Date of Contract, O.C., &c. (Ans.) 6235 (iv), 8176, 8442 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle, Consignment to N.W.M. Police, Where manufactured (Ans.) 5259 (iii).

—— Contract *re* Bayonets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vii).

—— memorandum *re* agreement (read) 13553 (vii).

—— Contract Price, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 8174 (iv).

—— Cor. with Imp. Govt., Rep. in British War Office, Disappearance from Library of House, Ques. of Priv., 4961 (iii).

—— Disposition of Manufactured Rifles (Ans.) 3237 (ii).

—— Extension of Cove Fields Lands, &c. (Ans.) 4405 (iii).

—— Extravagance of Militia Dept., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 8953 (v).

—— Interchangeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 3899 (ii).

—— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c. (Ans.) 178 (i).

—— Number delivered as per Contract, Cost per Rifle (Ans.) 8180 (iv).

—— Number ordered, Payments, Total Number delivered, &c. (Ans.) 168 (i).

—— Number reported Unfit for Use (Ans.) 3841 (ii).

—— Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' *re* Accident at Rockliffe Range (Ans.) 10515 (vi).

—— Payments to since Jan. 1, 1908 (Ans.) 7210 (iv).

—— Provisions for Bayonets, &c. (Ans.) 3483 (ii).

—— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of (Ans.) 3237 (ii).

—— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c. (Ans.) 365 (i).

—— Tests in England, Reps., &c., Ques. of Priv., 8167 (iv).

—— Tests, Rep. of Col. Gaudet (Ans.) 9714 (v).

—— Total Number in Use in Canada (Ans.) 5786 (iii).
See 'Dom. Arsenal.'

Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. Johns, Tenders *re* Supplies (Ans.) 5788 (iii).

St. Helen's Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B 218, 13418 (vii)

St. John Fusiliers, 62nd, Annual Drill, Delay in Payments to (Ans.) 847 (i).

St. John Cold Storage, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 3580 (ii).
See 'N.B.'

Sherbrooke Militia Corps, Establishment of (Ans.) 9273 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

S. A. War, Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c. (Ans.) 1111 (i).

——— Medals for 3rd Contingent (Ans.) 1110 (i).

——— Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3769, 3819 (ii).

Sub-target Machines ordered, Dates, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 171 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Militia (salaries) 8871 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4136 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5732 (iii), 10286 (v), 13540; (customs dues) 12156; (Dom. arsenal) 12154; (gratuities) 13177; (pay and allowances) 12147; (properties) 12148; (provisions, &c.) 12150; (Quebec reviews) 13176; (rifle and artillery grants) 12152; (Ross rifle contract) 13543; (R. M. College) 12152, 13177; (salaries and wages) 12147; (Stoney Creek monument) 13177; (warlike stores) 12148 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886; Man. (Winnipeg hospital) 10955; (Winnipeg, military) 10970; (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10975 (vi); (Guelph armoury) 7678; (Hamilton drill hall) 7693; (Kingston) 7814; (Kingston, artillery park) 7701; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700 (iv); (Kingston, militia stores) 10908 (vi); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7703; (London, military) 7706 (iv); (Quebec cliffs) 12148 (vii).

Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contract *re* (Ans.) 5207, 5258 (iii).

——— Number ordered, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 569 (i).

Thirteenth Hussars, Service Medal *re* Fenian Raids (remarks) 13533 (vii).

Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans, &c. (Ans.) 7204 (iv).

Valleyfield Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv).

Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from, by Govt. (Ans.) 356 (i).

Western Rifle Association, Pet. *re* Govt. Grant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L., *Carleton, Ont.*

Address, The, 23 (i).

——— on M. to consider (remarks) *re* Questions, 8 (i).

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth, in Com. on Res., 4846 (iii).

Advertisements for Tenders of Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4717 (iii).

Algoma Steel Co., Orders from Govt. for Steel, &c. (remarks) 8606 (v).

All-Red Line, Omission of (remarks) on the Address, 28 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12432, (amt.) 12439; neg. (Y. 48; N. 108) 12499 (vii).

Anglo-American Treaty with G.B., Information *re* (remarks) 6985 (iv).

——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 9715 (v).

——— Further Information (remarks) 7447 (iv).

——— Information *re* Presenting, 8516 (v).

——— Tel. *re* (remarks) 6926 (iv).

Appeal Court of B.C., B. 165 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 8466 (v); in Com., 10863 (vi).

Architectural Institute of Canada on M. (Mr. Ethier) to refund Fees, 11234 (vi).

Asiatic Labour in B.C.: Ques. of Privilege, 6526 (iv).

Audit and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12658 (vii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10934 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4389; in Com., 4400 (iii).

See 'Que. Tercentenary,' &c.

Behring Sea Commission, Expenses of Sir Charles Tupper (remarks) 2883 (ii).

——— Correction *re*, 4669 (iii).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13571 (vii).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3470 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5949 (iii).

Boundary Delimitations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9743 (v).

Bounties paid by Govt. for 1908-9 (Ques.) 13226 (vii).

Bridge Subsidies to Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com., 13313 (vii).

B.C. Fisheries Commission, Report *re* (remarks) 5728 (iii).

Buildings, Cost of Construction (remarks) 12661 (vii).

Business of the House, Precedence *re* Questions (remarks) 431 (i).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 5135 (iii).

See 'Govt. Business.'

Cabinet Changes (remarks) on the Address, 24 (i).

Campaign Funds, Charges by Min. of Pub. Works (remarks) on the Address, 26 (i).

Campaign Literature franked by Depts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10353 (vi).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Res., 6201 (iii); in Com., 6414 (iv).

Canada Shipping Act Amt B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12855 (vii).

——— B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13058 (vii).

Canada and U.S. Treaty Negotiations, Completion of, &c. (remarks) 937 (i).

——— Boundaries Treaty (remarks) 7834 (iv).

See 'Fisheries,' &c.

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187, on M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Order Paper, 13494; on M. for 2°, 13506 (vii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 202 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12847 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6871 (iv).

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept (remarks) 6059 (iii).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Cattle Embargo in G. B., Cable *re* Removal by G. B. (remarks) 13228 (vii).

'Champlain,' Str., Use of by Political Agents (remarks) 9126, 9280, 9342, 9460 (v).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546, 10747, 11021 (vi).

Chinese Immigration into B.C., O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 554 (i).

See 'Asiatic,' 'Japanese,' &c.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10719, 10724; on M. for 2°, 11338; in Com. on Res., 11355; in Com., 11364, 11561, 11640 (vi), 12164; on Senate Amts., 13520 (vii).

Civil Service Bill, Correction in Hansard *re* Increases, 11494 (vi).

——— Inquiry for, 8516 (v).

——— Resolutions *re* (remarks) 11016 (vi).

Civil Service Commission Rep., Inquiry for, 3317 (ii), 4963, 5408, 5567 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5623 (iii).

——— Policy of the Govt. *re*, on M. to Adjn. House, 5882 (iii).

——— Delay in Printing, &c., Investigations *re*, on M. to Adjn., 6143 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers (Amt.) on M. for Sup., 7506; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 99) 7618 (iv).

See 'Marine and Fisheries,' &c.

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com of Sup., 9193 (v).

Colchester Election (remarks) on the Address, 39 (i).

Cold Storage Co.: *See* 'N.B.,' &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1046 (i).

Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, Cor, &c. *re* Govtl. Action (Ques.) 174 (i).

Committees, Sel. Standing (remarks) on M (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 (i).

——— Organization &c. (remarks) 507, 560 (i).

——— Sitting concurrently with House, on M. (Mr. Finlayson) 9579 (v).

Companies Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5493 (iii).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12203 (vii).

——— Information *re* Break, 11121, 11406 (vi).

Criminal Code Amendts., on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 9282 (v).

Criminal Code (Ry. mortgages) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13317 (vii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 11314 (vi).

Customs Defalcations at Huntingdon, B.C., Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9442 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Kennedy) 9460 (v).

Customs Duties on Militia Uniforms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Supply (remarks) 10134 (v).

See 'Supply.'

Customs Inspectors, Suggestion of Civil Service Report (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).

Customs Statistics, Duplicating with Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 9549 (v).

Cyr, Mr., Letter from, Ques. of Order *re* Reading, &c., 8462 (v).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Members (remarks) 13539 (vii).

Debates, Official Reps., Conc. in without Notice (remarks) 8896 (v).

Debt of Canada, Portions falling due, &c. (Ques.) 315 (i).

——— Portions maturing in 1908 (Ques.) 315 (i).

Detroit Tunnel, Customs Collection *re* Construction Materials, (M. for O. Cs., &c.*) 5477 (iii).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Surrender of Title, Negotiations *re* (Ques.) 3849 (ii).

——— Name of Govt. Agent (Ques.) 5084 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Dokis Indian Reserve, Surrender of Timber, O.Cs. Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 5087 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1140 (i), 1617, (amt.); Production of, 1622; agreed to, 1667 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1801 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. deb. 1844 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7859 (iv), 8423 (v); in Com., 11798, 11828; (amt.) 11922 (vi), 12956; on M. for 3°, 13232 (vii), on M. for 3° (amt.) 13251; on Senate Amts., 13579 (vii).

Dom. Elections Bill and Obstruction Tactics (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).

Dom. Lands Survey B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 231; in Com., 754, 949 (i); Sen. Amts., 3755 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11127, 11153 (vi); in Com., 11158, 11165, 11408, 11510, 11948; Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 11977 (vi); on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, 12395 (vii).

See 'Lands,' &c.

Doukhobors, Homestead Lands, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9957 (v).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Tel. from Sec. Board of Trade (read) 7620 (iv).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7628 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, O. C., on Inquiry for, 6854 (iv).

——— O.C., *re* Rule *re* Producing (remarks) 6927 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 9773, 10259 (v).

Drill Halls Ret., Inquiry for, 5659 (iii).

Drury, R. L., Apptmt. as Japanese Agent (remarks) 4769 (iii).

——— O.C. *re* Apptmt. Inquiry for, 4963 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4687 (iii); in Com., 10763 (vi).

Dunsmuir, Hon. Mr., Lt. Gov. of B.C., Cor. with Govt. *re* Legislation (remarks) 1861 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13261; in Com. on Res., 13279; in Com., 13419 (vii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5485 (iii).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance of by Govt. (Ques.) 1117 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Esquimault Naval Station, Cor., &c., *re* Maintenance (M. for copies) 1128 (i).

Estimates, Suppl., Inquiry *re* Further, 12503 (vii).

Estimates, Preparation of, Insufficient Votes, &c. (remarks) in Conc., 5920 (iii).

Exchequer Court Act Amt.B. 116 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8503 (v).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13459 (vii).

Financial Stringency, &c. (remarks) on the Address, 35 (i).

See 'Wheat,' &c.

Fisheries Act (trials) Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 5219 (iii).

Fisheries Boundaries Treaty between U.S. and Can., Information *re* (remarks) 2023 (ii), 6844 (iv).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1712 (i).

Fishing Bounties paid to Cape Breton Fishermen, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

Fishing Licenses: *See* 'Whale,' &c.

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1393 (i), 3514 (ii); in Com., 3582, 3642 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty Bill (remarks) *re* Discussion, 3754 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Delay *re* Canadian Tariff &c. (remarks) 13534 (vii).

——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 1206 (i).

——— on Preparation of Statement *re* Duty Units (remarks) 943 (i).

——— (remarks) on the Address, 28 (i).

French SS. Subsidy: *See* 'Can. and France,' &c.

French Translation of Govt. Documents &c (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3181 (ii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10556 (vi).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayments of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 668 (i).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5496 (iii).

——— B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12555 (vii).

Govt. Business, Introduction of Govt. Bills (remarks) 10258 (v), 11826 (vi).

Govt. Business (remarks) 10403, 10511 (vi), 12163 (vii).

——— Ry. Subsidies (remarks) 12504 (vii).

——— Suppl. Estimates, &c. (remarks) 11016 (vi).

Govt. Legislation &c. (remarks) 7721 (iv), 10303, 11123 (vi).

Govt. Officials and Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11903 (vi).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections in N.B., on M. (Mr. Sproule) to Com. of Sup., 2894 (ii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6280 (iv).

Grain Bill: *See* 'Man. Grain,' &c.

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2226 (ii); in Com., 12070 (vii).

G.T. Ry. Co.: *See* 'Major's Hill Park.'

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr Crawford) in Com., 9463 (v).

G.T.P. Ry., Cost of Construction (Statement) in Com. of Sup., 12238 (vii).

——— on M. (Mr. Graham) to lay on Table, 12049 (vii).

——— Reply to Min. of Rys., 12682 (vii).

——— Cost inclusive of Terminals, &c., (Ques.) 9265 (v).

——— (remarks) on the Address, 37 (i).

——— Total Cost, &c. (remarks) 5728 (iii).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 10393, 10916, 11407, 11939 (vi).

G.T.P. Eastern Division, Estimated Length, &c. (Ques.) 5563 (iii).

G.T.P., Engineering Staff, Resignation of Mr. Hodgins (Ques.) 366, 516 (i).

——— (M. for cor.*) 558 (i).

——— Charges *re* Classifications, &c. (remarks) 6844, 6925 (iv).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. to Com., 7213 (iv).

G.T.P., La Tuque Branch, Flooding by Water (remarks) 8607 (v).

——— Mountain Division, Incomplete Ret (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).

——— Ret., Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).

——— Supplies via American Routes (remarks) 9027 (v).

See 'Indian,' &c.

Gunn, Mr. B. B., Decease of (remarks) 431

Halifax Garrison, Disbandment of &c. (remarks) 1208 (i).

——— Discontent *re* Pay, Par. in Press, 5659 (iii).

See 'Esquimalt.'

Halifax Immigration Frauds, Dismissal of Mr. J. Bernstein (remarks) 8605 (v).

——— Charges *re* (remarks) 9334 (v).

See 'Immigration,' &c.

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3710 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Lennox) to ref. back to Ry. Com., 3229 (ii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests *re* Treatment (remarks) 5490 (iii).

See "Chinese," &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Hindus in B.C., Deportation from B.C., &c. (remarks) 5338 (iii).

House of Commons Act (members) Amt. (B. 66) 1° m., 1346 (i); 2° m., 5226 (iii).

House of Commons, Allotment of Rooms in New Wing (remarks) 5728 (iii).

——— Rules and Hours for Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 590 (i).

See 'Rules.'

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6395 (iv).

Immigrants, Fraudulent Circular issued &c. (remarks) 606 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 769 (i).

——— B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5657 (iii); in Com., 6431 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7066 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of to Agents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1328 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 1298 (i).

Immigration Irregularities at Halifax, Investigation *re* (remarks) 5567 (iii), 6465 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Robertson (remarks) 9127 (v).

——— Restitution *re* (remarks) 5659 (iii).

——— Statement *re* (remarks) 4963 (iii).

See 'Halifax,' &c.

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13129 (vii).

Indian Reserves, Land Grant to G.T.P. Ry. Co. in B.C., O.Cs. Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6471 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 833; on M. to ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1743 (i).

I.C.R., Cars sent to U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).

——— Civic Elections at Halifax, Interference of Employees (remarks) 6845 (iv).

——— Employes in Prov. of Quebec, Interference in Provincial Elections (remarks) 9777 (v).

——— Employees and Municipal Elections (remarks) 2885 (ii).

——— Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1995 (iii).

——— Truro Sewerage Frontage, (M. for cor.*) 5800 (iii).

See 'Govt. Rys., &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Irrigation Act, Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 955 (i); on M. to withdraw, 2974 (ii).
—— B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4671 (iii).
Japanese in B.C., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lemieux) 12659 (vii).
Japanese Immigration (remarks) on the Address, 32 (i).
—— Announcement of Mr. Lemieux's Mission (remarks) 1208 (i).
—— Cor. *re* Limitation, &c., Inquiry for, 94 (i).
—— Debate in Japanese Diet, Rep. *re* (remarks) 4737 (iii).
—— Information *re* (remarks) 947 (i).
—— Parliamentary Control of, 2025, (amt.) 2043 (ii). Neg. (Y. 45; N. 100) 2158 (ii).
—— Statement by Postmaster General (remarks) 1424 (i).
—— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1602, 1614 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration, O.Cs. Cor. Papers, &c. (M. for copies) 854 (i).
Japanese Treaty, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1928 (i.)
Joly, Sir Henry, Lt. Gov. of B.C., Cor. &c. sent to by Govt. (M. for copies*) 554 (i).
Judges in Man. and Ont., Salaries B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 12551; in Com., 13050 (vii).
Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12399 (vii).
Keewatin Timber and Pulp Woods, Disposal of, &c. (remarks) 13587 (vii).
Kun, Agnes Ballum, Exercise of Clemency by Justice Dept. and Res. of Town Council of Sydney (read) 9334 (v).
—— Release of (remarks) 9580 (v).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1026 (i).
Lands Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 10526 (vi).
See 'Dom. Lands,' &c.
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 10952 (vi).
Life Saving Stations, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).
Literature distributed through Mails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9103 (v).
Loans to Govt., Temporary, &c., Outstanding, Rates of Interest, (Ques.) 235 (i).
—— since Oct., 1906, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 314 (i).
Lobster Fishing at Pictou, Inquiry for Ret., 12772 (vii).
Lovell, Mr. H., Decease of (remarks) 230 (i).
Major's Hill Park, and G.T.R. Hotel (remarks) 1425, 1585 (i).
See 'G.T.R.'

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Consent of Legislature, &c. (remarks) 936 (i).
—— Bill *re* Extension (remarks) 1741 (i), 2882 (ii), 11706 (vi).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 12790 (vii).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12569 (vii).
Man. Voters Lists, Affidavits quoted by member (remarks) 7949 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Ass't. Judge in Exchequer Court (remarks) 11311 (vi).
—— Apptmt. of Counsel (remarks) 6845 (iv).
—— Apptmt. of Counsel for Civil Service Commissioners, on M. for Sup., 7322 (iv).
—— Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. Hse., 8458 (v).
—— Delays, &c., on M. for Sup., 9725 (v).
—— Deputy Minister, Resignation, Acceptance of (remarks) 7621, 7938, 7995, 8088 (iv).
—— Evidence *re* (remarks) 8516 (v).
—— Evidence presented day by day to Hse. (remarks) 8293 (v).
—— Investigation by Minister (remarks) 6526 (iv).
—— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10742 (vi).
—— Officials, Suspension *re* C. S. Report (remarks) 6004 (iii), 6846 (iv).
—— Postponement of by Judge Cassels (remarks) 8385 (v).
—— Proceedings, Public, &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3029 (ii); in Com., 3034 (ii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) on M. (Mr. Blain) to ref. back to Com., 7227; in Com., 7242 (iv).
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Legal Opinion of Justice Dept. (M. for copies*) 5477 (iii).
—— Inquiry for, 2381 (ii).
Militia Camps, Holding of, &c. (remarks) 9779, 9835 (v).
'Montcalm' Str., Collision, Investigation *re* (remarks) 8172 (iv).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9478 (v).
See 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Motions, Unopposed, and Business of the House (remarks) 8896 (v).
National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13498 (vii).
See 'Que.,' &c.
N.T. Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.'

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9420 (v).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3054 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3670 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co's. B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) on Senate Amts., 10511 (vi).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid *re* Immigration (remarks) on M. for Sup., 770 (i).

Northwest Territories Act Amt. B. 210 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13052 (vii).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co's. B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7725 (iv).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4697 (iii); in Com., 10856 (vi).

Opium Prohibition B. 205 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 12550; on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).

Owen Sound Strike, Settlement of (remarks) 8606 (v).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co's. B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6229 (iv).

Pakenham Mail Bags, Destruction of, &c. (remarks) 1425 (i).

Patent Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12625 (vii).

Peace Union, Interparliamentary Union, Meeting at Ottawa (remarks) 13582 (vii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3168 (ii).

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7932 (iv).

P.E.I. Public Works Expenditure, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Ret., 2172 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 12628 (vii).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4654 (iii).

Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10692 (vi).

Private Bills, Discrepancy in Fees between Senate and House of Commons (remarks) 10122 (v).

Provincial Subsidies, Increased Payments, &c.(Ques.) 173 (i).

Public Acounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3080 (ii).

——— Meetings and Adjournments (remarks) 1442 (i).

——— Sittings concurrently with House (remarks) 9504 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Public Bills and Orders, Precedence of (remarks) 2941, 3405 (ii).

Public Buildings constructed since 1897, Amounts expended, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

Public Works Estimates, Discussions *re* (remarks) 5661, 5730 (iii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4945 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Cor., Plans, Specifications, O.Cs., &c. (M. for ret.*) 605 (i).

Quebec Bridge Disaster (remarks) on the Address, 30 (i).

——— Report, Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 5914 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Rep., 946, 1739 (i), 3043 (ii).

——— Printing of (remarks) 6924, 7099, 8171 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Moneys contributed *re* Finances, Estimated Cost of Completion (Ques.) 5566 (iii).

——— Par. in Toronto Globe *re* Change of Site (remarks) 7931 (iv).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. 217 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13417; in Com., 13491 (vii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co's. B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).

Quebec Tercentenary, Number of Troops, &., (remarks) 10259 (v).

Questions, Precedence of &c. (remarks) 350 (i).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) on Par. in 'Globe,' 2383 (ii).

Railway Act (Commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4965 (iii).

——— (compensation) Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 5246 (iii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3397 (ii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 583 (i).

——— on ques. of Order, ref. to debate in Senate, 577 (i).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4659 (iii); in Com., 8511 (v), 10636; on Amt. (Mr Monk) to M. for 3°, 11606; on M. for 3°,11614; (amt.) 11619; Amt. neg. (Y. 40, N. 74) 11631 (vi).

Ry. Mortgages: *See* 'Criminal Code,' &c.

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com., Applications and Constructions, 13478 (vii).

——— Inquiry for, 12771 (vii).

——— Applications for, Memorandum *re* (remarks) in Com., 13304, 13315 (vii).

Returns delayed, &c. (remarks) 13082 (vii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Returns delayed, on Inquiry for, 2384 (ii), 6847 (iv).

——— Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Toronto Globe, 4660 (ii).

See 'Documents,' &c.

Ross Rifle Co., Defects, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) on M. for Sup., 9073 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9331 (v).

——— Report from Public Accounts Com., Delay, &c. (remarks) 5728 (iii).

Rules of the House, Proposed Amendments to, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2985 (ii).

See 'House of Commons.'

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3011 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) 5546 (iii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. MCraney) in Com., 8564, 9069, 9167 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Agreement with Govt. *re* Sale of Homestead Lands, Letter (read) 9127 (v).

——— Information *re* (remaks) 9280 (v).

——— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10102 (vi).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1382 (i).

——— Extension of Time of Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).

——— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10121 (v).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5417; (amt.) 5460 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3762 (ii), 12595; in Com., 13048; (amt.) 12612; on Senate Amts., 13524 (vii).

Stanstead By-election, Disappearance of Papers (remarks) 8087 (iv).

——— on M. for Sup., 8839 (v).

——— on M. for Com., 8888 (v).

Sub-target Machines, on M. to ref. papers to Pub. Accts. Com. (remarks) 946 (i).

Supplies for Govt., Apptmt. of Purchasing Commission, on prop Res. (Mr. Foster) 5820 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 5831 (iii).

Supply B. 220 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13579 (vii).

Supply—Conc., 5499 (iii).

——— Estimates, Basis of Appropriations (remarks) 5919 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Supply—Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9909 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10034 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ross) 10025

See 'Dom. Elections B. 115,' &c.

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 672; (census, &c.) 674 (i); (dairying) 10397 (vi); (Patent Record) 672 (i).

Canals—Generally (salaries) 10325; (staff and repairs) 10304 (vi).

Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v); (salaries, &c.) 616 (i); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 978 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9536 (v); Miscellaneous (cruisers) 9578 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 9226, 9441 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest reserves) 10062 (v); (salaries) 10040 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9878 (v); (deportations) 9882 (v); (literature, &c.) 9948 (v).

Militia (annual drill) 10286 (v); (rifle ranges) 12505 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3147, 3185 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5510 (iii).

Post Office (inspectors) 9103 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg military)10973; (Winnipeg warehouse) 8568 (v); Miscellaneous (Deep Waterways Commission) 11112; Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11071 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10378 (vi); (construction) 12238 (vii); (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5550 (iii); (Windsor Branch) 10145 (v).

Railways — Miscellaneous (extra clerks) 10342 (vi); (inspections, &c.) 10341 (vi); (legal expenses) 10363 (vi).

Supreme Court Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5497 (iii).

Technical Schools, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12660 (vii).

Telegraph and Telephones and Man. Boundaries, Legislation, Inquiry for, 3042 (ii).

Telephones and Telegraphs, Control by Ry. Commission (remarks) on the Address, 37 (i).

See 'Ry. Act Amt.'

Timber Berths, &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff) Ques. of Order *re* reading Evidence before Pub. Accounts, 11308 (vi).

Timber Licenses, Inquiry for Ret., 1739 (i).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2527 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10701 (vi).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners' Rep. and Ry. Commission Reps., Printing of, &c. (remarks) 7 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Trust Funds: *See* 'Colonial Securities.'

Under-Secretaries of State (remarks) on the Address, 25 (i).

U.S. Warships passing through Canadian Canals (remarks) 5338 (iii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178,on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).

Whale Fishing Licenses granted in B.C., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10284 (v).

Wharfs, Piers, &c., and other Public Works, Expenditure since Jan. 1st, 1897, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 4867 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W. and Financial Aid, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2182 (ii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10532 (vi).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9636 (v).

Yukon Moral Reform, Inquiry for Dr. Shearer's letter, 10303, 11122 (vi).

Yukon Placer Mining Act. Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8188 (v),10519 (vi).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C., *Algoma West.*

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Subsidies, Reports, &c. (Ques.) 892 (i).

Alien Labour, Protection to Canadians, Pet. (read) in Com. of Sup., 12156 (vii).

Archives Dept., Index Cards, Quantity purchased, Names of Firms, &c. (Ques.) 6057 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjourn House, 5906 (iii).

—— (remarks) on Presentation, 5644 (iii).

Coal Lands in N.W.T., Lease granted, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5087 (iii).

Copper Cliff Post Office, Charges against Postmaster Kilpatrick (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 658 (i).

—— (remarks) in Com. on Election Bill, 11913 (vi).

Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services, &c. (Ques.) 1736 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

Dredging Contracts, Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c. (Ques.) 1736 (i).

—— Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6634 (iv).

Dredging in Ontario Harbours, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1129 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7949 (iv); 11739; in Com., 11818, 11905; (amt.) 11931 (vi); in Com., 12926; on M. for 3° (amt.) 13230; neg. (Y. 60; N. 99) 13249 (vii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Customs Duties, &c. (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

Fort William or Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T.P. Ry. Co. (Ques.) 5256 (iii).

G.T.R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale, B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12077 (vii).

G.T.P., Steel Rail Contracts, Importations, &c. (Ques) 12775 (vii).

—— Steel Rails, Purchases, Prices, Firms, &c. (Ques.) 10738, 10790 (vi).

—— Supply Transportation, Award of Contracts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2171 (ii).

—— Ties purchased in U.S., &c. (remarks) 1443 (i).

—— Transportation of Supplies, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1932 (i).

Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Rebuilding (Ques.) 7210 (iv).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, 13095; (amt.) 13122; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 101) 13138 (vii).

—— (remarks) *re* Telegram of Mr. Sifton, 13528 (vii).

—— Withdrawal from Sale, &c. (Ques.) 2396 (ii).

I.C.R. Officials, A. T. LeBlanc, &c., Accounts, Vouchers, &c. *re* Travelling Expenses, &c. (M. for copies*) 2982 (ii).

—— Steel Rails purchased from Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re* (Ques.) 9269 (v).

Manitoulin & North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, Reps. *re* &c. (Ques.) 893 (i).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

Niagara Falls, Rep. of Dr. Spencer, Cost of, &c. (Ques.) 6054 (iii).

Ontario, North, Division of Prov. (remarks) 8294 (v).

Port Arthur Dredging, Contracts, Securities, &c. (Ques) 697 (i).

Prefontaine, Hon. R., Date of Sailing for England, Acting Minister of Marine, &c. (Ques.) 7732 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3125 (ii).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3085 (ii).

Public Buildings and Works, Initiated since 1896, (M. for ret.*) 2170 (ii).

Ques. of Priv., Stmnt. of hon. member for Thunder Bay *re* Misleading House, 7995 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, 11610 (vi).

Ry. Act Amt., (remarks) 12194 (vii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Returns, Inquiry for, 2381 (ii).

St. Mary's River, Kaministiquia, Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contracts, Expenditure *re*, &c. (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

'Sault Express,' Amounts paid for Advertising, &c. (Ques.) 696 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 853, 1129 (i).

Sault St. Marie Port, Farm Produce entered, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 898 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Steel Works, Closing of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13470 (vii).
See 'G.T.P.' &c.

Seed Grain Distribution, Extension to Unorganized Territories (remarks) 5408 (iii).

——— O.C. *re* Advances (remarks) 6635 (iv).

Spanish River Dredging, Amount of Expenditure (Ques.) 4764 (iii).

Steel Concrete Co., Payments to by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).
See 'Walker.'

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5872 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 635 (i); Labour Dept. (salaries) 12156 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4015 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers) 1072 (i); (life-saving stations) 2972; (wrecks) 3152, 3195 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5524 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Mint) 1452, 1474; (Museum) 1498 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (legal costs) 5557; (Pictou) 5559 (iii).

Timber Berths, East Saskatchewan, Conditions of Sale to Owners, &c. (Ques.) 3839 (ii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1050, &c., Bonuses, Rentals, &c. (M. for ret.*) 852 (i).

——— Nos. 1048, &c., on Order for Ret. (amt.) 850 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3318 (ii).

Timber Berths, Original Documents, &c. (M. for ret.) 2983 (ii).
See 'Indian Lands.'

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on M. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2466 (ii).

Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contracts with Steel Concrete Co., Payments *re* (Ques.) 3842

——— Payment by Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 5085 (iii).
See 'Steel.'

Yukon Placer Mining Act, Grants *re*, Claims, Names, &c., for one year (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

BOYER, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*

'Challenge' Dredge, Quantity of Material removed (Ques.) 12651 (vii).

Dorval, Dredging at Yacht Club Wharf (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

Dredging Work at Rigaud River, &c. (M. for cor.*) 6240 (iv).

Maple Syrup and Sugar Adulteration, Penalties *re* Violations, &c. (Ques.) 6639 (iv).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3461 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Claims *re* Accidents, &c. (M. for reports*) 6239 (iv).

BRABAZON, Mr. G. H., *Pontiac.*

Georgian Bay Canal, Survey, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for copies, 1997 (i).

——— Final Report of Engineer, &c. (Ques.) 240 (i).

Immigrants, Total Number entering Canada for ten Months, Deportations, &c. (Ques.) 240 (i).

BRISTOL, Mr. E., *Toronto Centre.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3866

Canadians at Niagara, Indignity by U. S. Customs Officers (remarks) 11121 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11669 (vi).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Minister (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1638 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1797 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11126; in Com., 11815, 11843; (amt.) 11820 (vi); in Com., 12920; on M. for 3°, 13234 (vii).

French Treaty, going into Effect (Ques.) 8614 (v).

Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c. (Ques.) 9712 (v).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res, 13303 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3705, 3720 (ii).

Japanese Immigration, Parliamentary Control, &c., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2056 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1605, 1663 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Appointment of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7354 (iv).

BRISTOL, Mr. E.—*Con.*

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9502 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. (B. 82) in Com., 4997, 5052; (amt.) 5056 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 1442 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1454, 1470 (i).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).

Timber Sales to Saskatchewan Valley Co., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8807 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8700 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff) 11309 (vi).

Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties (Ques.) 8616 (v).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6120 (iii).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9679 (v).

BRODER, Mr. A., *Dundas.*

Brockville Cheese Curing Room, Lease, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 3897 (ii).

Budget, The, 5980 (iii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10753 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Report, Investigations, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).

Deep Waterways Commission, St. Lawrence, Damming at Long Sault (remarks) 13142 (vii).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1825 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11140 (vi).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12554 (vii).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6905 (iv).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2098 (ii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2904 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (dairying, &c.) 10398; (exhibitions) 10591 (vi); Canals, Welland (electric lighting) 12205 (vii); Public Works, Miscellaneous (telegraph branch) 11098 (vi).

Technical Students, Employment on Govt. Works, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3297 (ii).

BRODER, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Williamsburg Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12205 (vii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P., (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *Rouville.*

'Arctic,' Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June 1904, to June, 1907 (Ans.) 185 (i).

———Trip in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup. 4012 (ii).

Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction (Ans.) 3849 (ii).

Beauchemin, A., Employment at Sorel (Ans.) 5167 (iii).

See 'Sorel,' &c.

Becancour River Dredging, Commencement of, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 7213 (iv).

Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re* (Ans.) 1733 (i).

——— Expenses of Sir C. H. Tupper (explanation) 4669 (iii).

Bellechasse Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 4830 (iii).

Belleville Harbour, Issue of Bonds, &c. (Ans.) 6238 (iv).

——— Ret., Delay, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).

Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ans.) 3241 (ii).

Bernier, Capt., Islands flagged *re* Arctic Expedition (Ans.) 5208, 5466 (iii).

Birnie and Noble, Advances to, &c. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 987 (i).

See 'Fishing,' &c.

Briar Island Marine Signalling, Change of System (Ans.) 9266 (v).

B.C. Fisheries Commission, Report *re*, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).

B.C. Fishing, Licenses issued to Packers Associations (Ans.) 8173 (iv).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P., Travelling Expenses from June 30th, 1906 (Ans.) 1347 (i).

See 'Marine,' 'Travelling,' &c.

Bronte Harbour Wharfage, Dues collected (Ans.) 13064 (vii).

Burlington Channel Lighthouse, Damages to (Ans.) 5467 (iii).

Campbellton Harbor, Gas Buoys, Tender *re* (Ans.) 8612 (v).

Can. Ensign: *See* 'Red Ensign.'

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6161, 6173, 6198; 1°*, 6215 (iii); 2°*, in Com., 6408 (iv).

See 'Franco,' &c.

Canada Shipping Act, Amt. B. 17 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on M. for 2°, 3420 (ii).

——— (B. 183) 1°*, 10119 (v); in Com., 12851, 13052 (vii).

Canso Medical Officer, Successor to Dr. Brine (Ans.) 1736 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Captains of Govt. Vessels, Examinations *re* Efficiency (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing (Ans.) 681 (i).

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept. (remarks) 6060 (iii).

See 'Marine,' &c.

'Castle' Tug, Removal of Wreck, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 6641 (iv)

Champlain, Str., Emplymt. by Political Agents, (explanation) 9280 (v).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).

——— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5890 (iii).

———Statement *re* Marine Dept., 5620 (iii).

——— Translation (remarks) 6926 (iv).

Clarke, Capt. Arthur, Compensation *re* Death (Ans.) 8180 (iv).

Clement, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 11300 (vi).

Coal Shipments from N.S. and Cape Breton, Res. from Board of Trade, P.E.I. (Ans.) 5471 (iii).

Cold Storage Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction (Ans.) 8379 (v).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Minister (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 999, 1040 (i).

See 'Travelling.'

'Coquitlam,' Str., Compensation *re* Seizure (Ans.) 2389 (ii).

Cowie, F.W., Salary, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 5649 (iii).

Currie, W. D., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 7731 (iv).

Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8896 (v).

Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c. (Ans.) 1934 (i).

Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services (Ans.) 1736 (i).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1149 (i).

'D. H. Thomas,' Tug, Dom. Subsidy Grant (Ans.) 8184 (iv).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Operation at Canso (Ans.) 5651,5779, 5790 (iii), 8179 (iv).

Dog-Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S. (Ans.) 1126 (i).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance of by Govt. (Ans.) 1117 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of Cor. 1128 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Falconer, K., Payments to for Services (Ans.) 8890 (v).

——— Payment of Balance of Account (Ans.) 10516 (vi).

——— Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4000 (ii).

Fire Extinguishers purchased by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7640 (iv).

——— (personal explanation) 7663 (iv).

——— Production of Original File (remarks) 9281 (v).

——— Quotations from, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7765 (iv).

——— on Inquiry for Original Papers, 8912 (v).

Fisheries, B.C., Negotiations with Mr. Bastedo (remarks) 6849 (iv).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1723 (i).

Fisheries Inspectors in Alberta, Names, &c.; (Ans.) 12390 (vii).

Fisheries between Dom. and Provs., Jurisdiction *re* (Ans.) 2395, 3429 (ii).

——— Conference *re* (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

——— Negotiations with Provs., Instructions to Mr. Bastedo (remarks) 4407 (iii).

——— Protection Service, Amounts expended since 1885 (Ans.) 1118 (i).

Fisheries in Lake Winnipeg, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 2390 (ii).

Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

Fish Hatchery at Selkirk, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ans.) 3240 (ii).

Fishing Leases granted between Lake Superior and Rocky Mountains, Name &c. (Ans.) 1684 (i).

Fishing Licenses in B.C., Granted to Japanese (Ans.) 7446 (iv).

Fishing Rights in Matane River, &c. (Ans.) 7446 (iv).

——— Complaints, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).

Fishing Privileges, Lesser Slave Lake, Lease &c. (Ans.) 6398 (iv).

Fish Island, Name of Present Lightkeeper (Ans.) 6058 (iii).

Fog Signal Co., Payments to (Ans.) 11498 (vi).

Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor, &c. (Ans.) 3427 (ii).

France and Canada SS Subsidy, (prop. res.) 3493 (ii).

See 'Can. and France.'

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 927 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1384 (i); in Com., 3609, 3636 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4335 (iii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13082 (vii).

Gananoque and Burnt Island Lights, &c., Apptmt. of Keeper (Ans.) 8383 (v).

Gaudette, Mr. Victor, Emplymt by Govt. (Ans.) 515, 1120 (i).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 981 (i).

——— on Rep. of Mr. Birnie (remarks) 5729 (iii).

See ' Birnie, &c.

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6282 (iv).

Govt. Steamers, Number purchased, &c. (Ans.) 10731 (vi).

——— Maintenance and Supplies, in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

——— Pay of Officers, &c. (Ans.) 10736 (vi).

——— Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c. (Ans.) 5468 (iii).

See ' Cowie,' &c.

Hackett, Capt., Tug *re* Lime Kiln Crossing, Remuneration, &c., (Ans.) 7729 (iv).

Halliday Bros., Lighthouses, Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 6236 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 3°, 4543 (iii).

Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Building (Ans.) 7210 (iv).

' Hurona-Mongolian ' Collision, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 358 (i).

Hydrographic Surveys, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 1128 (i).

Ice-Breaker for Northumberland Straits, Progress *re* Construction (Ans.) 1734 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2944 (ii).

Ingonish Light-keeper, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 8618 (v).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6477 (iv).

I.C.R. Employes and Provincial Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9778 (v).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to by Marine Dept. (statement) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).

' Lady of the Lake,' Str., Crew during Winter &c. (Ans.) 6403 (iv).

——— Purchase Price, Staff, &c. (Ans.) 3434 (ii).

Life-Saving Boats in B.C., Purchase of &c. (Ans.) 684 (i).

Life Saving Stations, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).

Lighthouse Keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1934 (i).

Lighthouses in Nicolet River, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3837 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Lighthouses in Quebec, Classification, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 172 (i).

Lighthouse Service on St. Lawrence, Charter of Steamers, &c. (Ans.) 11299 (vi).

Lighting Buoys on Rideau Canal, Contract *re* (Ans.) 9477 (v).

Lobster Fishery Overseers in Lunenburg, &c., Names, &c. (Ans.) 2794 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries, Issue of Licenses, *re* (Ans.) 2388 (ii).

Lobster Fishery Regulations, Pet. from Fishermen's Union N.S. (Ans.) 6644 (iv).

Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts (Ans.) 10256 (v).

Lobster Fishing Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland County (Ans.) 9473 (v).

——— Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 4404 (iii).

Lobster Fishing Licenses in P.E.I., on M. (Mr. Martin) for Cor., 5475 (iii).

Lobster Fishing at Pictou, on Inquiry for Ret., 12772 (vii).

Lobster Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size, &c. (Ans.) 10257 (v).

Lobsters, Undersized, Caught at Lunenburg, &c., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 2793 (ii).

Lockery & McCombel, Amounts *re* Extra Harbour Dues (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

' Lord Kitchener,' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services (Ans.) 7198 (iv).

Louisburg, Bait Freezer, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 4406 (iii).

——— Harbour Dues for 1906, &c. (Ans.) 7503 (iv).

——— Harbour Master, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 3428 (ii).

——— Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c. (Ans.) 4402 (iii).

Lyall & Sons, Storage of Refuse on Harbour Property (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

Marconi Co. and Commercial Press Business (Ans.) 513 (i).

Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Operation of, &c. (Ans.) 2161 (ii).

Marconi System, Regulation *re* Rates, &c. (Ans.) 174 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Dept., Acting Deputy (remarks) 11939 (vi).

——— Dep. Minister, Resignation and Acceptance (remarks) 7938 (iv).

——— Letter *re* (read) 8088 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, Ret. *re* Mr. Falconer's Accounts, laid on Table, 4223 (iii).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 510 (i).

——— Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3929 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7325 (iv).

——— Apptmt. of Counsel (remarks) 6845 (i).

——— Apptmt. of Mr. Perron (remarks) 6926 (iv).

——— Defalcations of Mr. Roy (remarks) 10741 (vi).

——— Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. House, 8452 (v).

——— Deputy Minister, Suspended Officers, Date of Apptmt, &c. (Ans.) 6982 (iv).

——— Investigation by Minister (remarks) 6636 (iv).

——— Investigation, Public &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).

——— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10742 (vi).

——— Officers under Suspension (remarks) 6846 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries, Minister's Travelling Expenses, Refund, &c. (Ans.) 8889 (v).

Marine and Fisheries Warehouse, Sussex St. (Ans.) 13062 (vii).

Marine and Militia Stationery Supplies, Purchase *re* Book-keeping (Ans.) 6234 (iv).

Markey Fishing Leases, Copy laid on Table, 11404 (vi).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3022; in Com., 3034 (ii).

Meaford Harbour, (B. 158) 1° m., 7195 (iv); in Com., 8510 (v).

Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept. (Ans.) 11701 (vi).

Montcalm, Str., Amount expended, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).

——— Purchase Price, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 8441 (v).

'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended, &c. (re-vestigation *re* (remarks) 8087, 8171 (iv).

——— Accident (remarks) 10121 (v).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Contract *re* Cement (Ans.) 7199, 7499 (iv).

——— Expenditure *re* Cleaning, &c. (Ans.) 8888 (v).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3456 (ii).

Motion, Unopposed, and Business of the House (remarks) 8896 (v).

Naval Instruction, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c. (Ans.) 1119 (i).

Naval Stations in Canada, Maintenance of, Arrangements with G. B. *re* (Ans.) 1118 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations (Ans.) 5651 (iii).

Partridge Island Stores, Emplymt. of Ferry, Rate, &c. (Ans.) 1120 (i).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3980 (ii).

'Petrel' Str., Amounts paid for Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 7937 (iv).

Playgreen Lake, Conditions *re* Lease, &c. (Ans.) 6403 (iv).

Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 10255 (v).

Prefontaine, Hon. Mr., Date of Sailing for England, &c. (Ans.) 7732 (iv).

Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 984 (i).

P.E.I. Cable Service, &c. (remarks) 8516 (v).

P.E.I. Fisheries Protection Service, Annual Cost, &c (Ans.) 360 (i).

——— Life-Saving Station, Establishment of (Ans.) 681 (i).

P.E.I. Lighthouse Supplies, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 358 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Contract *re* Construction of Steamer (Ans.) 2546 (ii).

——— Georgetown and Cape George Route, Test *re* (Ans.) 895 (i).

——— Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 8444 (v).

——— Progress *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 365 (i), 5796 (iii).

——— Rep. *re* (Ans.) 4584 (iii).

——— Signing of Contract (Ans.) 10254 (v).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Removal of Steamers from Georgetown Route (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1109 (i).

——— 'Str. Stanley,' Route, &c. (Ans.) 172 (i), 6160 (iii).

——— Total Quantity of Freight, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

——— Withdrawl of Str., &c. (remarks) 1207 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Investigations, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3084 (ii).

Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Changes *re* (Ans.) 1940 (i).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 10663 (vi).

Red Ensign, Flying on Merchant Vessels, Authority for (Ans) 12776 (vii).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 1018, 1740 (i), 2025, 2886, 3318 (ii).

——— Delayed (remarks) 13082 (vii).

Rideau Canal, Buoys, &c., Contract *re* Lighting (Ans.) 8613 (v).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Russian Govt., Compensation to B.C. Schooners (Ans.) 683 (i).
St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis (Ans.) 3230 (ii).
——— Expenditure and Collections (Ans.) 1935 (i).
Ste Anne de Sorel, Lighthouse, Destruction of Trees, &c. (Ans.) 7732 (iv).
St. Lawrence Route, Wrecks, Collisions, &c. (Ans.) 10739 (vi).
St. Louis, Mr., Payments to, by Marine Dept (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
St. Peters Post Office, on Inquiry for Ret., 2787 (ii).
Salmon Fishing Licenses in B.C., Number, Condition, &c. (Ans.) 5652, 5998 (iii).
——— Gardner's Inlet, &c. (Ans.) 5652 (iii).
——— Payments *re* (Ans.) 5651 (iii).
Salmon Net Fishing, Priviliges in Restigouche River (Ans.) 13518 (vii).
Saskatchewan Fishing Licenses, Issue of, &c. (Ans.) 351 (i).
Shad Hatchery at Windsor, N.S. (Ans.) 8894 (v).
Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7756 (iv).
Shipping Master, Quebec, Apptmt of, &c. (Ans.) 11700 (vi).
Shipping, Statistics *re* Tons registered (Ans.) 2790 (ii).
See 'Canadian Shipping Act,' &c.
Signal Dues at Halifax (B. 152) 1°m., 6457 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8510 (v).
Sorel Pay Lists, Alleged Padding, Rep. *re* (remarks) 7938 (iv).
——— Allegations against Mr. Roy (remarks) 8295 (v).
——— Final Rep. (remarks) 10794 (vi).
——— Investigation *re* Pay Rolls, &c. (Ans.) 4768 (iii).
——— Papers laid on Table, 5477 (iii).
——— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet (remarks) 7099 (iv).
——— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet laid on Table, 8170 (iv).
——— Rep. *re* Irregularities (remarks) 5408 (iii).
Sorel Shipyards, Mr. Desbarats, Connection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
Soulanges County Wharfage Dues, Amount received, &c. (Ans.) 9277 (v).
Spain, Commander, Travelling Expenses, Cor. with Aud. Gen. (Ans.) 4405 (iii).
——— Cor. laid on Table, 4825 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 4670 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
——— (statement) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
'Stanley,' Str., Passenger Accommodation (Ans.) 687 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Steamboat Inspection Report (presented) 3896 (ii).
Stevenson, Mr. A. W., Payments to *re* Auditing, Dept. of Marine (Ans.) 3233 (ii).
Submarine Signal at Negro Point, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5202 (iii).
Summerside Harbour and Str. Stanley (remarks) 6160 (iii).
Supplies purchased for Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5829 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (ass't. dep. min.) 12915 (vii); (salaries) 977 (i).
Fisheries (dogfish works) 13325 (vii); (inspectors, &c.) 12261 (vii); (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).
Hydrographic Surveys (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 13169 (vii).
Immigration (agents) 9853 (v).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, rents, &c.) 5039 (iii); (aids to navigation) 5040, 5773 (iii); (lighthouses) 12262 (vii); (lightkeepers) 13323 (vii); (Lime Kiln crossing) 13323 (vii); (maintenance, &c.) 5039 (iii); (pensions) 13324 (vii); (pilotage pensions, &c.) 5046 (iii); (Point Pelee lightship) 13325 (vii); (repairs) 5039 (iii); (salaries) 4755, 5039 (iii); (signal service) 5045 (iii); (Thunder Bay ice-breaker) 5041 (iii); (wireless stations) 5045 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries (dockyard) 5039 (iii); (dredging plant, &c.) 4754 (iii); (hospitals) 5782 (iii); Hudson Bay Patrolling) 3985 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1885 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752 (iii); 12262 (vii); (Patrol Boats in Hudson Bay) 4747 (iii) (Sorel property) 4751 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Marine investigation) 13169 (vii).
Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3220 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 1078 (i), 5763 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2942, 2952; (life-saving awards) 2972 (ii); (masters and mates) 2969 (ii); (naval schools) 3153 3222 (ii); (obstructions) 3211 (ii); (tidal service) 3215 (ii); (winter mail service) 3217 (ii); (wrecks) 3147, 3184, 3195, (wrecking plant subsidies) 3221 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Elmwood) 13335 (vii).
Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13321 (vii); (St. Lawrence channel) 5035 (iii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11082 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Bonaventure) 12036 (vi); (Peribonka) 12036 (vi); (Piche Point) 12035 (vi).
Technical Students, Emplymt. on Govt. Works, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3294

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. &c., 915 (i); on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 922 (i).

Toronto Harbour Life Saving Station, Establishment of (Ans) 4586 (iii).

Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River (Ans.) 9476 (v).

Trap Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, &c. (Ans.) 7204 (iv).

Travelling Expenses of Minister, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4122 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 986 (i), 3985 (ii).

'Victor,' Tug, Repairs to, &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Reid) 9775 (v).

'Vigilant,' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision (Ans.) 683 (i).

Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contracts with Marine Dept. (Ans.) 3230, 3843 (ii).

——— Contracts with Steel Concrete Co., Payments *re* (Ans.) 3843 (ii).

Washington Fisheries Commissioners, Expenses *re* (Ans.) 1732 (i).

Washington Treaty and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of, &c. (Ans.) 2165 (ii).

Watson, Mr., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Fraud (remarks) 6848 (iv).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6121 (iii).

Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Signals (Ans.) 9274 (v).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Granting of Licenses, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A McLean) 10269 (v).

——— Moneys due, Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 5996 (iii).

Wharfs, Piers, &c., Amount of Revenue collected (Ans.) 2391 (ii).

——— Expenditure, on Inquiry for Ret., 4867 (iii).

Willson, T. L., Payments *re* Ottawa Carbide Co. (Ans.) 11498 (vi).

Wireless Tel. Stations on Pacific Coast, Erection of (Ans.) 683 (i).

BROWN, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*

Pontiac Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 155) 1°*, 6525 (iv).

Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 195) 1°*, 11589 (vi).

BUREAU, Hon. J. (Solicitor General) *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*

Convict Labour, Control of, Sales of Articles, &c. (Ans.) 238 (i).

Hansard, Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9131 (v).

BUREAU, Hon. J.—*Con.*

Judges, Supreme Court, Quebec Apptmnt. on Commissions (Ans.) 358 (i).

Justice, Deptl. Report (presented) 185 (i).

'Le Soleil,' *re* Voting of French Members, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7994 (iv).

Revised Statutes, French Version, Date of Completion (Ans.) 357 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5539 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 10396 (v); Justice (Exchequer Court) 5506; (salaries) 5505 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (Arctic cruise) 4012 (ii); Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5522 (iii); (maintenance) 5509 (iii).

BURROWS, Mr. T. A., *Dauphin.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8357 (v).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11172, 11445, 11526; (amt.) 11943 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10822 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6358 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12812 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12568 (v).

Seed Grain for Settlers in Man., &c., in Com. of Sup., 2772 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2772 (ii); Public Works— Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8531 (v).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr Lake) 2378 (ii).

——— Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Winnipeg 'Telegram,' 9023 (v).

——— Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8734 (v).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8751 (v).

CALDWELL, Mr. T. B., *Lanark, N.*

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5146 (iii).

CALVERT, Mr. W. S., *Middlesex, W.*

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82, on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5062 (iii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 16) 3° m., 1929 (i).

CALVERT, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886 (vi).

West Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 430 (i).

CARNEY, Mr. M., *Halifax.*

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 764 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10595 (vi); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4160 (ii).

CARON, Mr. J. B. T., *Ottawa.*

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4026 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 11344 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 2005 (i).

Northern Empire Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 86) 1°*, 2160 (ii).

Royal Mint of Canada, Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* (M. for copy*) 5210 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4026 (ii).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, (N.B.)*

Anse St. Jean Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).

Chicoutimi Public Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8401 (v); in Com., 13021 (vii).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6798 (iv).

Fraser Lumber Co.'s (B. 8) 1°*, 231 (i).

Govt. Employees and Provincial Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10990 (vi).

G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep., 12293 (vii).

Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12405 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

N.B. Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 1108 (ii).

Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9929 (v).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5441 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12619 (vii).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.— *Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10899 (vi); N. S. (Shelburne) 7177 (iv); Ont. (Kingston) 10913 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John surveys) 13348 (vii); (St. John tidal waters) 12005 (vi); N.S. (Port Hood) 11276 (vi); Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12112 (vii).

CASH, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. (amt.) 11964 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5014 (iii).

—— Manner of Living, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5752 (iii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6334 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 3314 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 26) 1°*, 430 (i).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12580 (vii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1353 (i).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (general expenses) 5752 (iii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T., *Huron, E.*

Address, The, 263 (i).

Bubonic Plague, Prevention of into Canada (Ques.) 686 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6214 (iii).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2573 (ii).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1651 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11945, 11953 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5007 (iii).

Fishing Licenses issued in Saskatchewan Lakes, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 559, 697 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. 2896 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1238 (i).

Fruit Marks Act Inspection Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10564 (vi).

Hudson Bay Co., Original Land Registers of Lord Selkirk's Estate, &c. (Ques.) 4403 (iii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6834 (iv).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T.—*Con.*

McGee, Hon. Thomas D'Arcy, Monument *re* (remarks) 6288 (iv).

Mint Building, Ventilation of, &c. (Ques.) 3036 (ii).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13501; in Com., 13502 (vii).

Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9945 (v).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) on Senate Amts., 13316 (vii).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii); in Com., 12623 (vii).

'Petrel,' Str., Supplies, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 7937 (iv).

Postmasters' Assessments, Amount collected, &c. (Ques.) 6458 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on M. (Mr. McLean) to conc., 13353 (vii).

Salmon Fishing Licenses, Number granted in B.C., Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 5998 (iii).

Saskatchewan Fishing Licenses, Issue of, &c. (Ques.) 351 (i).

S.A. SS. Subsidy, Amount to Elder-Dempster Co. (Ques.) 2792 (ii).

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12607 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries, &c.) 622 (i); Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5759 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4184 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. W., *Antigonish.*

Antigonish Armoury, Leasing, &c., Letters, Tels., &c. (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1702 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Georgetown and Cape George Route, Test *re* (Ques.) 895 (i).

——— Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4630 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 11695 (vi).

CHRISTIE, Mr. P., *Ontario, S.*

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vii).

Cattle, Exports and Imports from Canada to G.B. (Ques.) 6460 (iv).

Cattle Registered, Importations from U.S., from 1904-7 (Ques.) 6238 (iv).

Postal Services, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7266 (iv).

CHRISTIE, Mr. P.—*Con.*

Railway Commission (ass't. chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3930 (ii).

Sheep Quarantine by U.S. (remarks) 13537 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock) 12895 (vii); (seeds) 12893 (vii).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H., *Essex, S.*

Address, The, 254 (i).

Battlefields of Canada, B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4385 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5120 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11825, 11859; (amt.) 11881 (vi).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 25) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 3194, 3226, 3621, 3692, 3737 (ii), 4224 (iii); 3° m., 4357, 4536 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6474 (iv).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

Patent Medicines, B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12627 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Meetings and Adjournments (remarks) 1440 (i).

——— 3rd Rep. (M. to conc.) 2159 (ii).

——— Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3131 (ii).

Tobacco, Protection *re* Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 913 (i).

Walker, Andrew, Relief (B. 124) 1°*, 5336 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6126 (iii).

Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.'s (B. 108) 1°*, 3834 (ii).

Windsor Pump and Foundry Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 72) 1°*, 1424 (i).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8494 (v).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S., *Kent, W.*

Address, The, 194 (i).

Binder Twine Seizures, Payments to A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amount, Price, &c. (Ques.) 4584 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 6465 (iv).

See 'Militia.'

Bounties paid by Govt. since 1896 (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

——— (Ques.) 895 (i).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Brome County Employees, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

Budget, The, 6527 (iv).

Canned Foods, &c., Inspection Regulations, Names of Counties, &c. (Ques.) 514 (i).

——— Cor. *re* Regulations, &c. (M. for copies*) 557 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy, B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6174 (iii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11254 (vi).

Charlan, Mr., Salary as Tobacco Expert (Ques.) 11495 (vi).

Chilvers, Messrs., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 8894 (v), 9266 (v).

Chilvers, Francis W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 10515 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12164 (vii).

Colchester Point, Essex Pier, Amount expended (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

Concrete Wharfs, Dissatisfaction in Ont. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).

Detroit River Tunnel, Duties on Construction Material, &c. (Ques.) 1116 (i).

——— Material imported, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).

——— Material entered free of Customs Duties (Ques.) 10254 (v).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 10417 (vi).

Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. by Customs Dept. at Windsor (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

Documents, Original, Ques. of Priv., 6010 (iii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5031 (iii).

Dredging Contracts, Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6634 (iv).

Essex County Junior Judge, Apptmt. of &c. (Ques.) 1939 (i).

Falconer, Payments to *re* Auditing Accounts of Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4178 (ii).

Floods at Chatham, Damage &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4742 (iii).

Foster, Frederick, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

Glencoe Post Office Building, Contract *re* (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

Hackett Dock, Purchase of, at Amherstburg (Ques.) 7730 (iv).

Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered (Ques.) 9280 (v).

Hogs slaughtered, Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13092 (vii).

Immigrants deported from Chatham, Names and Cause, &c. (Ques.) 5796 (iii).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Immigrants at Chatham, Complaints *re* Deportation of (Ques.) 6922 (iv).

Immigrants distributed in West Kent, Certificates, &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

Immigration Agents appointed in Ontario, Names, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1129 (i).

Immigration Agents, Special Prizes, &c. (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Immigration Forms, Number returned by Farmers, &c. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

Immigration Officers in Kent County, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 514 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 3172 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3041 (ii), 4223 (iii).

Indian Department, Extravagant Management (remarks) on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11066 (vi).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr Templeman) in Com., 6470 (iv).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11248 (vi).

Lime Kiln Crossing, Charter of Capt. Hackett's Tug, Remuneration *re* (Ques.) 7729 (iv).

Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Lady Evelyn' (Ques.) 5799 (iii).

Marcoun, Mr. Frank, Commission *re* Settlement of Claims, &c. (Ques.) 1122 (i).

Meats and Canned Food Inspectors, Number appointed, Names, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).

Meat Inspection Regulations, Meetings at Chatham (remarks) in debate on Address, 196 (i).

Meat Inspection Act Violations, Inquiry for Ret., 3012 (ii).

Militia, Purchase of Blankets, Return *re* (remarks) 5914 (iii).

See 'Blankets.'

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 793 (i).

Pacaud, Benjamin, Apptmt. to Customs, Windsor (Ques.) 5200 (iii).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii).

Pepin, J. A., Emplymt. at Windsor Customs (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

Perdue, Dr M. B., Apptmt. as Inspector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 173 (i).

Piggeries at Experimental Farm (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4931 (iii).

Railway Commission (Ass't. Chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3928 (ii).

Rankin, Col., Resignation of (remarks) 11405 (vi).

Returns, Inquiry for, 1739 (i).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4665 (iii).

Ruscomb River Works, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1122 (i).

Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c. (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 12894 (vii); (Meat and Canned Foods Act) 12893 (vii); (seeds) 12892 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 652 (i).

Fisheries (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (administration) 12732 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lime Kiln crossing) 13323 (vii); (Thunder Bay icebreaker) 5042 (iii).

Marine, &c.—Public Works (ship channel) 5038 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (naval schools) 3154 (ii); (obstructions) 3212 (ii); (wrecks) 3188 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8524 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Dom. renewals, &c.) 7479 (iv); (Glencoe) 7487 (iv); (Guelph armoury) 7678 (iv); (Kingston R. M. C.) 7704 (iv); (Leamington) 7705 (iv); (Markham) 7712 (iv); (North Bay) 7712 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal Station C.) 7420 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8599 (v); (Maple Creek) 8600 (v); (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hood) 11273 (vi); (Port Royal) 11278 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Belle River) 12090 (vii); (McGregor's Creek) 12103 (vii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13322 (vii).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11073 (vi).

Tecumseh Park Breakwater, Dangerous Condition (remarks) 12657 (vii).

Thames River Wharf, Damages to (remarks) 7506 (iv).

Tilbury, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. &c., 908 (i).

Wallace, Michael J, Emplymt in Customs at Windsor (Ques.) 7500 (iv).

Waugh, James, Refund to Govt. *re* Immigration Agent (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6138 (iii).

Wilson Cordage Co., Cor. Accounts, &c. (M. for copies*) 1129 (i).

Windsor, Detroit and Belle Isle Ferry Co., Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— Expiration of Franchise (Ques.) 1940 (i).

COCKSHUTT, Mr. W. F., *Brantford.*

Address, The, 123, (amt.) 147 (i); Amt. Neg. (Y. 95: N. 56) 274 (i).

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12448 (vii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10940 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada, B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4391; in Com., 4409 (iii).

Bell Memorial Association, Grant, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11206 (vi).

Brantford Srike, Cor. with Justice Dept. (Ques.) 10016 (v).

Budget, The, 5314 (iii).

Buffalo Herds for Parks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5756 (iii).

Butter Imports, Quantity, Countries of Origin, &c. (Ques.) 1116 (i).

Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6176 (iii).

Canadian Associated Press B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12407 (vii).

Cataract Power Co., Welland Canal, Amount diverted at DeCew Falls, &c. (Ques.) 897 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12183 (vii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9736 (v).

Customs Dept. and Civil Service Rep. *re* on M. for Sup., 10428 (vi).

Customs Seizure for 1905-7, Reasons, Fines, &c (M. for ret.*) 4588 (iii).

——— Customs Dept., Criticism, on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10428 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10825 (vi).

Dominion Power Co.'s Bill, Inquiry for, 10919 (vi).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1237 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3556 (ii); in Com., 3617 (ii), 3640 (ii).

Fraser, Donald, Customs Collector, Investigation *re* Defalcations (Ques.) 5200 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12555 (vii).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2240 (ii).

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6661 (iv).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12725 (vii).

COCKSHUTT, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4227 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6451 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of, to Agents, &c. (prop. res.) 1295 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6998 (iv).

Indian Schools, Dr. Bryce's Report (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 625 (i).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6490 (iv).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2074 (ii).

Newspaper Rates, List of Publications (M. for copy*) 1295 (i).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10704 (vi).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8857 (v).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4659 (iii) .

Saskatoon, Saskatchean, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4238 (ii)

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (seed branch) 5501 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 625 (i).

Indians—(destitute, relief) 5762 (iii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5756 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5741 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10891 (vi); Ont. (Brantford) 7455 (iv).

Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 2873 (ii).

CONMEE, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12855 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5097 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10721 (vi); in Com., 11386 (vi); 12167 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7982 (iv), 7998 (iv), 11727 (vi); in Com., 11802 (vi), 11833 (vi), 12958 (vii); on M. for 3°, 13235 (vii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5030 (iii).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6803 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 8635 (ii).

CONMEE, Mr. J.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6659 (iv).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12678 (vii).

——— Ties purchased in U.S. (remarks) 1445 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3702 (ii), 3719 (ii).

Hudson Bay Ry. (remarks) on Amt. (Mr. Foster) *re* Financial Review, 13467 (vii).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12561 (vii).

Midland Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).

Niagara, St. Catherines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5064 (iii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4914 (iii).

Railway Act (Commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4971 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12611 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5664 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4054, 4132 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt (Mr. Lake) 2345 (ii).

COPP, Mr. A. J. S., *Digby*

Dominion Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1°*, 1108 (i); in Com., 4231 (ii); on Senate Amts., 5785 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 5412, 5519 (iii).

Townsend, Arthur James, Relief (B. 196) 1°*, 11589 (vi).

CRAWFORD, Mr. J., *Portage la Prairie.*

Address, The, 316 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11986 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8076, 8089 (iv); in Com., 13007 (vii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Ry Co.'s (B. 151) 1°*, 6287 (iv).

——— on Order for Com., 7141 (iv); in Com., 7667, 8125 (iv), 8552, 8609, 8741, 9377, 9461 (v).

Grazing Land leased to Brown, Bedingfield & Co., Number of Acres (Ques.) 13062 (vii).

'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9132 (v).

CRAWFORD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6382 (iv)

Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N. W. Ters., Areas reserved on July 1, 1896 (Ques) 13512 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).

Railway Act (demurrage) Amt B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3381 (ii).

Returns, Questions, &c., ordered by House, Time to complete, &c. (Ques.) 4242 (ii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1364 (i).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5523 (iii)

Public Works--Buildings--Man. (Dauphin) 8521 (iii); (Neepawa) 8537 (v).

Timber Berths, Awarded between June 1904 and July 15th, 1896, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3851 (ii).

——— Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2676 (ii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S., *York (N.B.)*

Blackhall, Mrs., Claims *re* Caraquet Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6878 (iv).

Civil Service Act. Amt B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11558 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1861 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13028 (vii)

Elections in N.B., Federal Govt. Patronage, on M. for Sup., 3043 (ii)

Freight Rates, Discrimination *re* City of St John, Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr Crawford) in Com., 9464 (v).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12710 (vii).

——— Grand Falls and Moncton Section, Contract *re* (Ques.) 9266 (v).

Immigration in N.B., Co-operation with N.B. Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).

I.C.R., Claim Agent, E. H. Allen, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 3480 (ii).

——— Deterioration in Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10147 (v).

——— Freight Rate Discrimination against Fredericton, N.B., Cor., &c. (M. for copy) 2558 (ii).

——— Moncton Shops, Contractor, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1509 (i).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Pictou Engine House, Contract *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12403 (vii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).

Mail Service in N.B. and N.S., Number of Post Offices, Postal Revenue, &c. (M. for ret.*) 852 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12796 (vii).

Moncton Shops, Payments to E. A. Wallberg (Ques.) 8892 (v).

N.B. Coal and Ry. Co.'s Claim against Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 9714 (v).

Post Office Services Ret., Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4916 (iii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6227 (iv).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10639 (vi).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9830 (v).

St. Mary's Indian Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).

Seed Grain for N.W. Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2911 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12597 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 12889 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries, &c.) 621 (i); Mines (salaries) 647 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 652 (i).

Immigration (deportations) 9886 (v).

Indians—N.B. (agents salaries) 13170 (vii); (salaries) 12736 (vii); (schools) 13170 (vii).

Militia (gratuities) 13178 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2942 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13154 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Emerson) 8534 (v); (Neepawa) 8537 (v); (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8573 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fredericton) 13328 (vii); (Moncton) 13328 (vii); (Quarantine, water service) 7187; (St. John) 7186 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7119; (Bridgewater) 7136 (iv) (Halifax customs) 7156 (iv); (Inverness) 7172 (iv); (Shelburne) 7173 (iv); (Westville) 7179; (Yarmouth) 7182 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph armoury) 7679 (iv); (Kingston artillery park) 7701 (iv); (Kingston, hospital)

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

7702 (iv); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7704 (iv); (North Bay) 7718 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dom. Arsenal) 7438 (iv); (Dundee) 7287 (iv); (Farnham) 7287 (iv); (Knowlton) 7291 (iv); (St. John's) 7444 (iv); (St. John's military) 7442 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta (Battleford) 8578 (v); (Edmonton) 8579 (v); (Estevan) 8581 (v); (Humboldt) 8584 (v); (Moosejaw) 13337 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Buctouche) 11684 (iv); (Campbellton wharf) 11685 (vi); (Campbellton 13344 (vii); (Caraquet wharf) 11685 (v); (Dover wharf) 11692 (vi); (Madawaska) 11696 (vi); 13344 (vii); (Miscou) 13344 (vii); (Moncton) 11696 (vi); (New Mills) 13345 (vii); (Richibucto) 11698 (v); (St. John river) 11698 (vi); (St. John, surveys) 13346 (vii); (St. John, tidal waters) 12008 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11216 (vi); (Baddeck) 11220 (vi); (Cow Bay) 11225 (vi); (Portuguese cove) 11279 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10384 (vi); (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (Chatham diversion) 12758 (vii); (claims dept.) 10176 (v); (double tracking) 12250 (vii); (Fredericton improvements) 12758 (vii); Halifax accommodation) 12227 (vii); (Indiantown branch) 12258 (vii); (locomotives) 10156 (v); (machinery) 12257 (vii); (Moncton car shops) 12251 (vii), 12256 (vii); (Pictou accommodation) 12230 (vi); (Sackville) 12235 (vii); (salaries) 10147 (v); (supplies) 10191 (v).

Railways—P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claim) 12762 (vii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.) 10389 (vi).

Venoit, Mr. P. G., Complaints *re* Interference in Politics (Ques.) 6406, 7730 (iv).

Woodstock, N.B., Mr. C. L. Smith's Salary, &c. (Ques.) 2794 (ii).

——— Interference in Elections, on M. for Sup., 2886 (ii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10534 (vi).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W., *St. John (City).*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3862 (ii).

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12469 (vii).

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to, in Com. of Sup., 4026 (ii).

Aud. General, Salary B. 208 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12645 (vii).

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11990 (vi).

Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6173 (iii).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W. —*Con.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12852 (vii).

——— B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12647 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12183 (vii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11983 (vi).

Dom. Liabilities due N.B. from 1869 to 1884, &c. (Ques.) 2217 (ii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4686 (iii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1722 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1236 (i); on M. for 1°, 3494 (ii); in Com., 3593 (ii), 3637

Franco-Canadian Treaty, and Favoured Nation Clause (Ques.) 514 (i).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res, 2222 (ii); in Com., 12081 (vii).

Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 10015 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Instruction *re* Municipal Offices, &c. (Ques.) 3430 (ii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10493 (vi).

Imports from France, Value for five years, &c. (Ques.) 1124 (i).

I.C.R., Claims *re* Damages, Settled and Unsettled, &c. (Ques.) 5793 (iii), 7196 (iv).

——— Employees, Names and Number taken in Jan. and Feb. in N.B. (Ques). 5793 (iii).

——— Hard Pine Tenders, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

——— Moncton Workshops, Tenders *re* Leasing, &c. (Ques.) 5800 (iii).

——— Number employed in N.B. for Jan. Feb., &c. (M. for ret.*) 6241.

International Ry., N.B., Directors, Amount of Stock, &c. (Ques.) 4246 (iii).

Lobster Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size, &c (Ques.) 10257 (v).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 12795 (vii), 12829 (vii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9494 (v).

Negro Point Submarine Signal, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 5202 (iii).

New Brunswick Cold Storage Co., Lease of Land to, Cost and Terms, &c. (Ques.) 563 (i).

——— Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9313 (v).

See 'Trueman.'

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

N.B. Credit, Amount &c. (Ques.) 1937 (i).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. Patronage (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3050 (ii).

Obstruction to Supply, on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10032 (v).

Partridge Island Stores, Emplymt. of Ferry, Rate, &c. (Ques.) 1120 (i).

Patent Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12624 (vii).

Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. 10692 (vi).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4958 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10648 (vi).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in House of Com., on M. for Sup., 9780 (v).

——— Ques. of Priv., 9891 (v).

Rifle Range, Charlottetown, Purchase Price, &c. (Ques.) 6233 (iv).

Ryan, Mr. G. M., Ry. Mail Supt., Apptmt. of Successor (Ques.) 7504 (iv).

St. John Fusiliers, 62nd, Payments *re* Annual Drill, Delays, &c. (Ques.) 846 (i).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563 (v).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1561 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com on Res,, 3787 (ii); in Com., 12596 (vii).

Sussex Military Camp (remarks) 9836 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10569 (vi); (Year Book) 678 (i).

Canals—Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13175 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries, &c.) 639 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9541; Miscellaneous (printing, &c.) 9577 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 9229 (v).

Fisheries (dogfish reduction works) 13325; (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Geological Survey (maps, &c.) 12260; (specimens) 12261 (vii).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9972 (v).

Indians—N.B. (schools) 13172 (vii).

Labour Dept.—(Gazette) 12261 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5040 (iii); (lifeboats) 13323; (lighthouses) 12262; (Point Pelee lightship) 13325 (vii); (salaries) 5039 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and Cumberland) 12263.

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4026 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1908 (i).

Marine—Public Works (ship channel) 5036 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5736 (iii); Dom. arsenal) 12155; (gratuities) 13177; (provisions, &c.) 12150; (R. M. College) 12152; (warlike stores) 12149 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (Civil Service Commissioners) 13168; (Olympic Games) 13167 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3221 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 1082 (i); (ice-breakers) 2961; (life-saving awards) 2973; (masters and mates) 2969; (Naval Schools) 3153, 3223; (tidal service) 3215; (wrecks) 3194, 3196 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors, N.B.) 13153 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 13328; (St. John) 13329 (vii); (St. John, quarantine station) 5703 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 7136 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston militia stores) 10908 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C. (additions) 1487; (mint) 1451, 1483; (museum) 1497 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 7290 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John harbour) 12012 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11218; (Caribou Island) 11225; (Cow Bay) 11226; (Round Hill) 11282 (vi).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects' branch) 11096; (clerical assistance) 11100; Deep Waterways Commission) 11102; (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 10186 (v); (double tracking) 12236, 12250; (Halifax accommodation) 12229 (vii); (legal services) 10190 (v); St. John accommodation) 12257 (vii); (salaries) 10154 (v).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

Trueman, Mr., and N. B. Cold Storage Co., &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 9344 (v).

See 'N.B. Cold Storage.'

Uniforms, Official, and Customs Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9570 (v).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8484 (v).

DELISLE, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*

Captains of Govt. Vessels, Examinations *re* Efficiency, &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

Lacoste, Sir Alexander, Amount of Pension, &c. (Ques.) 1934 (i).

Money Lenders, Operating in Public Buildings, &c. (Ques.) 1738 (i).

DEMERS, Mr. J., *St. John's and Iberville.*

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3576 (ii).

Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils, Quantity imported from G. B. for 1904-5-6-7 (Ques.) 1506 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. John's military) 7442 (iv).

DESJARDINS, Mr. S., *Terrebonne.*

Jesus River Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan (Ques) 6980 (iv).

Peat Industry, Employment of Mr. Erik Nystrom, &c. (Ques.) 1122 (i).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12487 (vii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1177 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8143 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 2012 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Prohibition Vote in Quebec (remarks) in Com of Sup., 662 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4922 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4056 (ii); Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1098 (i).

DUBEAU, Mr. J. A., *Joliette.*

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 77) 1°*, 1584 (i).

Cigar Stamps, Use of Black Ones (Ques.) 12390 (vii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3573 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6490 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Year Book) 679 (i).

Tobacco Industry, Amts. to Inland Revenue Act, &c. (Ques.) 178 (i).

——— (M. for copies) 899 (i).

DUGAS, Mr. F. O., *Montcalm.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8282 (iv); in Com., 11863 (vi).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt., B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6493 (iv).

Tobacco, Foreign, Refund, Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 4402 (iii).

DYMENT, Mr. A. E., *Algoma East.*

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 137) 1°*, 5913 (iii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 138) 1°*, 5913 (iii); in Com., 8610, 9070 (v).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2195 (ii).

ELSON, Mr. P., *Middlesex, E.*

Address, The, 304 (i).

Binder Twine, Purchasers Names and P. O. Addresses (Ques.) 9715 (v).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy, B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6209 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5098 (iii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5011 (iii).

Lord's Day Act, Violations at Ottawa *re* Horse Racing on Sunday (remarks) 3753 (ii).

Opium, Amount received *re* Duties, Pet. from B.C. *re* Prohibition, &c. (Ques.) 8614 (v).

Ry. Semaphores, Standard Ladder and Posts, &c. (Ques.) 239 (i).

Salmon Fishing Licenses, B.C., Payments *re* (Ques.) 5651 (iii).

Semaphores at Interlocking Plant, London, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 9714 (v).

Sheep Quarantine by U. S., &c. (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10575 (vi).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R., *Westmoreland.*

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7671, 8553 (iv).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12866 (vii).

——— B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12647 (vii).

C.P.R., Papineauville Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9178 (v).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 755 (i).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6750 (iv).

Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13273 (vii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).

Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections, on M. (Mr. Sproule) to Com. of Sup., 2893 (ii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6267 (iv).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6653 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 833 (i).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, (prop res.) 2435 (ii).
——— Passes issued to P. S. Archibald, (Ques.) 2387 (ii).
N. B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3058 (ii).
P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13482 (vii).
P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch, B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 12629 (ii).
P.E.I., Hillsborough Bridge Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2713 (ii).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).
Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor, I. C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10154 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10595 (vi).
Militia (gratuities) 13178 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).
Railways—I. C. R. (inspecting auditor) 10154 (v); (double tracking) 12237 (vii); (St. Cyrille diversion) 12757 (vii).
Tobacco, Violation of Act, Ques. of Order, in Com. of Sup., 9242 (v).
William, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R., &c. (Ques.) 2388 (ii).

ETHIER, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Architectural Institute of Can., Refund of Fees (M.) 11234 (vi), 11404 (vi).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3488 (ii).
Geological Survey, Technical Officers (remarks) on Conc., 13575 (vii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3459 (ii).
Ry. Act (land surveys) Amt. (B. 30) 1° m., 560 (i).
Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13482 (vii).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. &c., 911 (i).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance) *Shelburne and Queen's (N.S.)*
Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 352, 363 (i).
Address, The, 94; on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 531 (i).
Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4719 (iii).
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12465 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps, &c. (Ans.) 2593 (ii).
Anglo-French Exhibition, Purchase of Goods, &c. (Ans.) 8443 (v).
——— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 8444 (v).
Anglo-French Treaty, Ratification by British Govt. (remarks) 11706 (vi).
See 'Franco,' &c.
Apples seized at Port of Montreal, Value, &c. (Ans.) 1508 (i).
Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5381 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Ethier) to refund Fees, 11234 (vi).
Aud. Gen.'s Deptl. Rep. (Vol. i)—(presented) 7 (i).
——— (Vol. ii)—(presented) 766 (i).
——— (Vol. iii)—(presented) 6 (i).
Aud. General, Salary (B. 208) Prop. Res., 12502; in Com. on Res., 12645, 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 12645 (vii).
Audit and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12658 (vii).
——— Independent Bank Audit, Establishment of (Ans.) 11232 (vi).
Bank Act Amt. (B. 160) 1° m., 7307 (iv); 2° m., 10919; in Com., 10933 (vi).
Bank Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4298 (ii).
Banks, Aid to: *See* 'Dom. Notes Bill,' 'Wheat,' &c.
Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure (remarks) 9336 (v).
Belleville Harbour, Total Revenue, &c. (remarks) 2593 (ii).
Belleville—Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 8556, 8609 (v).
Binder Twine Seizures, Payments to A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).
Blue Books, Distribution of (remarks) 432 (i).
Boards of Trade Act Amt. (B. 133) 1°*, 5337 (iii); 2° m. and in Com., 11987 (vi); in Com., 12393 (vii).
Bonusing System, on Notice of M. (Mr. Monk) 6289 (iv).
Boone Co., Payments to (remarks) 5083 (iii).
Bounties paid by Govt. for 1908-9 (Ans.) 13226 (vii).
Bridge Subsidies to Ry. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com., 13312 (vii).
British Columbia Bank incorp. B. 49 (Mr. Sloan) on M. for 2°, 1469 (i).
B.C., Revenue contributed to Dom. from 1872-3 to 1905, on M. (Mr. D. Ross) for Ret. 3436 (ii).
British Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3621 (ii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Bronze Coat-of-arms, Duty *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).

Budget, The, (M.) for Com. on Ways and Means (annual statement) 5137 (iii).

——— (remarks) 519, 560 (i), 4316, 4670 (iii).

See 'Financial Review.'

Business of the House, Precedence *re* Questions (remarks) 430 (i).

Campaign Literature franked by Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10352 (vi).

Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6174, 6194 (iii); in Com., 6412 (iv).

Canada and Germany Treaty (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10601 (vi).

——— Trade Relations (remarks) 13082 (vii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 209) prop. Res., 12392 (vii); in Com. on Res., 12646; 1°, 12649; in Com., 13053 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. (B. 187) on M. to place on Order Paper, 13493; 2° m, 13506 (vii).

Canadian Associated Press (B. 201) prop. Res., 12052 (vii); in Com. on Res., 12408 (vii); in Com., 12644 (vii); 2° m., 12837; in Com., 12848 (vii).

——— Memorial from Pres'dt. J. Ross Robertson (read), 12837 (vii).

Canadian Associated Press, Govt. Subvention, &c. (Ans.) 5080 (iii).

Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c. (Ans.) 5208 (iii).

Canadian Loans, Rate of Interest (remarks) 12194 (vii).

See 'Loans,' &c.

Canadian Weather Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. M. S. Schell) in Com., 5174 (iii).

Canso Medical Officer, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 6647 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12881 (vii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11256 (vi).

Cigarette, Anti-Legislation *re* (remarks) 7279 (iv).

Civil Servants, Increases *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) prop. Res., 11300 (vi); in Com. on Res., 11359 (vi); in Com., 11402, 11641 (vi), 12185 (vii).

Civil Service Bill, on Inquiry for, 8516 (v).

——— Resolution *re* (remarks) 11017 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Rep., on Inquiry for, 90, 938, 1740 (i), 3043, 3317 (ii), 4316, 4832, 4963, 5408, 5491, 5567 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4495 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Civil Service Commission's Rep., presented, 5620 (iii).

——— Number distributed, &c. (remarks) 5723, 6060 (iii), 6222 (iv).

——— Translation, &c. (remarks) 6222, 6926 (iv), 13477 (vii).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Civil Service Commission's Report, Policy of Govt. (remarks) on M. to Adjn. House, 5883 (iii).

Civil Service System, Re-organization of, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9158 (v).

Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c. (Ans.) 6924 (iv).

Cold Storage Cos., Grants to (Ans.) 1938 (i).

Colonial Conference, 1907, Total Expenditure by Govt. (Ans.) 512 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).

See 'Intercolonial,' &c.

Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, &c., Cor. *re* Govtl. Action (Ans.) 174 (i).

Companies Act Amt. (B. 104) 2°* and in Com., 5492 (iii).

Contractors' Securities, Amounts retained (Ans.) 1112 (i).

Co-operation B. 5 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 4565 (iii).

Copper Cliff Postmaster, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 659 (i).

Crown Life Insurance Co.'s B. 180 (Mr. Tisdale) in Com., 9962 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup. (remarks) 10143 (v).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11984 (vi).

Customs, Outside Service (salaries) 9221 (v).

Debates, Official, Adoption of 2nd Rep. (remarks) 12505 (vii).

——— 4th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to Conc., 8835 (v).

——— Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8898 (v).

Debt of Canada, Portions falling Due (Ans.) 315 (i).

——— Portions maturing 1908 (Ans.) 315 (i).

See 'Loans,' &c.

Detroit River Tunnel, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10182 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on M. for Sup., 1805 (i).

Dominion Guarantee Co.'s B. 127 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 6231 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11202 (vi).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt., on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to Amt. (Mr. Lake) on M. for 3°, 11977 (vi).

Dom. Liabilities due to N.B. from 1869 to 1884, &c. (Ans.) 2217 (ii).

Dom. Loans and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c. (Ans.) 313 (i).

Dominion Notes Issue (grain advances) (B. 159), 1° m., 7307 (iv); 2°*, in Com., 10795 (vi).
See 'Seed Grain,' &c.

Dom. Notes Outstanding, Oct. 1907, Total Amount (Ans.) 692 (i).
See 'Loans.'

Dom. Power and Development Co.'s (B. 173) on Conc. by Senate, 12549 (vii).

Dominion Revenue from 1873 to 1907 (Ans.) 1734 (i).

Draper, Mr., and Mr. Pepper, Candidates for Municipal Office (Ans.) 687 (i).

—— (Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).

Dry Docks Subsidy (B. 119) M. for Com. on Res., 4314 (iii); in Com. on Res., 4675 (iii); 1°*, 4689 (iii); in Com., 6911 (iv), 10761; on Senate Amts., 11633 (vi).

Easter Adjournment (M.) *re* 6843 (iv).

Employees of Parliament, Religions, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5480 (iii).

Estimates of 1908-9 (presented) 554 (i).

—— Suppl. (1908) presented, 2381 (ii), 5134 (iii).

—— Suppl. (1909) presented, 12503 (vii).

Estimates, Preparation of, Insufficient Votes, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5920 (iii).

Favoured Nation Treatment, Conventions *re* Commercial Relations, &c. (Ans.) 840 (i).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13442 (vii).
See 'Budget.'

Financial Stringency : *See* 'Wheat,' &c.

Fisheries Regulations, Violation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5780 (iii).

Foresters Subsidiary High Court B. 62 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 5175 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty (B. 57), Res. prop., 941; (M.) for Com. on prop. Res., 1213 (i); on M. for 1°, 1421 (i); 2° m., 2220, 3502; in Com., 3582, 3636; 3°m., 4317, agreed to (Y. 103; N. 5) 4376 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 930 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Goods and Minimum Tariff, on M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret., 851 (i).

—— Delay in Approval, &c. (Ans.) 12655 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Delays *re* Canadian Tariff (remarks) 13535 (vii).

—— Discussion *re* (remarks) 1206 (i), 3754 (ii).

—— Distribution to Members (remarks) 606 (i).

—— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 12651 (vii).

—— Favoured Nation Clause and Foreign Countries (Ans.) 845 (i).

—— German Surtax, Effect, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

—— Going into Effect (Ans.) 8614 (v).

—— Imports from U.S., Exclusion, &c. (Ans.) 846 (i).

—— Information *re* (remarks) 570 (i).

—— Information in Detail (remarks) 1585 (i).

—— Maximum and Minimum Rate, &c. (Ans.) 178 (i).

—— Mess from His Ex. (presented) 6 (i).

—— and Most Favoured Nation Clause (Ans.) 514, 564 (i).

—— Preferential Tariff, Names of Countries, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

—— Preparation of Stmnt. (remarks) 8 (i).

—— Printing and Distribution, &c. (remarks) 94 (i).

—— Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13083 (vii).

—— Shipments from Canada, &c. (Ans.) 4763 (iii).

—— Stmnt. *re* Papers to be distributed 848 (i).

—— U.S. Exports, &c. (Ans.) 896 (i).
See 'Mess. from His Ex.'

Fruit Inspection, in Closed Packages, &c. (Ans.) 2982 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3623 (ii).

Govt. Business (remarks) 13207 (vii).

—— Legislation *re* (remarks) 11123 (vi).

—— Suppl. Estimates, &c. (remarks) 11016 (vi).

Govt. Securities *re* Dom. Notes, &c. (Ans.) 6235 (iv).

Grain Shipments from the West, Financial Aid, &c. (remarks) 608 (i).
See 'Dom. Notes Bill.'

Grand Bend Wharf, Contract (Ans.) 5653 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Bond Issue, Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 8441 (v).

—— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12694 (vii).

—— Guarantee Bonds (B. 171) 1° m., 8835 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 10771 (vi).

—— Medical Attendance, O.C. regulating

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Deductions (Ans.) 1937 (i).
—— Medical Fees, Deductions *re* (Ans.) 9473 (v).
—— Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).
—— Route, Change of, Financial Reasons, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' Ques. of Priv., 8089 (iv).
—— Securities *re* Construction Contracts (Ans.) 357 (i).
—— Ties purchased in U.S. (remarks) 1445 (i).
Gunn, B. B., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 431 (i).
Halifax Garrison, Discontent *re* Pay, &c. (remarks) 5660 (iii).
Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Instruction *re* accepting Municipal Offices (Ans.) 3430 (ii).
—— Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).
Hay and Straw Embargo, by G. B. (Ans.) 4765 (iii).
Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).
Immigrants stranded in Toronto (remarks) 429 (i).
Insurance Act Amt. (B. 42) 1° m., 827 (i); 2° m., 1741, (M.) to ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1743 (i).
Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*, 1107 (i).
—— Information *re* (remarks) 7099 (iv).
—— Introduction of (Ans.) 9272 (v).
—— (Remarks) 8386 (v).
Insurance Commission, Total Expenditure, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 232 (i).
—— Evidence, Sale of, for private Profit (Ans.) 6059 (iii).
Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c. (Ans.) 241 (i).
Insurance, Supt., Salary (B. 200) in Com. on Res., 12407 (vii).
Intercolonial Conference, Expenses of Canadian Ministers (Ans.) 13511 (vii).
—— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 13225 (vii).
See 'Colonial,' &c.
I.C.R., Circular *re* Payment of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10128 (v).
—— Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid from 1903 to 1907 (Ans.) 4245 (iii).
Judges Salaries, Application *re* Payments (remarks) 11018 (vi).
Keewatin Timber and Pulp Lands, Disposal of (remarks) 13587 (vii).
Labour unemployed, Protection to (Ans.) 10735 (vi).
Lead Bounties (B. 191) prop. Res., 9773 (v); in Com. on Res., 10952; 1°*, of B., 10953 (vi); 2° m., 11235; in Com., 11243 (vi); 3° m., 12054 (vii).
Lead Bounty Bill, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 11408, 11705 (vi).
Lithographing and Printing, Expenditure by Govt. Outside of Canada (Ans.) 1506 (i).
Live Stock, N.B., Information *re* Figures, &c. (Ans.) 1507 (i).
Loans, Temporary, since Oct. 1906, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 314 (i).
Loans, Temporary, Total Amounts, &c. (Ans.) 314 (i).
Loan of August, 1907, Names of Banks where discounted (Ans.) 564 (i).
Loan negotiated in London, Conditions *re* (Ans.) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 13584 (vii).
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal (Ans.) 11501 (vi).
Loan, Temporary or Advances, Rates of Interest (Ans.) 12654 (vii).
See 'Dom. Loans,' &c.
Lumber Combine Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 2977 (ii).
Lumber Duties from U.S., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 9509 (v).
McGee, Hon. Thos. D'Arcy, Monument to (remarks) 6238 (iv).
MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11220 (vi).
Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 689 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, Extension (remarks) 6222 (iv).
—— on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12794 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7330 (iv).
—— Deptl. Investigation by Minister (remarks) 6526 (iv).
—— Distribution of Evidence (remarks) 10789 (vi).
—— Evidence, Printing, &c. (Ans.) remarks) 8517 (v), 11301 (vi).
—— on Inquiry for Evidence (Mr. Foster) 11203 (vi).
—— Leave of Absence for Mr. Watson (remarks) 10918 (vi).
—— Rep. of Judge Cassels (remarks) 10915 (vi).
See 'Civil Service,' &c.
Meat and Food Inspection Act, Number and Names of Establishments (Ans.) 1505 (i).
Military Camps, &c. (remarks) 9838 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Mint Building, Ventilation of (Ans.) 3036 (ii).

Mint, Date of Operation, Value of Coinage, &c. (Ans.) 11297 (vi).

——— Gold Coins, &c. (Ans.) 2593 (ii).

Mint, on Inquiry for Papers, 938 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 941 (i).

Mint, Royal, Sums expended, Apptmts., &c. (Ans.) 232 (i).

Money-Lenders operating in Public Departments (Ans.) 1738 (i).

Montreal Turnpike Trusts, Indebtedness, Payments, Audit, &c. (Ans.) 1932 (i).

——— Payment of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 2979 (ii).

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Amount of Deposit in Govt. Hands (Ans.) 3485 (ii).

N.B. Credit, Amount of (Ans.) 1937 (i)

Obstruction to Supply, on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10020 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 10025 (v).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9221 (v).

Old Age Annuities (B. 120) in Com. on Res., 4690; 1°*, 4702 (iii); 2°*, in Com., 10848 (vi); 3° m., 12053 (vii); on Senate Amts., 13316 (vii).

Old Age Pensions Bill (M.) to withdraw, 3654 (ii).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2433 (ii).

Ordnance Property, Toronto, Sale Bill (prop. res.) 13226 (vii).

Ottawa Improvement Commission, Amount expended to Jan. 1st, 1908, &c. (Ans.) 11500 (vi).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6182, 6228 (iv).

Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of (remarks) 610 (i).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloane) to Com. of Sup., 3978 (ii).

Petroleum Bounty (B. 199) in Com. on Res., 12406 (vii); in Com., 12644 (vii).

Pianos rented, &c. for Speaker's Rooms (Ans.) 563 (i).

Post Office Savings Bank Deposits, Increase of Interest (Ans.) 691 (i).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2744 (ii).

——— Communication with C. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13353 (vii).

P.E.I. and G.B., SS. Subventions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12754 (vii).

P.E.I., Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 12636 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

P.E.I., Subsidy, Deduction *re* Hillsborough Bridge (Ans.) 5079 (iii).

Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present agreement, &c. (Ans.) 315 (i).

——— Amounts paid before and after Adjustment (Ans.) 8616 (v).

——— Dates of Payments, Sums owing, &c. (Ans.) 564 (i).

——— Date of last Payments, &c. (Ans.) 237 (i).

——— Increased Payments, &c. (Ans.) 173 (i).

Public Accounts (presented) 6 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3110 (ii).

——— Meetings, &c. (remarks) 9504 (v).

——— on M. to Conc. in 3rd Rep., 2160 (ii).

Public Bills and Orders, Govt. Business (remarks) 13493 (vii).

——— Precedence of, &c. (remarks) 3404 (ii).

Public Works Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) 5730 (iii).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, Extravagance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7146 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4937 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Deficit, &c. (Ans.) 6459 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 2394 (ii).

——— Investigation *re*, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 2553 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Finances, Estimated Cost of Completion, &c. (Ans.) 5566 (iii).

——— Corrected answer, 6059 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Report, on Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).

Quebec Bridge and G.T.P., Agreement *re* Rentals, &c. (remarks) 13227 (vii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 583 (i).

——— B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 11605 (vi).

Railway Commissioners Board Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8511 (v).

Religious Fanatics in Man. (remark) 12161 (vii).

Representation of the Mar. Provs. in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9839 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Daniel) 9892 (v).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 6010 (iii).

Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Price, &c. (Ans.) 5654 (iii).

Royal Mint, Amount of Gold and Silver Coins (Ans.) 8613 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Royal Mint, Ques. of Order *re* Govt. Apptmts., 1461 (i).

St. John Cold Storage Co., Names of Stockholders, &c. (Ans.) 1938 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5547 (iii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563, 8610, 9068, 9167 (v).

Seed Grain Bill, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2780 (ii).

Seed Grain for Settlers in Man., &c., in Com. of Sup., 2770 (ii).

See 'Grain,' &c.

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2916 (ii).

Senate Sittings, Number of Days, Cost, &c., for 1895, 1906-7 (Ans.) 1114 (i).

Shipping Rings, Combinations, &c. (remarks) 5919 (iii).

——— Royal Commission *re* (remarks) 5916 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5520 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers, Land Grants (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

South Huron By-Election, Amount paid Returning Officer (Ans.) 9270 (v).

Standard Plate Glass Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 41 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 6183 (iii).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8849 (v).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5822; (amt.) 5826, Agreed to (Y. 93; N. 43) 5879 (iiii).

Supply—(M.) for Com., 554 (i).

Supply (B. 96) *re* Seed Grain, 1° m., 2°*, and in Com., 2782 (ii).

——— (B. 136) 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5957 (iii).

——— (B. 186) 1°*, 2°*, and 3°*, 10510 (vi).

——— (B. 220) 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 13579 (vii).

Supply, Changes in Procedure (remarks) 1884 (i).

——— Charges of Obstruction by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9395 (v).

See 'Obstructions,' &c.

——— Conc. (M.) 5499, 5915, 5919 (iii).

——— Discussion *re* Estimates (remarks) 5661 (iii).

——— Estimates, Basis of Appropriations (remarks) 5920 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10588 (vi).

Charges of Management (Dom. Notes) 5562 (iii); (Receiver General) 12160 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 635 (i); Finance (Artz, J. G.) Conc., 13578 (vii); (Ross, H. T.) 12914 (vii); (salaries) 637 (i); Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 610 (i); Interior (salaries, &c.) 617 (i), 9708 (v); Militia (salaries, &c.) 611 (i); Printing and Stationery (salaries) 612 (i); Privy Council (Bennetts, F. K.) 12902 (vii); Railways (Butler, M. J.) 12756 (vii); Sec. of State (C. S. examiners) 12917 (vii); Sec. of State (salaries, &c.) 611 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9577 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 9253 (v).

Finance (Treasury Board) 5562 (iii).

House of Commons (Clerk of Crown in Chancery) 10508 (vi); (printing, &c.) 10507; (provincial voters' lists) 10508 (vi); (sessional clerks) on Conc., 13578 (vii).

Inspection of Staples (inspectors) 12264 (vii).

Insurance (Supt.'s office) 12160 (vii).

Justice (Exhequer Court) 5507 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13152 (vii); (China and Canada, &c.) 13152 (vii); (G. B. and Canada) 12728 (vii); (P.E.I. and G.B.) 12264 (vii); (St. John and Cumberland) 12263; (subsidies) 12262 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4017 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5662 (iii); (customs dues) 5662 (iii); (supplies, &c.) 5662 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Brantford monument, Telephone) Conc., 13567 (vii); (charwomen) 10509 (vi); (Civil Service Commission) 13168 (vii); (cotton strikers) 13162 (vii); (Jamaica Earthquake) 5784 (iii); (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii); (Olympic Games) 13167 (vii); (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5783 (iii); (seed wheat) 2770 (ii); (Yukon, Bank of Commerce) 13167 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3152 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5514 (iii).

Post Office (stamps, &c.) 9111 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Emerson) 8535 (v); (Winnipeg warehouse) 8571 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1453, 1472 (i); (rents, &c.) 11004 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dom. Arsenal) 7437; (Knowlton) 7292 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Baddeck) 11220 (vi); (Lakevale channel) Conc., 13568 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11083 (vi).

Railways Generally (extra clerks) 10344 (vi); I.C.R. (collection of revenues) 5694 (iii); (Moncton—Truro, additional line) 12760 (vii); (salaries) 10128 (v); Ry. Commission (Quebec Bridge) 12770 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Senate (salaries) 10489 (vi).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Act) 12264 (vii).
Temporary Govt. Loans, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 234, 235 (i).
Town Site, Section 32, Erection of Public Buildings (Ans.) 1348 (i).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep., (presented) 7 (i).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers from March, 1907 (Ans.) 562 (i).
See 'Colonial,' &c.
Uniforms and Customs Refunds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9570 (v).
Wallberg, E. A., Payments by Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 5086 (iii).
Water Carriage of Goods (B. 178) on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).
——— (remarks) 13416 (vii).
Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 554 (i), 13579 (vii).
Ways and Means—The Budget, 5137 (iii).
Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6118 (iii).
Wednesday Evenings and Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9486 (v).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6185 (iii).
West India Trade, Reciprocity Negotiations (remarks) 1860 (i).
Wharfs, Piers and Harbours, Total Expenditure since 1895 (Ans.) 5078 (iii).
Wheat Transportation from West, Financial Aid, &c. (Ans.) 173 (i).
——— Bank Negotiations (Ans.) 171 (i).
——— Financial Aid, &c. (Ans.) 1938 (i).
——— Financial Aid by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copies of Papers, &c., 899 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copies of Cor. &c., 2176 (ii).
——— Special Arrangements *re* Shipments of Feed Wheat with Ry. Cos. (Ans.) 893 (i).
Whisky, Illegal Distribution at Thetford Mines, Customs Frauds, &c. (remarks) 9894 (v).
Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).
——— Dom. Revenue and Expenditures from March 31st to June 30th, 1907 (Ans.) 1346
——— Expenditures, Total Expenditure (remarks) *re* Question, 1128 (i).
——— Judges Salaries (remarks) 11123 (vi).
——— Money Transmission, Rates, *re* &c. (Ans.) 2979 (ii).
——— Revenue and Expenditure, Total Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1114 (i).

FINLAYSON, Mr. D., *Richmond, N.S.*
Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re* (Ques.) 1733 (i).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12872 (vii).
Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* (Ques.) 5655 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11865 (vi).
Public Accounts Com., Sittings concurrently with Hse. (M.) 9579 (v).
Washington Fisheries Commission at Washington, Expenses *re* (Ques.) 1732 (i).

FISHER, Hon. S. A. (Minister of Agriculture) *Brome.*
Accountants for Marine Dept., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4111 (ii).
Address, The, 213 (i).
Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (prsented) 7 (i).
Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative (Ans.) 8611 (v).
——— Goods purchased from T. Lindsay Co. (Ans.) 8615 (v).
Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5385 (iii).
Archives Dept., Index Cards purchased, Names of Firms, &c. (Ans.) 6057 (iii).
Blankets purchased, Ret., on Inquiry for, 6465 (iv).
Boneless Meat, Frozen, Imported into G.B., Par. in English Newspapers, &c. (Ans.) 3231 (ii).
Brockville, Cheese Curing Room, Lease, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).
——— Cold Storage Plant, Disposal of (Ans.) 3234 (ii).
Bubonic Plague, Prevention of into Canada (Ans.) 686 (i).
Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6202 (iii).
Canned Goods Inspection Act Amt. (B. 147) 1° m., 6221; in Com., 6870 (iv).
Canned Goods Inspection Act, Enforcement of (Ans.) 3846 (ii).
Canned Goods Inspection Regulations, Names of Counties, &c. (Ans.) 514 (i).
Cattle Embargo by G. B., Removal of, Action of Govt. since 1896 (Ans.) 2168 (ii).
——— Par. in Montreal Gazette, 13081 (vii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12880 (vii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 6223 (iv).
Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2767 (ii).
Census (complete) of the N.W. Provinces Report (presented) 3422 (ii).
Census Map, Publication of (Ans.) 4406 (iii).
Central Experimental Farm, Sale of Cattle, &c. (Ans.) 2389 (ii).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*
Charlan, Mr., Salary as Tobacco Expert (Ans.) 11495 (vi).
Chartered Banks of Canada, Report (presented) 8086 (iv).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5109 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 189) in Com. on Res., 11350; 1° m., 10717; 2° m., 11315; in Com., 11362, 11536, 11634 (vi), 12163; on Senate Amts., 13520 (vii).
Civil Service Bill, Physical Fitness (remarks) 11018 (vi).
Civil Service Commission's Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).
See 'Marine.'
Civil Service Act Amt. Bill, (remarks) 11124 (vi).
Civil Service Examiners' Report (presented) 8086 (iv).
Cold Storage Establishment in East Elgin, Assistance to (Ans.) 352 (i).
Cold Storage Plants, Construction in Alberta (Ans.) 1685 (i).
Cold Storage, Number constructed, Applications, &c. (Ans.) 236 (i).
Cold Storage Ret., Letter of Mr. McKeown, on Inquiry for, 4223, 4407 (iii).
See 'N.B.'
Cold Storage Shipments, Number for year ending March 1908 (Ans.) 6404 (v).
Co-operation B. 5 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 4565 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 13256 (vii).
Exhibitions, Amount of Subsidies paid to (Ans.) 4406 (iii).
Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4584 (iii).
Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provs. (Ans.) 7990 (iv).
—— Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade (Ans.) 8182 (iv).
—— Establishment of (Ans.) 2593 (ii).
—— Number under control of Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Rep. (presented) 1018 (i).
—— Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 4585 (iii).
Fruit and Dairy Divisions, Separation of, &c. (Ans.) 2166 (ii).
Fruit Inspection (apples) Complaints *re* (remarks) 2756 (ii).
Fruit and Vegetable Inspectors, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 516 (i).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*
Fruit Marks Act Inspection Amt. (B. 148) 1° m., 6221 (iv); in Com., 10553 (vi).
Fruit Marks Act, Prosecutions *re* Apples, &c. (Ans.) 4831 (iii).
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. (B. 123) 1°*, 5337; in Com., 5495 (iii).
—— (B. 197) 1°*, 11990 (vi); 2°*, in Com., 12554 (vii).
Govt. Steamers, Built in Canada (stmnt.) 11124 (vi).
Grain Commissioners Report, on Inquiry for, 4224 (iii).
Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims against Dept. of Agriculture (Ans.) 5791 (iii).
High Commissioner's Office, Increase of Salaries (Ans.) 10737 (vi).
Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered (Ans.) 9280 (v).
—— Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13089 (vii).
House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10498 (vi).
House of Commons Accountant, &c., Increase of Salary under C. S. Bill (remarks) 13528 (vii).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt. (B. 148) in Com., 6900 (iv).
Inspectors of Food Products, Number of Apptmts. (Ans.) 353 (i).
Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, &c. (Ans.) 5079 (iii).
Japanese Immigration, &c., Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2123 (ii).
—— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of O.Cs., &c., 880 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Investigations, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7351 (iv).
See 'C. S. Commission.'
Meats and Canned Foods Inspection Act Amt. (B. 149) 1° m., 6221; in Com., 6890, 7244; 3° m., 7215 (iv).
Meats and Canned Foods Inspectors, Number appointed, &c. (Ans.) 172 (i).
Meat Inspection Regulations, &c., Meetings at Chatham (remarks) in Debate on Address, 213 (i).
Moberley, Mr. H. J., Payments to, by Govt. (Ans.) 3818 (ii).
N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9321 (v).
N.B. Cold Storage Plants, Bonuses by Govt. (Ans.) 9272 (v).
Order, Ques. of, *re* Montreal Liquor Licenses, Remarks of Hon. Mr. Scott, 4065 (ii).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Perdue, Dr. M. B., Duties and Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 173 (i).

Presbyterian College, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7668 (iv).

Prohibition Vote in Quebec (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).

Returns, on Inquiry for 1018, 1740 (i), 2385 (ii).

Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 6000 (iii).

Seed Grain Purchases, Apptmt. of Agent in P.E.I. (remarks) 3690 (ii).

Sheep Quarantine by U.S., &c. (Ans.) 13064 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13537 (vii).

Smith, Mr. W. M., Dom. Fruit Inspector, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 2393 (ii), 5085 (iii).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Appmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5860 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture (Archives) 671; (census, &c.) 673 (i), 12379 (vii); (dairying) 10397; (exhibitions)10569 (vi), 12889; (fumigating stations) 12879 (vii); (Imperial Institute) 10623 (vi); (live stock) 12895 (vii); (Meats and Canned Foods Act) 12893 (vii); (Patent Record) 672 (i); (Seed Control Act) 5500 (iii); (seeds) 12891 (vii); (Year Book) 677 (i).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (Dep. Minister) 12878 (vii); (salaries) 645; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4044 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 13340 (vii); Que. (Cookshire) 7283; (Grosse Isle) 7290; (Knowlton) 7291 (iv).

Quarantine (public health) 5504 (iii).

Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 10390 (vi).

Timber Marking Act Amt. (B. 193) 1° m., 11120 (vi); in Com., 12408 (vii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Tuberculin Tests, Results of, &c. (Ans.) 9271 (v).

Wheat Frozen, Shipments from Man., &c., on M. (Mr. Blain) to adjn., 826 (i).

Woollen Industry, Number of Employees, Value of Output, &c. (Ans.) 7504 (iv).

FORGET, Mr. R., *Charlevoix.*

I.C.R. 'Ocean Limited,' Date of Beginning and ending of running (Ques.) 6054 (iii).

——— Trains and Official Cars, &c. (Ques.) 5474 (iii).

Post Office Savings Banks, Increase of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 691 (i).

St. Irenee des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster (Ques.) 5795 (iii).

FORGET, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont (Stanley Island pier) 5721 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E., *Toronto, North.*

Accountants for Marine Dept., Payment to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4110 (ii).

Address, The, 66 (i).

Advertisements in Newspapers, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 509 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4721 (iii).

Advertising in Mar. Prov. Newspapers, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 936 (i).

Agricultural Implements, Amounts of Rebates, &c. (Ques.) 1112 (i).

Allan, Mr., Interference in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

All-Red Route (remarks) in debate on Address, 87 (i).

——— on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12419, 12488 (vii).

——— Purposes of Mr. White's Duties in England (remarks) 608 (i).

——— Mr. Sifton's Address *re* Canada's Attitude (remarks) 947 (i).

——— Statement *re*, Negotiations (remarks) 366 (i).

American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps, &c. (Ques.) 2593 (ii).

American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c. (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Analytical Index to Debates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10504 (vi).

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. B. 141 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Anglo-French Treaty, Ratification of by British Govt. (remarks) 11705 (vi).

See 'Franco, &c.

Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 600 (i).

'Arctic' Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June, 1904, to June, 1907 (Ques.) 184 (i).

——— Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4012 (ii).

Assay Office, Vancouver, Results, &c. (remarks) on Conc., 13573 (vii).

Bait Freezer and Cold Storage Plant in St. John, N.B., Cor., Agreements, &c., with Govt (M. for copies*) 558 (i).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 7307 (iv); on M. for 2°, 10924; in Com., 10933 (vi).

Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4309 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure (remarks) 9335 (v).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4380; in Com., 4393, 4408, 4497; on M. for 3°, 4530 (iii).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13569 (vii).

Belleville Hospital Site, Inquiry for Ret., 7506 (iv).

Bernier, Capt., Islands, Customs' Ports Flagged by him (Ques.) 5208, 5466 (iii).

Blue Books, Distribution to Members, Changes *re* (remarks) 194 (i).

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11988 (vi).

Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1291 (i).

Boundary Delimitations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9743 (v).

Brass Importations, &c. (remarks) 6233 (iv).

Briar Island, N.S., Marine Signalling, Change of System (Ques.) 9266 (v).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P., Advances *re* Travelling Expenses for Priv. Sec., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses since July, 1904 (M. for ret.*) 1689 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1347 (i).

Buchanan Town Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10086 (v).

Budget, The (reply) 5163; (M.) to adjn. debate, 5199; (rsmd.) 5260 (iii).

——— (remarks) 519, 559 (i); 4316, 4670 (iii).

Budget Speech sent out by Deptl. Clerks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10349 (vi).
See 'Financial,' &c.

Buffalo Herd, Location in Elk Park, &c. (Ques.) 5208 (iii).

——— Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10103 (v).

——— Purchased for Parks, Authority for Expenditure (Ques.) 896 (i).

Business of Hse. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 10688 (vi).

Cabinet Appointments (remarks) in debate on Address, 80 (i).

Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c. (Ques.) 5207 (iii).

Canadian Loans, Rate of Interest (remarks) 12194 (vii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12841, 12850 (vii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11253 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546, 10753 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11351; on M. for 1°, 10718, 10727; in Com., 11369, 11549, 11634 (vi), 12164 (vii).

——— (remarks) 11124 (vi).

Civil Service Commission, Instructions to Judge Cassels, Inquiry for, 7505 (iv).

——— Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7543 (iv).

Civil Service Commission, Rep., Inquiry for, 938, 1740 (i), 2787, 3043 (ii), 4315, 4495 (iii).

——— Number printed, &c. (remarks) 6222 (iv).

——— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5884 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5631 (iii).

Civil Service System, prop. Res. (M.) to drop, 6242 (iv).

——— (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 9132 (v).

Clarke, Capt. Arthur, Compensation *re* Death, &c. (Ques.) 8179 (iv).

Clement, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 11300 (vi).

Cold Storage Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction (Ques.) 8379 (v).

Cold Storage Ret., Missing Letter (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Cold Storage Co., Ques. of Priv. *re* Minister's Stmnt. *re* Insurance Commission, 9337 (v).
See 'N. B. Cold Storage,' &c.

Colonial Conference (remarks) in debate on Address, 82 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 998 (i).
See 'Imperial.'

Committee Meetings, Rep. in 'Globe,' on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) 2383 (ii).

Congdon, Mr. F. T., Stmnt. *re* Administration of Estates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10111 (v).

——— (remarks) 13420, 13518 (vii).

——— Instructions *re* Estates Trusts (Ques.) 12413 (vii).

Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 565 (i).

Contractors' Securities, Amounts retained (Ques.) 1112 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11981 (vi).

Customs Defalcations, Punishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9455 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup. (remarks) 10133 (v).

Customs, Receipts and Expenditures, 1907-8 (Ques.) 12655 (vii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9732 (v).

Cyr, Mr., Letter from, Ques. of Order, *re* Stmnts., 8460 (v).

Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8898 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10248 (v).

Deep Waterways Commission, Inquiry *re* Proceedings (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

Detroit River Tunnel, Customs Tariff *re* Materials, on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10172 (vi).

——— (remarks) 13526 (vii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1135 (i).

——— Notice of Motion, on Order being called, 2794 (ii).

——— Production of, to Members, on M. for Sup., 1766 (i).

———Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1628 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 1851 (i).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 8179 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8321 (v); in Com., 11828, 11895 (vi), 12945; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 13257 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11126 (vi).

——— in Com., 11163, 11165, 11203, 11408,11503, 11453, 11940; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11978 (vi); on Senate Amts., 13522 (vii).

Dom. Loan and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c. (Ques.) 313 (i).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10796 (vi).

Doukhobors, Condition of, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (remarks) 2218 (ii).

Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4679 (iii).

Dunsmuir, Lt. Gov. of B. C. and Natal Act, &c. (remarks) 1738 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239, 4577 (iii).

Estimates, Insufficient Votes, *re* Public Works, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5923 (iii).

Falconer, K., Payments by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).

Falconer, K., Payment to for Services (Ques.) 8890 (v).

——— Emplymt. by Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 5078 (iii).

'Fielding' Dredge, Number of Days Working (Ques.) 7199 (iv).

Financial Review, (amt.) on M. for Sup., 13420 (vii).

See 'Budget.'

Fire Extinguishers purchased by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7646 (iv).

——— Cor. quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7784 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Original Papers, 8901 (v).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7664 (iv).

——— Production of Original Papers (remarks) 9281 (v).

Fish Exportations from Man., Value, &c. (remarks) 4241 (iii).

Fisheries Negotiations with Provs., Instruction to Mr. Bastedo (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Fort William Terminals Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6224 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 1253 (i); on M. for 2°, 2220; in Com., 3582 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4341 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, Discussion *re* prop. Res. (remarks) 942 (i).

——— preparation of stmnt *re* duty units, 943 (i).

——— Delays in Ratification (remarks) 13536 (vii).

——— Distribution of, to Members (remarks) 606 (i).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 570 (i).

——— Information in Detail asked for, 1585 (i).

——— and Most Favoured Nation Clause, &c. (Ques.) 564 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 931 (i).

——— Printing and Distribution (remarks) 93 (i).

——— Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13083 (vii).

——— (remarks) in debate on Address, 86 (i).

——— Stmnt. *re* Tariffs (remarks) 8 (i).

——— U. S. Exports, Articles, &c. (Ques.) 896 (i).

Geological Survey Technical Officers (remarks) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 4230 (iii).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 991

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Girouard, Mr., Resignation from Yukon Council (remarks) 11634, 11938 (vi).
See 'Yukon.'

Gold Commissioner's Office, Yukon, Number of Clerks, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).

Govt. Employees, Interference in Elections, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11908 (vi).

Govt. Ownership, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 75 (i).

Govt. Steamers, Amounts paid for Provisions, &c., for three years, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1512 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1099 (i).

Grain Transportation from the West, Financial Aid, Explanation in the Senate (remarks) 607 (i).

G. B., Australia and Canada, &c., Fast Line Steamers, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 558 (i).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2227 (ii); in Com., 12061 (vii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8134 (iv).

——— Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 8837 (v); in Com., 10772 (vi).

G.T.P. Ry., Bond Issue, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 8440 (v).

——— Commissions issued to Inspectors (remarks) 9716 (v).

——— Contracts, Date, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6458, 6636 (iv).

——— Contracts *re* Eastern and Western Sections (Ques.) 6234 (iv).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. (Mr. Graham) to lay on Table, 12049 (vii).

——— Liquor Prohibition Sale: Inquiry for Ret. 2024 (ii).

——— Miles under Construction, &c. (Ques.) 165 (i).

——— Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).

——— Prohibition Zone, Cor. Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 558 (i).

——— Purchase of Rails for Eastern Division, &c. (Ques.) 9263 (v).

——— Securities *re* Construction Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 356 (i).

——— Transcontinental Commission, Total Salaries, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 13226 (vii).

Halifax Platform of Conservative Leader (remarks) in debate on Address, 66 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4224 (iii).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims *re* Damages (remarks) 5791 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Hillsborough Bridge Claims, on Inquiry for Ret., 3691 (ii).

Hillsborough Bridge Ret., Inquiry for, 2882 (ii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests against by Immigrants, Par. in Ottawa Citizen, 5488 (iii).

——— Tel. *re* Contract Labour (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Homestead Patents, Settlement Conditions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10095 (v).

Honey Imports, from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c. (Ques.) 8177 (iv).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5729 (iii), 10495 (vi).

——— Rules for Hours of Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 591 (i).

——— and Senate, Cost outside of Indemnities (Ques.) 4760 (iii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction of, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Date of Resignation, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 166 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5657 (iii).

Imperial Conference, 1907, Expenditure by Govt. (Ques.) 511 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Minister, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1513 (i).
See 'Colonial.'

Imports and Exports, ending Sept. 30th and Oct. 30th, 1907 (Ques.) 350 (i).

——— Values from June, to Dec. 1907 (Ques.) 1112 (i).

Imports for Home Consumption, Values for 1907-8 (Ques.) 13063 (vii).

Indian Schools, Rep. of Dr. Bryce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6467 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 833; on M. for 2°, 1742 (i).

Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*, 1107 (i).

——— Discussion *re* (personal explanation) Par. in Montreal 'Star,' 1860 (i).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 7099 (iv), 8386 (v).

Insurance Commission, Rep. *re* Political Literature, Ques. of Priv., 10792 (vi).

——— Rep., Ques. of Priv., 9461 (v).

——— Total Expenditure of Commission, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 232 (i).

I.C.R., Audit System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).

——— Cars sent to U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Circular Letter *re* Payments of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10127 (v).
——— Claims for Damages, by A. W. Belyea, &c. (Ques.) 9472 (v).
——— Employees, and N.B. Elections (remarks) 3317 (ii).
——— Extension Policy (remarks) in debate on Address, 73 (i).
——— Train Service, Explanations *re* Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Reid) for Ret., 6242 (iv).
——— Transportation, &c. on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4424 (iii).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 970 (i).
——— B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4671 (iii).
Japanese Immigration into B.C. (remarks) in debate on Address, 77 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 881 (i).
——— Ques. of Order *re* Attacks on Prov. Govt., 1763 (i).
——— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2101 (ii).
Lacas, E., Payments to, by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 930, 1035 (i).
Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of (Ques.) 8176 (iv).
Lafferty, Thos., Payment *re* Removal of Snags in St. John River (Ques.) 8379 (v).
Land Titles Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 10526; in Com., 10528 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 10952 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11235; in Com., 11243; on M. for 3° (remarks) 11250 (vi), 12054 (vii).
——— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 11407 (vi).
Lead Production, by Lead Producers, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 11705 (vi).
Lighthouse Service on St. Lawrence, Steamers chartered, &c. (Ques.) 11299 (vi).
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal (Ques.) 11501 (vi).
Loan of Aug., 1907, Names of Banks where discounted (Ques.) 564 (i).
Loans negotiated in London, Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, &c. (personal explanation) 13582 (vii).
Loans, Temporary or Advances, Rates of Interest outstanding, &c. (Ques.) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts: *See* 'Dom. Loans.'
'Lord Kitchener' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services (Ques.) 7198 (iv).
MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11220 (vi).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to for Legal Services (Ques.) 695 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12789 (vii).
Marconi Co., and Commercial Press Business, (Ques.) 512 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Change of Book-keeping System, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 510 (i).
——— O.Cs., Cor., &c., *re* System (M. for copies*) 852 (i).
——— ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries, Acting Deputy (remarks) 11939 (vi).
——— Deputy Minister, Date of Apptmts. of Suspended Officers, &c. (Ques.) 6982 (iv).
——— Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7335 (iv).
——— Amounts paid Counsel (Ques.) 8837 (v).
——— Delay in Investigation, &c., C. S. Report, &c., M. to adjourn (remarks) 8445 (v).
——— Evidence *re* (remarks) 11203 (vi).
——— Evidence, Distribution of (remarks) 10789 (vi).
——— Evidence and Reports, Printing, &c. (remarks) 11301 (vi).
———Issue of Judge Cassels' Commission (remarks) 6466 (iv).
——— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10741 (vi).
——— Minister's Travelling Expenses, Refunds, &c. (Ques.) 8889 (v).
——— Public Investigation, &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).
——— Rep. of Judge Cassels (remarks) 10915 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries Returns, Inquiry for, 2883 (ii).
Marine Signalling at Briar Island, Change of System (Ques.) 9266 (v).
Militia Depts., Threats by Min. of Militia (remarks) 13583 (vii).
Militia Schools, Garrisons, &c., Amounts paid for Provisions, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1512 (i).
Militia Stores, Inspection of, &c. (Ques.) 8181 (iv).
Mines Branch, Acting Director, Additional Salary (remarks) on Conc., 13569 (vii).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses from March, 1907 (Ques.) 562 (i).
Mint, Date of Operation, Values of Coinage, &c. (Ques.) 11296 (vi).
——— Sums expended, Apptmnts., &c. (Ques.) 232 (i).
——— Total Expenditure (M. for ret.*) 557 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 938 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).
'Montcalm,' Str., Investigation *re* Accident (remarks) 8171 (iv), 9715 (v).
——— Rep. *re* Accident (remarks) 10121 (v).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9483 (v).
Motions, Unopposed (remarks) 8839 (v).
National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13500; in Com., 13502 (vii).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11991 (vi).
N.B. Cold Storage Bait Co., Ministerial Interests, &c., on M. for Sup., 9283; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 9425 (v).
See 'St. John,' &c.
N.B. Elections, Interference of Govt. Officials (remarks) 3579 (ii).
——— Telegram (read) *re* Interference, 3229 (ii).
——— M. to adjn. House, 3657, 3678 (ii).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3060 (ii).
See 'Govt. Officials.'
Newspaper Advertising, Amounts paid (Ques.) 509 (i).
Niagara Lands, Sale for Military Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13540 (vii).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) 5060 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid and Claims, &c. (Ques.) 167 (i).
Obstruction Tactics, Discussion of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9220 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10033 (v).
——— Order, Question of (Mr. D. Ross) 10024 (v).
Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10332 (vi).
Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4691 (iii); in Com., 10850 (vi).
Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2425 (ii).
Opium Prohibition B. 205 (Mr. Lemieux) on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Amount expended to Jan. 1st, 1908, &c. (Ques.) 11499 (vi).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, Releases since 1896 (M. for ret.) 2822; (amt.) to Ret., 2846 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 9579 (v), 12919 (vii).
Patronage *re* Civil Service, &c. (M.) to drop, 6243 (iv).
See 'Civil,' &c.

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 11300 (v).
Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10704 (vi).
Preston, W. T. R., Employment by Govt. (Ques.) 360 (i).
P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2743 (ii).
Printing in 'Sun,' &c., Inquiry for Ret., 5661 (iii).
Prisoners, Released, &c.: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'
Protection Tariff, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 74 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Dates of last Payments, &c. (Ques.) 237 (i).
——— Sums owing, &c. (Ques.) 564 (i).
——— (remarks) in debate on Address, 79 (i)
Public Accounts Com., Meetings of (remarks) 945 (i).
——— Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3106 (ii).
——— Production of Original Documents (remarks) 4496 (iii).
See 'Documents,' &c.
Public Lands of Dom. (remarks) *re* in debate on Address, 70 (i).
Public Works, Applications *re*, Useless Expenditures (remarks) in Com., 5923 (iii).
——— Deptl. Salaries in Hamilton, Delays (remarks) 10016, 10119 (v).
——— Expenditure in Mar. Provs., since 1896 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., &c., Cost of Mail Service (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).
Quebec Bridge Commissioners' Report, Inquiry for, 4494 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).
Quebec Bridge and G.T.P., Agreement *re* Rental, &c. (remarks) 13227 (vii).
Quebec Bridge, Salaries to Officials (Ques.) 13517 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Army and Navy Veterans Association (remarks) 7448, 7998 (iv), 8695 (v).
Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 10633; in Com., 10638; on M. for 3°, 11613 (vi).
Railway Estimates, Obstruction of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10129 (v).
Ry. Mail Clerk at Edmonton, Expenses *re* Trial (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9108 (v).
Rv. Subsidies, on prop. Res. (Mr. Graham) 13069 (vii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Returns, Inquiry for, 1018, 1740 (i), 2385, 2882, 3318 (ii), 4223, 4832, 6010 (iii), 13081 (vii).

Returns ordered and lost in H. of C., placed in Record Dept. (remarks) 2882 (ii).

——— Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv. 4663 (iii).

Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure (Ques.) 5467 (iii).

Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion in Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).

Ross Rifles, Number ordered, Payments, Total Number delivered, Advances, &c. (Ques.) 168 (i), 8180 (iv).

——— Contract for Bayonets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13542 (vii).

St. John Cold Storage Ret., Inquiry for, 2309, 3690 (ii).

——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 3580 (ii). *See* 'N.B. Cold Storage.'

St. Louis, H., Employment by Govt., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 1347 (i), 2977 (ii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4232, 4579 (iii).

School Lands Exhange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 8086 (iv); on M. for 2°, 8472 (v).

Seed Grain buying and distribution, Information *re* (remarks) 13420 (vii).

——— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10122 (v).

Senate, Number of Sittings, Cost, &c., for 1895 and 1906-7 (Ques.) 1114 (i).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1574 (i).

——— (remarks) in debate on Address, 70 (i).

Shepley, Mr. G. F., Payments to (Ques.) 1112 (i).

——— Payments to (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5410 (iii).

'Sir Wilfrid Laurier' Dredge, Completion, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 5207 (iii).

Smith, Mr. Obed, Status in London (remarks) 5491 (iii).

Spain, Commander, Expenses *re*, Inquiry for Papers, 4670 (iii).

——— Aud. Gen.'s Rep. *re* (Ques.) 4405 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010, 1033 (i).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8847 (v).

Sub-target Machines, Number ordered, Dates of Order, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 171 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Sub-target Machines, Papers referred to Com. for last Session (remarks) 945 (i).

——— Return, Ref. to Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 312 (i).

Supplies for Govt. Contracts, Tenders, Appmt. of Purchasing Commission (prop. res.) 5802; Neg. (Y. 44; N. 99) 5880 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 5838 (iii).

Supply, Changes in Procedure (remarks) 1884 (i).

Supply (seed grain) B. 96 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 5671 (iii).

Canals—Generally (extra remuneration) 5697 (iii); (salaries) 10325; (statistical offices) 10317; (surveys) 10340 (vi).

Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5663; (staff salaries) 5696 (iii).

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12195; (piers and bridges) 12207; (Port Colborne) 12212 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5675 (iii); (surveys) 12207; (widening) 12211 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 636 (i); Finance (Artz, J. G.) 13578 (vii); (salaries) 637; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 610; Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 623 (i); Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v); (salaries, &c.) 619 (i); 9693 (v); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 976, 1033; Militia (salaries) 611 (i), 8871 (v); Printing and Stationery (salaries, &c.) 614; Privy Council (salaries, &c.) 610; Public Works (salaries) 639; Sec. of State (salaries, &c.) 611 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9229, 9444; (ports, &c.) 9220 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest reserves) 10051; (homesteads) 10086 (v).

Geological Survey (explorations, officers, &c.) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

House of Commons (Clerk of Crown in Chancery) 10508; (contingencies) 10502; (printing, &c.) 10507; (Library of Parlt) 10504; (salaries) 10501 (vi); (salary increases) 13562 (vii); (Sergeant-at-Arms) 10503 (vi); (sessional clerks) on Conc., 13577 (vii).

Immigration (general expenses) 5754 (iii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5755 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (dredging plant) 4754 (iii); (Hudson Bay patrols) 3985 (ii), 4747 (iii); (ice-breakers) 1885, 1904 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752; (Sorel property) 4751 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5662, 5732 (iii), 10289 (v), 13540 (vii); (customs dues) 5662 (iii); (Ross rifle) 13542 (vii); (supplies, &c.) 5662 (iii).

Miscellaneous (charwomen) 10509 (vi); (seed grain) 2773 (ii).

N.W.M. Police (compensations) 8870; (pay of force) 8863; (pensions) 8870; (salaries) 8863 (v).

N.W.T. (Govt salaries) 10116; (school grants) 10117 (v).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1086 (i); (ice-breakers) 2969; (life-saving awards) 2972; (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).
Post Office (extra assistance) 9112; (inspectors) 9108; (uniforms, &c.) 9110 (v).
Public Works (Ass't. Dep. Min.) 5698 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Alberta (Edmonton) 5705 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Fernie) 5706 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 8519; (Dauphin) 8520 (v); (Winnipeg hospital) 10955; (Winnipeg military) 10969 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives fittings) 5700; (improvements) 5707; (rents, &c.) 5707 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Quebec (Montreal pneumatic postal station) 5703 (iii); (Montreal station C) 7419; (Pointe St. Charles) 7419 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11210; (Baddeck) 11219; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hilford) 11267; (Port Hood) 11273; (Porter's Lake) 11263 (vi).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (Architects' branch) 11096; (cement testing) 11088; (clerical assistance) 11099, 11100; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11101 (vi); (gratuities) 5730; (graving docks) 5731 (iii); (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Ashcroft-Dawson) 5731; (B.C., Cape Beale Lines) 5731; (cable service) 5731 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (collection of revenues) 5695 (iii); (salaries) 10126; (train service) 10159 (v).
Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329; (unprovided items) 10328 (vi).
Senate (salaries, &c.) 10489 (vi).
Yukon (Govt. salaries) 10107 (v).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 5206 (iii).
Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. in Yukon (Ques.) 1126 (i).
Thirteenth Hussars, Service Medal, *re* Fenian Raids (remarks) 13533 (vii).
Timber Leases *re* Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8703 (v).
Timber Licenses, Applications to Mr. Mackenzie's Govt. (M. for ret.*) 3242 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 3038 (ii).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
——— Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Lake) for Copies, 2855 (ii).
Timber Limit Grants to Messrs McLeod, Lundy, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
——— Statement quoted by Mr. Turriff, Inquiry for, 2386 (ii).
Timber Sales, Opening of Tenders, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff), Ques. of Order, 11304 (vi).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10700 (vi).
Toronto Island Tunnel, Construction by Govt. (remarks) 5565 (iii).
Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of (remarks) 2594 (ii).
Torrens Land Title Fund, Information (remarks) 10916 (vi).
Transcontinental Ry. Commission, Expenses in Salaries, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 13517 (vii).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers at Colonial Conference (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. in Com. of Sup., 3985 (ii).
——— Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4117 (ii).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers from March, 1907 (Ques.) 562 (i).
Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 994 (i).
Trent Canal, Newmarket Canal, Reps., Surveys, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).
Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve, on M. for Sup., 7651 (iv).
Victoria Beach Piers, Amounts expended, &c. (Ques.) 237 (i).
Washington Treaty Negotiations and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of, &c. (Ques.) 2165 (ii).
Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).
Wednesday Evening Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11233 (vi).
Western Block Extension, Total Cost, Area, &c. (Ques.) 512 (i).
Whale Fishing Cos. in B. C., Licenses granted, on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10283 (v).
Wheat Transportation, Financial Aid by Govt. (M.) for Copies of Memorials, Cor., &c., 899 (i), 2173 (ii).
Wheat Transportation from West, Negotiations with Banks, &c. (Ques.) 171 (i).
See 'Bank,' 'Financial Stringency'
Whitehorse Townsite, Portions sold and retained, &c. (Ques.) 11496 (vi).
——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 181, 11166 (vi).
Wiley, Mrs. Louise, Claims against Mr. Congdon, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1131 (i).
See 'Congdon,' &c.
Woollen Industry, Reply to Manufacturers Ass'n. by Prime Minister (remarks) 13420 (vii).
Woollen Industry, Pet. *re* (remarks) 13518 (vii).
Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10529 (vi).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. for Sup., 9580 (v).

——— Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— Incomplete Return (remarks) 5785 (iii).

Yukon-Congdon, F. T., Investigation *re* Estates and Trusts (Ques.) 12050 (vii).

See 'Wiley.'

——— Election Conspiracy, Cor., &c., *re* Trial (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1114 (i).

——— Expenditures, Total Amount (remarks) *re* Question, 1128 (i).

——— Revenue and Expenditures from March 31st to June 30th, 1907 (Ques.) 1346 (i).

Yukon Financial Administration, Rep. of Mr. Beddoe (M. for copy*) 1132 (i).

——— Inquiry for, 6464 (iv).

Yukon, Govt. Officials, Re-arrangement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).

——— Lithgow, J. V., Girouard, J. E., and F. T. Congdon, Emplymt. by Govt., Date of Apptmt., &c (Ques.) 5999 (iii).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10519 (vi).

Yukon Sunday Observance Law, Instruction to N.W.M.P. *re* (Ques.) 565 (i).

——— Telegraph System, Receipts and Expenditures (Ques.) 512 (i).

——— White Horse Ter., Original Grants of Lands, Names (M. for ret.*) 2796 (ii).

——— Whiskey Permit Agents, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).

——— Wiley vs. Congdon, O.C.s., &c., *re* Charges (M. for copies) (amt.) 1691 (i).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W., *Kings and Albert, N.B.*

Anse St. Jean Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).

Architects on Public Works, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 10923 (vi).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7669 (iv).

Budget Debate, Ques. of Order, 6616 (iv).

Buildings, Architectural Designs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Campaign Literature (French) sent by Justice Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10354 (vi).

Campbellton Harbour, Gas Buoys, Tender *re* (Ques.) 8612 (v).

Campbellton Wharf, Tender *re* Piling Supply (Ques.) 8612 (v).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Chapman, Mr. F. O., Emplymt. in Immigration Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).

Chicoutimi Public Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vii).

Cigarette Restraint Bill (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13015 (vii).

Civil Servants, Increases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11362, 11553 (vi); on Senate Amts., 13520 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) on Presentation, 5640 (iii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9187 (v).

Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 695 (i).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Members (remarks) 13540 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11842 (vi), 13033 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11162, 11165, 11475, 11508, 11964 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10823 (vi).

Doukhobors Bonuses *re* Immigration (remarks) in Com. of Sup, 9952 (v).

Fisheries Regulations, Violation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5782 (iii).

Foresters, I. O., Charges in 'Le Canala,' Ques. of Priv., 6005 (iii).

Fraser, Mr. Donald, Dismissal from Customs, &c. (Ques.) 5473 (iii).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12677 (vii).

G.T.R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12072 (vii).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6647 (iv).

Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6391 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6435 (iv).

Indian Lands, B.C., and Provincial Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 629 (i).

Insurance Commission, Evidence, Sale of for Private Profit (Ques.) 6059 (iii).

I.C.R., Answer to Questions (remarks) 13415 (vii).

——— Earnings and Expenses (Ques.) 13510 (vii).

——— Employees, Circular *re* Non-Payment, Par. in St. John Press, on M. for Sup., 10016 (v).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2465 (ii).

—— Gross Earnings for 1908 (Ques.) 13225 (vii).

—— Newcastle Station, Inspector of Work, &c. (Ques.) 13511 (vii).

—— Receipts and Expenses (Ques.) 10514 (vi).

—— Stewart, Mr. James A., Emplymt. of (Ques.) 9712 (v).

Lobster Fishing Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland Co. (Ques.) 9472 (v).

Loggieville Dredging, Payments *re* (Ques.) 9472 (v).

Lyall, Mr. Peter, Contractor for G.T.P. Terminals at Winnipeg (Ques.) 7991 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12793, 12816 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries Dept., Misconduct of Official, Remarks checked, 6633 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries Warehouse, Sussex St., &c. (Ques.) 13062 (vii).

National Battlefields Commission (land) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13500; in Com., 13505 (vii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9328; (M.) to adjn. debate, 9330; rsmd., 9344 (v).

N.B. Elections, Mr. Pugsley's Political Connection with (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7130 (iv).

—— Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3054 (ii).

N.B. Post Offices, Closing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

N.B. Ry. Mail Service Vacancy, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10331 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10854 (vi).

Parliament Grounds, Circular Letter from C. S. Association (read) in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi).

Presbyterian College Board, Halifax B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7668 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13485 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3130 (ii).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7153 (iv).

—— Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4924 (iii).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. 217 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13491 (vii).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher (Ques.) 13225 (vii).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13485 (vii).

Rattenbury & Co., Govt. Agents *re* purchasing Oats in P.E.I., Assignment, &c. (Ques.) 12392 (vii).

Richibucto Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vii).

Ross Rifle Defects, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 9053, 9070 (v).

St. John River, Removing Snags, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3477 (ii).

Salmon Fishing by Nets, Privileges in Restigouche River (Ques.) 13518 (vii).

Seed Oats purchased in P.E.I., Prices, &c. (Ques.) 12391 (vii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12598; in Com., 13047 (vii).

Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10607 (vi); (live stock) 12899; (seeds) 12891 (vii).

Canals—Generally (surveys, &c.) 10340 (vi); Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13174; Trent (damages) 12768 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (Dep. Minister) 12878; Finance (Ross, H. T.) 12914; Marine and Fisheries (asst. dep. min.) 12915; Railways (Butler, Mr. M. J.) 12755; Sec. of State (C. S. examiners) 12917 (vii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 650 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9240, 9260, 9444 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest rangers) 10041, 10051; (salaries) 10038; (surveys) 9987 (v).

Geological Survey (oil boring) 13165 (vii).

House of Commons (salary increases) 13567 (vii).

Hydrographic Surveys (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 13170 (vii).

Immigration (agents, U.S.) 9965; (literature, &c.) 9950; (relief to settlers) 9985 (v).

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12752; (salaries) 12736, 13170; (schools) 13170 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (pensions) 13324 (vii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Canada) 12728 (vii).

Militia (annual drill) 5741 (iii), 10287 (v); (gratuities) 13177; (R.M. College) 13177; (Stoney Creek monument) 13177 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Bank of Commerce, Yukon) 13168; (Chinese riots) 13156; (Civil Service Commissioners) 13168; (Olympic games) 13167 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2954 (ii).

Penitentiaries—B.C. (land purchase) 12918 (vii).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (inspectors) 9107 (v), 13153 (vii)
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cranbrook) 13338; (Ladysmith) 13338 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 11008; (rents, &c.) 10982 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 10974 (vi); (Portage la Prairie) 13336; (Winnipeg) 13336 (vii); (Winnipeg hospital) 10960; (Winnipeg military) 10970 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 13328; (Hillsborough) 13328 (vii); (Quarantine, steam sterilizer) 7187; (quarantine, water service) 7186; (St. John, military) 7186; (Tracadie, lazaretto) 7187 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7112; (Bridgewater) 7135; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax, customs) 7151; (Yarmouth) 7181, 7182 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7490; (Guelph, armoury) 7684; (Hamilton, drill hall) 7692; (Hamilton, post office) 7698; (Kincardine) 7698; (Kingston) 7814; (Kingston, artillery park) 7701; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700; (Kingston, hospital) 7702; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7702; (London, magazine) 7706; (London, military) 7706 (iv); (Niagara) 13332 (vii); (North Bay) 7811; (Owen Sound) 7817; (Port Arthur) 7825; (Renfrew) 7825; (St. Mary's) 7826; (Welland) 7830 (iv).
Public Works—Building—Ottawa (elevator attendants) 11011; (grounds) 11012; (heating, &c.) 11010 (vi); (museum) 1504 (i); (rents, &c.) 10983; (Rideau Hall) 11005 (vi); (skylights) 7816 (iv); (telephones) 11012 (vi); (Victoria Museum) 13477 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Chicoutimi) 7279; (Cookshire) 7281; (Dom. renewals) 7286; (Farnham) 7287; (Grosse Isle) 7289; (Lachute) 7294; (Lake Megantic) 7294; (Levis) 7298; (Longueuil) 7305; (Montreal, post office) 7417; (Montreal, station C) 7420; (Montreal, warehouse) 7424; (Nicolet) 7428; (Plessisville) 7430; (Pointe St. Charles) 7419; (Quebec, citadel) 7430; (Quebec, Dom. arsenal) 7435; (Quebec, drill hall) 7431; (Quebec, hospital) 7433; (Quebec, immigrant) 7432; (Quebec, warehouse) 7432; (St. Hyacinthe) 7440; (St. John's) 7414; (St. John's, military) 7442; (St. Rochs) 7438 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Moose Jaw) 13337; (Prince Albert) 13337 (vii); (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10975 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (maintenance) 11005 (vi).
Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (North Thompson River) 13351 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 12028 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Beaver Harbour) 13344; (Dorchester) 13344; (Harvey) 13344; (Leonardsville) 13344; (Lorneville) 13344; (Miscou) 13344

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(vii); (St. Andrews) 12011; (St. John) 12013; (St. John, tidal waters) 12000 (vi); (St. John, wharfs) 13345; (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Pugwash wharf) 11279; (Round Hill wharf) 11282; (Yarmouth) 11291
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Goderich breakwater) 13350; (Juniper Island) 13350; (McGillicuddy & Smeeth claims) 13350 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Souris) 13341; (Summerside) 13343 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a la Barbe) 12028; (Anse a l'Ilot) 12029; (Barachois de Malbaie) 12029; (Batiscan) 12036; (Berthier) 12029; (Bic) 12030; (Bonaventure) 12036; (Chateauguay) 12030; (Chicoutimi) 12030; (Clarke City) 12031; (East Templeton) 12031; (Lake Aylmer) 12032; (Lavaltrie) 12033; (Les Eboulements) 12033; (Montmagny) 12034; (Nicolet) 12034; (Notre Dame de Portage) 12034; (Peribonka) 12035; (Petite Decharge) 12034; (Piche Point) 12035; (Richelieu) 12037; (Rimouski) 12035; (Rivière du Lievre) 12037; (St. Laurent) 12042; (St. Maurice) 12041 (vi); (Three Rivers, deep water wharf) 13349 (vii); (Yamaska, dredging) 12043 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. and Alta. (Lesser Slave) 13351 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects' branch) 11096; (clerical assistance) 11099; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11102; (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Chicoutimi) 13179; (operating) 13178 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Fredericton) 12758 (vii); (locomotives) 10150 (v); (Moncton-Truro, additional line) 12760; (Petit Rocher spur) 12759; (St. Cyrille diversion) 12756 (vii); (stationery) 10181 (v).
Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329 (vi).
Railways—P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claims) 12762 (vii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (Que. Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve (remarks) on M. for Sup, 7653 (iv).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10533 (vi).

GALLIHER, Mr. W. A., *Kootenay.*

Alberta and British Columbia Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 192) 1°*, 11120 (vi).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3474 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

GALLIHER, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 13) 1°*, 350 (i).

Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s (B. 33) 1°*, 606 (i).

Cannon, Catharine Ann Relief (B. 175) M. to remit Fees, 13510 (vii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546, 10760 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5128 (iii).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1170 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8619 (v); in Com., 11894 (vi); on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 13256 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4578 (iii).

——— B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Fort William Terminals Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6225 (iv).

Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario Relief (B. 139) 1°*, 5913; 2° m., 6190 (iii); in Com., 7141 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6437 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6492 (iv).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 959 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 878 (i).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6519 (iv).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11237; in Com., 11243 (vi); on M. for 3°, 12059 (vii).

Metal Shingle Patent Relief (B. 207) 2° m., 12649; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Private Bills, 12649 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4997 (iii).

Northwestern Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 54) 1°*, 1108; 2° m., 1468 (i).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9224 (v).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4929 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Conc., 13405 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13401 (vii).

GALLIHER, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*

Railway Act (commission) Amt B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4967 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10653 (vi).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4580 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of Time for Payments, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2920 (ii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5413, 5519 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3808 (ii).

Suburban Mail Delivery, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3284 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands (coal lands) 10070 (v); Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Mint) 1484 (i).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers to Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4580 (iii).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8489 (v)

GANONG, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3870 (ii).

Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection (Ques.) 5202 (iii).

Cirkel, Franz, Remuneration *re* Geological Report *re* Graphite Properties, &c. (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

Glucose, Quantity imported from G. B. (Ques.) 6980 (iv).

Grand Manan Telegraph System, Application *re* Leasing (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6493 (iv).

I.C.R. Station, Asphalt Platforms, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 5466 (iii).

Leonardville Wharf, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

N.B. Coal and Ry. Co., Balance of Subsidy, Claims *re* (Ques.) 9270 (v).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3667 (ii).

Pianos rented, &c., for Speakers' Rooms (Ques.) 563 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4935 (iii).

Rails purchased from Govt. by N. B. Coal and Ry. Co., &c., Amounts paid and still due (Ques.) 9269 (v).

GANONG, Mr. G. W.--*Con.*

Richibucto Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c. (Ques.) 12412 (vii).

Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5040; (Thunder Bay ice-breaker) 5043 (iii).

Marine, &c., Public Works (ship channel) 5036 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10883; (Victoria immigration) 10883 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10897 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8533 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7497; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7705; (Leamington) 7705; (Markham) 7710; (North Bay) 7718 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11009; (rents, &c.) 11002 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10189; (train service) 10160 (v).

Welchpool, N.B., Wharf, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

White Head Wharf, Report *re* Cost (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12923 (vii).

I.C.R. Employees Provident Fund Act, Names on List (Ques.) 4582 (iii).

Lighthouses in Quebec, Classification, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).

——— Rep. of Inspectors, &c. (M. for copy*) 697 (i).

Literary Aid Fund, Proposed Govtl. Action (Ques.) 1286 (i).

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Amount of Deposit with Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3485 (ii).

Rivière du Loup Station, Improvement to (Ques.) 5468 (iii).

Shipping Master, Quebec, Apptmt. of, Capt. Koenig's Duties (Ques.) 11699 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4757 (iii).

Trois Pistoles Station, I.C.R., Construction of (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

GEOFFRION, Mr. V., *Chambly and Vercheres.*

G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re* (M.) to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., 12265, Agreed to, 12389 (vii).

——— 1st rep. (presented) 8515 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works — Buildings — Que. (Longueuil) 7305 (iv).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4852 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., &c., Ques. of Order, 2809 (ii).

Dom. Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. (B. 84) 1°*, 1859 (i).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 48) 1°*, 891 (i).

Port Colborne Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3093 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 12212; (surveys) 12207 (vii).

GERVAIS, Mr. H., *Montreal (St. James).*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) on prop. Res., 2881 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4854 (iii).

Anglo-Canadian Insurance Co.'s Change of Name (B. 126) 1°*, 5256 (iii).

Architects, Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5379, 5408, 5785, 5953 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10950 (vi).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on M. for 2°, 3419 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11538 (vi).

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. (B. 92) 1° m., 2543 (ii).

——— (trade restraint) Amt. (B. 96) 1° m., 2976 (ii).

Debates, Official (M.) *re* Correction in Res. on Committees, 824 (i).

——— 1st Rep. (presented) 2590 (ii).

——— 2nd and 3rd Reports of Committee (presented) 6979 (iv).

——— 2nd Rep. (M.) to conc., 7834 (iv); (amt.) 13224 (vii).

——— 4th Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 8835 (v).

——— 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10228 (v).

Debates, Official Reporters, and Civil Service Bill (remarks) in Com. on B. 189, 11539 (vi).

Dom. Guarantee Co., Limited (B. 127) 1°*, 5255 (iii).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13302 (vii).

Montreal Circuit Court Judges, Increase in Salary (remarks) in Com. on Bill 206, 12552 (vii).

Montreal Excise Officers, Increases to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, Attack of Hon. Mr. Scott, Ques. of Priv., 4064 (ii)

GERVAIS, Mr. H.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, Cor., Plans, &c. (M. for copies) 2996 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Excise (provisional allowances) 817 (i).

Supreme Court Act (appeals) Amt. (B. 91) 1° m., 2542 (ii).

Travellers Life Assurance Co.'s Incorp. (B. 35) 1°*, 606 (i).

GIRARD, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*

Chicoutimi Public Works Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13188 (vii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4886 (iii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s (B. 107) 1°*, 3834 (ii); in Com., 5386 (iii).

GORDON, Mr. D. A., *Kent, E.*

Battlefields of Canada, B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4389 iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of Sale, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5253 (iii).

Floods at Chatham, Damages *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4743 (iii).

Giraud, Eugene Francois, Patent Relief (B. 52) 1°*, 1108 (i).

Immigration Agents in Ont., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 3176 (ii).

Immigration Distribution Agents, James S. Waugh, Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 1690 (i).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9898 (v).

Railway Act (Commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4970 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7486 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P., (Minister of Railways and Canals) *Brockville.*

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4721 (iii).

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 892 (i).

Algoma Steel Co., Orders for Steel, &c. (remarks) 8606 (v).

Bear River Station Dwelling, P.E.I. Tender, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 2161 (ii).

Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 3038 (ii).

—— Lease to Robert Co., &c. (Ans.) 8443 (v).

—— Lease on Inquiry for, 1740 (i).

—— (remarks) 13475 (vii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. Co. and G.T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2811 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv), 8552, 9066 (v).

'Bessie Butler' Str., Dimensions, &c., Use of by R. C. Clergy (Ans.) 12411 (vii).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2993 (ii).

—— Transfer of Power Plant, &c. (Ans.) 1114 (i).

Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging (Ans.) 4244 (iii).

Bridge Subsidies to Ry. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) 13310 (vii).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Service, on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. (remarks) 192 (i).

—— Connections with C.P.R. (remarks) 432 (i).

Brockville-Ottawa and Prescott Ry. Connections, &c. (remarks) 434 (i).

Buell, W. S., Employment *re* Telephone Commission (Ans.) 10011 (v).

Campaign Literature sent by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10343 (vi).

Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c. (Ans.) 236 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com. 4231 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 214) prop. Res., 13282; in Com., 13420 (vii).

Canadian Northern Ry., Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood Branch (remarks) in Com., 13309 (vii).

—— Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood and Pas Mission (remarks) 13475 (vii).

C.P.R., Saskatchewan Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13305 (vii).

Canals, Statistical Branch, List of Officers (read) 10317 (vi).

Cataract Power Co., Amount of Water diverted at De Cew Falls (Ans.) 897 (i).

Central Ry. of Canada, Charter, Deposit, &c. (Ans.) 4767 (iii).

Charlottetown, Pipe Line to Tank, Contract *re* (Ans.) 5656 (iii).

Charlottetown Ry. Station, Contract Price *re* Construction (Ans.) 517 (i).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5894 (iii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9207 (v).

Cold Storage Co. of N.B., Lease of Land to, &c. (Ans.) 563 (i).

Cold Storage Cars for I.C.R. *re* Dairy Produce, Number, &c. (Ans.) 1688 (i).

Cooper & White, Payments to Govt. for Land at Welland (Ans.) 3841 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Accident to Bank (statement, 11120 (vi).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Cornwall Canal, (remarks) 12660 (vii).
——— Rep. *re* Repairs, 12161 (vii).
——— Statement *re* Breakage, 11406 (vi).
Cornwall Canal, Arrangements with M'f'g. Cos., *re* Water Power (remarks) 13034 (vii).
——— Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).
Cowly and Highwood, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Deep Waterways Commission, Damming of St. Lawrence at Long Sault (remarks) 13152 (vii).
Dom. Power Co.'s Bill, on Inquiry for, 10919 (vi).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments, &c. (Ans.) 9711 (v).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 213) prop. Res., 13258; in Com. on Res., 13278; 1° of B., 13282; in Com., 13419 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239 (iii).
Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5483 (iii).
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Express Charges in Mar. Prov., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 518 (i).
Falconer, Kenneth, Emplymt. in Ry. Dept. (Ans.) 5078 (iii).
——— Payments by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).
Fort William Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6181 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3635, 3794 (ii).
Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6272 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6656 (iv).
——— Accidents *re* Construction, Prevention of (remarks) 6850 (iv).
——— Accidents to Workmen, Investigation, &c. (remarks) 10624 (vi).
——— Apptmt. of District Engineer at Kenora (Ans.) 895 (i).
——— Branch Lines, B. 51 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 7141, 8137 (iv), 8552, 8609, 8742, 9381 (v).
——— Classifications of Districts 'B' and 'F,' Investigation *re* (Ans.) 12051 (vii).
——— Construction, Accidents to Employees (remarks) 7447 (iv).
——— Contracts, Dates, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6158, 6637 (iv).
——— Contracts *re* Eastern and Western Sections, &c. (Ans.) 6234 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., Contract for Supplies to District No. 3 (Ans.) 1120 (i).
——— Cost of Construction (M.) to lay on Table, 12049 (vii).
——— Cost of Construction, on Stmnt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 12247 (vii).
——— Cost of Construction (reply) on M. for Sup., 12662 (vii).
——— Cost of Construction (remarks) 10916, 11407, 11939 (vi).
——— Discrimination against Canadian Contractors (Ans.) 7936 (iv).
——— Eastern Division, Estimated Length, &c. (Ans.) 5563 (iii).
——— Eastern and Western Limits, Establishment of (Ans.) 9265 (v).
——— Engineering Staff, Changes *re* (Ans.) 509, 681 (i).
——— Estimated Cost, Inclusive of Terminals, &c. (Ans.) 9265 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10395 (vi).
——— Grand Falls and Moncton Section, Contract *re* (Ans.) 9266 (v).
——— La Tuque Branch, Damages by Floods, &c. (explanation) 8894 (v).
——— La Tuque Branch, Damages by Flooding (remarks) 8607 (v).
——— Liquor, Prohibition of Sale, on Inquiry for Ret., 2024 (ii).
——— Medical Officer Parent, Payments to (Ans.) 8618 (v).
——— Miles under Construction, &c. (Ans.) 166 (i).
——— Moncton and Winnipeg Section, Number of Miles located (Ans.) 2387 (ii).
——— Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
——— and N.T. Ry., Disputed Question (Ans.) 6236 (iv).
——— Policy *re* Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).
——— Prohibition Zone, Reduction of (Ans.) 517 (i).
——— Protest *re* Land Acquisitions (Ans.) 6640 (iv).
——— Purchase of Rails, &c., for Eastern Div. (Ans.) 9264 (v).
——— Resignation of Major Hodgins, &c. (Ans.) 359 (i).
——— Return, on Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).
——— Steel Rail Contracts, Importations, &c. (Ans.) 12775 (vii).
——— Steel Rails, Names of Manufacturers, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 10790 (vi).
——— Steel Rails, Purchases, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 10738 (vi).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., Steel Rails purchased, Corrected Answer, 13065 (vii).

——— Supplies to Prince Rupert via American Routes (remarks) 9026 (v).

——— Transcontinental Commission, Salaries, Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 13226, 13517 (vii).

——— Transportation of Supplies, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1932 (i).

——— Winnipeg to Moncton Section, Number of Miles completed, &c. (Ans.) 6643 (iv).

Gunnip, Mr. James, Pet. *re* Claims for Injuries (Ans.) 3844 (ii).

Halifax and South-western Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3226, 3621, 3702, 3726 (ii),4225; on M. for 3°, 4363, 4542 (iii).

Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connection (remarks) 434 (i), 3317 (ii), 10179 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).

Hillsborough Bridge, Total Cost *re* Construction (Ans.) 1686 (i).

——— Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) 1739 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 2882, 3042, 3690 (ii).

Hodgins, Major, Resignation from G.T.P. Staff (Ans.) 516 (i).

Holland River Dredging, Divisional Engineer, &c. (Ans.) 4767 (iii).

——— Name of Inspector (Ans.) 3037 (ii).

——— Payments to Lake Simcoe Dredging Co. (Ans.) 2980 (ii).

Hunter, Henry C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1292 (i), 3237 (ii).

I.C.R., Accidents, Letter *re*, &c. (remarks) 6987 (iv).

——— Amqui Station, Cost of Construction (Ans.) 10012 (v).

——— Amqui Station, Vote *re* Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 12774 (vii).

——— Asphalt Platforms: *See* 'Stations.'

——— Audit System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10151, 10214 (v).

——— Book-keeping System, Cor. *re* Par. in St. John Daily Telegraph, 5260 (iii).

——— Cars sent to U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).

——— Circular *re* Payment of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10127 (v).

——— Claims Agent, Mr. E. H. Allen, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 3481 (ii).

——— Claims *re* Damages, Settled and unsettled (Ans.) 5793 (iii), 7196 (iv).

——— (remarks) 6002 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Concrete Pipe Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 6640 (iv).

——— Connections with Quebec Central at Lévis (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10179 (v).

——— Dartmouth Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

——— Delays to 'Maritime Express' (Ans.) 8615 (v).

——— Deterioration in Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10149 (v).

——— Earnings and Expenses (Ans.) 13511 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13415 (vii).

——— Employees and Civic Elections in Halifax (remarks) 6845 (iv).

——— Increased Wages, &c. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).

——— Employees, and Municipal Elections (remarks) 2884 (ii).

——— Employees, Number and Names of Persons taken in N.B. during Jan. and Feb. (Ans.) 5793 (iii).

——— Employees Provident Fund Act, Names on List (Ans.) 4582 (iii).

——— Employees Provident Fund Amt. (B. 117) 1° m., 4576; in Com., 4994 (iii).

——— Employees and Provincial Elections (remarks) 9777 (v).

——— Gross Earnings for 1908 (Ans.) 13225 (vii).

——— Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connections, &c. (remarks) 434 (i), 3317 (ii), 10179 (v).

——— Horses killed at Truro, Compensation &c. (remarks) 434 (i), 3317 (ii), 10179 (v).

——— Ice Supply Contract (Ans.) 5259 (iii).

——— Ice supplied by J. A. McDonald, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 7446 (iv).

——— Lac Saumon Station (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

——— Moncton Workshops, Tenders *re* Leasing (Ans.) 5800 (iii).

——— Motor Cars, Test *re* Operation, &c. (Ans.) 566 (i).

——— Newcastle Station, Inspector of Work, &c. (Ans.) 13511 (vii).

——— Notices printed in French, &c. (Ans.) 7936 (iv).

——— 'Ocean Limited,' Number of Trips, &c. (Ans.) 6054 (iii).

——— O'Shaughnessy, Pass to (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

———Oxford and Pictou Branch, Total Expenditure *re* Construction (Ans.) 10733 (vi).

——— Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene Train Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10158 (v).

——— Passes issued to Mr. P. S. Archibald, &c. (Ans.) 2387 (ii).

——— Pictou Branch, Transfer from Halifax Division, &c. (Ans.) 12774 (vii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

I.C.R., answer to question (remarks) 12661 (vii).

——— Pictou and Copper Crown Co., Total Expenditure *re*, &c. (Ans.) 10734 (vi).

——— Pictou Engine House, Contract *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

——— Pictou Station, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost of Construction (Ans.) 10790 (vi).

——— Rates, Increase in Winter to P.E.I. (Ans.) 5995 (iii).

——— Receipts and Expenditures (Ans.) 10514 (vi).

——— Revenue from Terminals, &c. (Ans.) 5471 (iii).

——— Riviere du Loup Station Master (Ans.) 7445 (iv).

——— Rolling Stock, &c. (statement) in Com. of Sup., 5697 (iii).

——— Ste. Monique Gates, Number to be made (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

——— Stations, Asphalt Platforms, Contracts, *re* (Ans.) 5466 (iii).

——— Steel Rails purchased from Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re* (Ans.) 9269 (v).

——— Stellarton to Pictou, Total Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10734 (vi).

——— Stewart, Mr. James A., Emplymt. of (Ans.) 9712 (v).

See 'Audit,' &c.

——— Sunday Trains, Instructions *re* (Ans.) 10735 (vi).

——— Tatamagouche, Delay in Train Service (Ans.) 1292 (i).

——— Ties delivered, Change *re* Inspection (Ans.) 12052 (vii).

——— Trains, Hauling of Private Cars (Ans.) 5474 (iii).

——— Train Service, Explanations *re* Delays, on M. (Mr. Reid) for Ret., 6242 (iv). 10149 (v).

——— Transportation, &c. (annual statement) on M. for Sup., 4420 (iii).

——— Trois Pistoles Station (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

——— Truro Buildings, Name of Tenderers (Ans.) 6233 (iv).

——— Truro Engine House, Contract to Rhodes & Co. (Ans.) 1936 (i).

——— Truro Station, Unsanitary Condition (Ans.) 7211 (iv).

——— Williams, Mr., Emplymt. (Ans.) 2388 (ii).

——— Unopposed Returns (remarks) 5914 (iii).

International Ry., N.B., Directors, Stock, &c. (Ans.) 4246 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Inverness County Ry. Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12235 (vii).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12404 (vii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

Lyall, Mr. Peter, Name of Contractor of G.T.P. Terminals at Winnipeg (Ans.) 7991 (iv).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 893 (i).

——— Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Moncton Shops, Payments to E. A. Wallberg (Ans.) 8892 (v).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C. P. Ry., Extension, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7659 (iv).

N.B. Coal and Ry. Co.'s Claim against Ry. Dept. (Ans.) 9270, 9714 (v).

N.B. Elections, and Govt. Employees (remarks) 3317, 3579 (ii).

——— Interference by Dom. Govt. on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3662 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5049 (iii); on Senate Amts., 10512 (vi).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288, 13289 (vii).

Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12390 (vii).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10330 (vi).

Otonabee Power Co., Amount of Payment *re* Horse Power (Ans.) 5471, 5656 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5567 (iii).

Ottawa, Brockville & St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s B. 74 (Mr. Grant) on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

Owen Sound Dredging, Inspector Telford, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 3038 (ii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 9070 (v).

Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

Port Maitland Piers, Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender (Ans.) 691 (i).

——— Appmt. of Mr. W. W. Krick as Inspector (Ans.) 6919 (iv).

Port Mulgrave, N.S., Wharfs, Preventing Boats landing Cargoes (Ans.) 9274 (v).

P.E. I. Ry., Alma Station, Pet. *re* Construction (Ans.) 6642 (iv).

——— Bear River Stationmaster's Dwelling, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1737 (i).

——— Branch Lines, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3264 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13485 (vii).

——— Claims of Mr. James Maher, &c. (Ans.) 3834 (ii).

——— Complaints *re* Excessive Charges, &c. (Ans.) 1123 (i).

——— Contract *re* News Agency (Ans.) 8444 (v).

——— Dundas and Avondale Extension, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 8383 (v).

——— Earnings and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 848 (i).

——— Harmony and Elmira Branch Line (B. 202) prop. Res., 12052; in Com. on Res., 12408; 2° m., 12628; in Com., 12631 (vii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* M. J. Haney's Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2751 (ii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Mr. Haney's Claim (remarks) 7100 (iv).

——— Montague Branch Extension (M.) to dsch. Bill, 11405 (vi).

——— Stanley Bridge Branch, Reps., Surveys, &c., on M. for Ret., 850 (i).

——— Stanley Bridge Extension, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 4829 (iii).

——— Station Agents, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

——— Time-Table, Protest *re* (Ans.) 1124 (i).

——— Train Service between Charlottetown and Murray Harbour (Ans.) 569 (i).

——— Tunnel, Rep. *re*, on Inquiry for (Mr. Lefurgey) 9893 (v).

——— Tunnel, Information *re* (Ans.) 562 (i).

——— Winter Communication, Mail Service, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 1206 (i).

Provincial Elections, and Federal Ministers' Speeches (remarks) 8851 (v).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s (B. 217) prop. Res., 13080; in Com. on Res., 13416; in Com., 13491 (vii).

Quebec Bridge Accident, Material on Hand, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 1291 (i).

——— Apptmt. of Engineer Hoare (Ans.) 8173 (iv).

——— Names of Jurymen (Ans.) 7991 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Agreement *re* Rentals, &c. (remarks) 13227 (vii).

——— Horse or Vehicle Traffic (Ans.) 10739 (vi).

Quebec Bridge Commissioners' Report (presented) 4566 (iii), 10915 (vi).

——— on Inquiry for Rep., 946, 1739 (i), 3043 (ii), 6223 (iv).

——— Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 5914 (iii).

——— Printing, &c. (remarks) 6924, 7099, 8171 (iv), 8608 (v).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge, Distribution of Printed Evidence (remarks) 10302 (vi).

Quebec Bridge Co., Salaries to Officials (Ans.) 13517 (vii).

Quebec and Lake St. John (branch lines) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

Quebec and N.B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13291 (vii).

Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher (Ans.) 13225 (vii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 581 (i); on Amt. to Senate Amts., 12192 (vii).

——— (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3412 (ii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3389 (ii).

——— (fire damages) Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Kennedy) on M. for 2°, 939 (i).

——— (telegraph and telephones) Amt. (B. 118) 1° m., 4658 (iii); 2° m., 10625, 10633; in Com., 10636; 3° m., 10777; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 10783, 11124; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11622; on Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) 11633; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 11607 (vi).

Railway Commission Act (Ass't Chief, &c.) Amt (B. 112) prop. Res., 3751; in Com. on Res., 3903; 1° m., 3933 (ii); in Com., 4964 (iii), 8510 (v).

Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Ry. Charters and Land Grants, Renewals of (Ans.) 9271 (v).

Railway Commission, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

——— Total Expenditure *re* Counsel Fees (Ans.) 10257 (v).

Railway Estimates, Vote for (remarks) 10007 (v).

Ry. Land Grants, Amounts and Names, &c. (Ans.) 9271 (v).

Railways and Municipal Agreements, &c. (remarks) 6988 (iv).

Rails purchased from Govt. by N.B. Coal and Ry. Co., Amounts paid and still due (Ans.) 9269 (v).

Ry. Semaphores, Iron Ladders and Posts, &c. (Ans.) 239 (i).

Railway Statistics Report (presented) 1346 (i).

Railway Subsidies (B. 215) prop. Res., 13066; in Com. on Res., 13285; 1° m., 13315; in Com., 13478 (vii).

——— (stmnt.) re Railways under Construction, 13478 (vii).

——— Applications for, Memorandum *re*, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies, Bridge Construction (remarks) in Com., 13309 (vii).

Ry. Surveys in Colchester County, Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).

——— Correction *re* Answer, 5046 (iii).

Ry. Tracks crossed by Water Mains, &c. (Ans.) 690, 1109 (i).

Richibucto Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c. (Ans.) 12412 (vii).

Riviere du Loup Station, Improvement to (Ans.) 5468 (iii).

Ste. Barbe, Damages *re* Floods (remarks) 6987 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Plans, Surveys, &c., 3905 (ii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8562 (v).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4234, 4546, 4579 (iii).

Sault Ste. Marie Steel Works, Closing of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13474 (vii).

Sauve, Alfred, Rep. of Investigation *re* (Ans.) 9278 (v).

Semaphores at Interlocking Plant, London, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 9714 (v).
See 'Ry. Semaphores.'

Sharbot Lake to Carleton Place, Railway Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Soulanges Canal, Electric Power, Contract with Govt., &c. (Ans.) 10011 (v).

——— Investigation *re* Overseer (Ans.) 6107 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Boyer, on Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9890 (v).

——— Rep. of Mr. Boyer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).

———(Ans.) 12413 (vii).

——— Total Expenditure *re* Investigation (Ans.) 10513 (vi).

Souris Wharf, Permission to Build, &c. (Ans.) 7728 (iv).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1930 (i).

Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).

Stoney Lake, Damage Claims (Ans.) 5565 (iii).

Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5649 (iii).

Sydney to Sydney Mines Branch Ry., Total Cost (Ans.) 7201 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Canals (additional remuneration) 13174 (vii).

Canals—Chambly (tow paths) 12226 (vii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 5671 (iii).

Canals—Generally (extra remunerations) 5697 (iii); (salaries) 10325; (staff and repairs) 10304; (statistical branch) 10317; (surveys) 10340 (vi).

Canals—Cornwall (break in bank) 12768; (gate lifter) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672; (slope walls) 5663; (staff salaries) 5696 (iii); (walls) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Murray (houses) 12227 (vii).

Canals—Quebec (steam road roller) 12225 (vii).

Canals—Rideau (improvements) 12227 (vii).

Canals—St. Lawrence (District office) 12225 (vii).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 12223 (vii).

Canals—Soulanges (improvements) 12225 (vii); (Manning & Macdonald's claim) 5668 (iii).

Canals—Trent (Buckhorn dam) 12227; (construction) 12225 (vii); (damages) 10308 (vi); (damages) 12768; (improvements) 12227; (Lindsay lock) 12227 (vii); (surveys) 10338 (vi).

Canals—Welland (dredging slide) 5673 (iii); (electric lighting) 12195; (piers and bridges) 12207 (vii); (Port Colborne) 10312 (vi), 12211 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5673 (iii); (surveys) 12207; (widening) 12210 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Railways (Butler, M. J.) 12755 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston) 10913 (vi); (Owen Sound) 7822; P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7185; Que. (Dominion Arsenal) 7437 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11085 (vi).

Railways—C.P.R. (compensation) 5561 (iii).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10378; (inspection) 10390 (vi).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12764 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 10187 (v); (Amherst) 12233; (Antigonish) 12229; (bridges) 12259; (Chatham diversion) 12757 (vii); (claims dept.) 10177 (v); (collection of revenue) 5694 (iii); (double tracking) 12236, 12250; (facilities, &c.) 12259; (Fredericton) 12758 (vii); (Halifax, accommodation) 5518 (iii), 12227; (Indiantown branch) 12258 (vii); (legal costs) 5557 (iii), 10190; (locomotives) 10150 (v); (machinery) 12257; (Moncton, car shops) 12250; (Moncton-Truro, additional line) 12760; (Mulgrave) 12229; (New Glasgow) 12230; (North Sydney) 12229; (Petit Rocher spur) 12759 (vii); (Pictou) 5558 (iii), 12230 (vii); (rolling stock) 5519 (iii), 12257; (St. Cyrille, diversion) 12756; (St. John, accommodation) 12257 (vii); (St. Rosalie, improvements) 5558 (iii); (Ste. Rosalie) 12259; (Sackville) 12236 (vii); (salaries) 10127 (v); (Springhill junction) 12233 (vii); (stationery) 10181 (v); (Stellarton) 12230; (surveys, branch lines) 12764; (Sydney Mines) 12229; (Sydney Mines, diversion) 12759; (Truro) 12231 (vii); (Windsor branch) 10145 (v).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329; (extra clerks) 10342; (inspections, &c.) 10341; (litigation) 10357; (statistical branch) 10328; (unprovided items) 10328 (vi).

Railways—P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claim) 12762 (vii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362; (maintenance, &c.) 10385 (vi); (Quebec Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Talbot, Mr. Evariste, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 6400 (iv).

Telephone Wires, Application to cross R. Tracks (Ans.) 690 (i).

See 'Ry. Tracks,' &c.

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5387 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners' Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

See 'G.T.P.,' &c.

Transportation: *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.

Trent Canal, Bradford Canal, Building of (remarks) 13476 (vii).

——— Cameron Lake, Water Level, &c. (Ans.) 9772 (v).

——— Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1735 (i).

——— Holland River Extension (remarks) 11940 (vi).

——— Tributaries, Completion of Works, &c. (Ans.) 1115 (i).

——— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 1114 (i).

——— Surveys, Rep. *re* (remarks) 6988 (iv).

Trois Pistoles Station, I.C.R., Construction of (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

Tusket Wedge, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).

Valleyfield Floods, Damages, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7808, 7996 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Sloan) in Com., 4545 (iii).

Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Welland Canal, Cost of Construction (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

——— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

——— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).

——— Resignation of John E. Scott (Ans.) 6059 (iii).

White Horse Pass Ry. Co., Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade (Ans.) 10736 (v).

Wilberforce Dam, Obstruction to Traffic, &c. Cor., Plans, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Copies, 2939 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Williams, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 2388 (ii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6185 (iii).

Yukon Freight Rates, Rep. of Ry. Commission *re* (Ans.) 894 (i).

GRANT, Mr. G. D., *Ontario, N.*

Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 74) 1°*, 1584 (i); on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).

GREENWAY, Mr. T., *Lisgar.*

Dominion Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7880 (iv).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1355 (i).

GUTHRIE, Mr. H., *Wellington, S.*

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. (B. 141) 1°*, 6054 (iii); in Com., 7724 (iv).

Budget, The, 6011 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Power, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7608 (iv).

Commercial Travellers, Provincial Tax, Agreement *re* Abolition, &c. (Ques.) 5794 (iii).

Companies Act Amt. (B. 104) 1°*, 3653 (ii).

Eastern Trust Co.'s (B. 103) 1°*, 3653 (ii).

Foresters Subsidiary High Court, &c. (B. 62) 1°*, 1283 (i); in Com., 5174 (iii).

Hamilton Electric Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3697 (ii).

——— on Mr. Speaker's Ruling, *re* Ref. back to Committee, 3362 (ii).

Northern Bank and Crown Bank (B. 156) 1°*, 6525 (iv).

Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3339 (ii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 16) 1°*, 350 (i).

Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry (prop. res.) 2856 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G., *Lanark, S.*

Address, The, 548 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3864 (ii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., and G. T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2816 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co's B. 214 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13285 (vii).

C.P.R. Plaster Rock Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation *re* Depts., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 6153 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5643 (iii).

Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8899 (v).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1175 (i).

——— Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1778 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11882 (vi).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 758 (i).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6774 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13278 (vii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5484 (iii).

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).

Fort William Terminals Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6224 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1240 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3632, 3803 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Surveys, Inquiry for, 1739 (i).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2238 (ii); in Com., 12062 (vii).

G.T.P. Ry., Branch Line Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8746, 9462 (v).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12717 (vii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12249 (vii).

——— Montreal Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

——— Port Arthur Branch, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3748 (ii), 4228 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6431 (iv).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13128 (vii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 1743 (i).

I.C.R., Circular *re* Payment of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10128 (v).

——— Rolling Stock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5698 (iii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Transportation, &c. (reply) to Annual Statement, 4448 (iii).

Interprovincial Bridge Co., N.B., Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 8481 (v).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11245 (vi).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12802 (vii).

Man. Voters' Lists, Affidavits quoted, Ruling *re* Laying on Table, 7948 (iv).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13418 (vii).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6228 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3270 (ii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2744 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, ref. to in Debate on Address, 548 (i).

Quebec Bridge Report, Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).

Quebec and Lake St. John (branch lines) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6227 (iv).

——— Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13292 (vii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3907 (ii); in Com., 4980 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 10664 (vi).

St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., 3011 (ii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7723 (iv).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4579 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5450 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Chambly (tow paths) 12226 (vii).
Canals—Cornwall (gate lifter) 12226 (vii).
Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 5671 (iii).
Canals—Generally (extra remuneration) 5697 (iii); (surveys, &c.) 10340 (vi).
Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672 (iii); (walls) 12226 (vii); (slope walls) 5663 (iii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Soulanges (Manning & Macdonald's claims) 5668 (iii).

Canals—Trent (improvements) 12227; (Lindsay lock) 12227 (vii).

Canals—Welland (dredging slide) 5673 (iii); (electric lighting) 12196 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5673 (iii); (surveys) 12207 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries, &c.) 617 (i).

Justice (salaries) 5505 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Mint) 1452 (i).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10381; (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridges) 12259 (vii); (collection of revenue) 5693 (iii); (double tracking) 12237; (facilities, &c.) 12259 (vii); (Halifax, accommodation) 5548 (iii), 12228 (vii); (locomotives) 10149 (v); (Moncton car shops) 12253; (North Sydney) 12229 (vii); (Pictou) 5559 (iii), 12230 (vii); (rolling stock) 5549, 5550 (iii), 12257; (St. John, accommodation) 12258 (vii); (St. Rosalie) 5558 (iii); (Sackville) 12236 (vii); (salaries) 10128; (supplies) 10202 (v); (Truro) 12231 (vii).

Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329; Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.) 10386 (vi).

Temiskaming Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 13305 (vii).

Tenders, *re* Opening of, Ques. of Priv., 2738 (ii).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2339 (ii).

Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Bridge Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

HALL, Mr. R. R., *Peterborough, W.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 9 (i).

Dominion Lumbering and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 172) 1°*, 9021 (v).

—— Pet. (presented) 1731 (i).

Petition (M.) to Present, 1731 (i).

HARTY, Mr. W., *Kingston.*

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clark) in Com., 3731 (ii).

Sharbot Lake to Carleton Place, Railway Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11091 (vi).

HENDERSON, Mr. D., *Halton.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 5763 (iii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4398, 4517 (iii).

See 'National,' &c.

Binder Twine Bounty, Amount paid from 1903 to 1907, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 191 (i).

Bronte Harbour Dues for Wharfage, Amount collected (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

Canada and France Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6166, 6174, 6195 (iii); in Com., 6411 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 67 (Mr. Pardee) on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

C.P.R., Papineauville Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) in Com., 13507 (vii).

Cattle exported to U. S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2767 (ii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11257 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5119 (iii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c. (remarks) 9734 (v).

Detroit River Tunnel, and Customs Tariff, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10488 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13022; on M. for 3°, 13229; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 13256 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11194 (vi).

Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 613 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4545 (iii).

—— B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13268; in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Estimates, Preparation of Insufficient Votes, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5920 (iii).

Fire Extinguishers, Purchase of, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7665 (iv).

—— Cor. quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7797 (iv).

Fort William Ry. Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6180 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3584 (ii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10557, 10568 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3794 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12557 (vii).

'Grafter,' Use of, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 10994 (vi).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2236 (ii).

G.T.P., Branch Lines B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 7141 (iv), 8751 (v).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 95 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3194, 3621, 3712, 3735, (ii), 4226; on M. for 3°, 4542 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10499 (vi).

Immigration Bonuses, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1323 (i).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13137 (vii).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6901 (iv).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10528 (vi).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3035 (ii).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C.P.R. Extension (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7661 (iv).

National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13504 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5076 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses, &c. (remarks) 797 (i).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4698 (iii).

Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry Co.'s B. 74 (Mr. Grant) on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6182 (iii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and the U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3164 (ii).

Postal Rate Reduction, &c. (remarks) 3159 (ii).

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7932 (iv); in Com., 10704 (vi).

Presbyterian College Board, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7667 (iv).

Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Funds B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2788 (ii).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, Extravagant Expenditure, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7145 (iv).

——— Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 4939 (iii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3913 (ii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10669 (vi).

Railways and Municipal Agreements, Penalties *re* Violations (remarks) 6987 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7676, 7723 (iv).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4235, 4546 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2934 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2777 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12611 (vii).

Standard Plate Glass Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 41 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 6183 (iii).

Sugar Imports for 1908, Total Amount (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

Supply, Estimates, Total Appropriations, 5919 (iii).

Supply (seed grain) B. 96 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 2782 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (dairying, &c.) 10398; (exhibitions) 10572 (vi); (seeds) 12891 (vii).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672; (staff salaries) 5696 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical survey) 9748 (v); Printing and Stationery (salaries, &c.) 613; Sec. of State (salaries) 612 (i).

Excise (distilleries) 814; (tobacco stamps) 816 (i).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4207 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1896 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 10293 (v); (customs) 5662 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5783 (iii); (seed grain) 2777 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5764 (iii); (wrecks) 3197 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5526; (maintenance) 5514 (iii).

Public Works (ass't. dep. min.) 5699 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cumberland) 10864; (Ladysmith) 10867; (Vancouver) 10868; (Vernon) 10870; (Victoria, immigration) 10876 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10887 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, military) 10973 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) customs) 7143; (Halifax, immigration) 7143; (Halifax, miltary) 7143 (iv); (Parrsborough) 13327 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7498; (Guelph, armoury) 7680; (Hamilton, drill hall) 7694; (Hamilton, post office) 7696; (North Bay) 7714; (Owen Sound) 7818; (Sarnia) 7829; (Simcoe) 7830; (Welland) 7831 (iv).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rents, &c.) 10983, 10994 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte, dredging) 5708 (iii); (Bronte) 12091 (vii); (Tiffin, dredging) 5712 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11080; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11108 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 12728 (vii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

Tobacco, Canadian, Protection to, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 914 (i).

Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908 (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

Vancouver Bank incorp B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4582 (iii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6185 (iii).

Winnipeg Bank incorp. B. 19 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2787 (ii).

HERRON, Mr. J., *Alberta.*

Blairmore Townsite (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12741 (vii).

Blunden, Fred. W., Imprisonment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vii).

——— on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3475 (ii).

Buffalo Herd, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10103 (v).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10547 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11367 (vi).

Coal and Govt. Lands, Acres in Possession of Govt. (Ques.) 843 (i).

Cold Storage Plants, Construction in Alberta, &c. (Ques.) 1685 (i).

Cowly and Highwood, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13309 (vii).

Customs Officers at Windsor, Age, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 12655 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11915 (vi).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 761 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11136; in Com., 11164, 11169, 11410, 11504 (vi); on M. for 3°, (amt.) 12397 (vii).

Fire Guardians, Number employed in Alberta, &c. (Ques.) 3433 (ii).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Fishery Inspectors in Alberta, Names, &c. (Ques.) 12390 (vii).

Fishing Leases granted between Lake Superior and Rocky Mountains, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).

Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13214 (vii).

Grazing Leases, Irrevocable for 21 years, Application for, &c. (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Homesteaders for Sections 16, 15, 27, &c., Issue of Patents, &c. (Ques.) 7503 (iv).

Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, Applications, &c. *re* Coal Mining Lands, (M. for copies*) 698 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6386 (iv).

Immigration Expenditure from March, 1907, 1908 (Ques.) 5080 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4674 (iii).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2141 (ii).

Lands applied for by Mr. Aylwin under Irrigation Regulations (Ques.) 7209 (iv).

Land Patents, S.E. ¼ Sec. 2, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 2171 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 2169 (ii).

Lewis, N.W.M. Policeman, Murder of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8867 (v).

Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.'s (B. 22) 1°*, 430 (i).

Macleod Post Office, Report re Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12565, 13223 (vii).

Newspapers in Alberta, Amounts paid to by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12390 (vii).

Piegan Reserve, Cattle Shipping, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 632 (i).

Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3402 (ii).

School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 8470 (v).

Section 14, South-east Quarter, Application for, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 5476 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2921 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1360 (i).

Seed Grain Supply Bill, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2782 (ii).

Southern Alberta Land Co., Application *re* Change of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 7729 (iv).

HEBRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3810 (ii), 12596; in Com., 12620; in Com., 13048 (vii).

S.A. Volunteers, Land Grants (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

Squatters' Claims in Alberta (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10617 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 632 (i).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10044; (coal lands) 10072; (forest rangers) 10049; (salaries) 10044 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9881; (agents, U.S.) 9967; (deportations) 9884 (v).

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12753 (vii).

Interior — Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5758 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5743 (iii).

N.W.M. Police (pay of force) 8867 (v).

Post Office (inspectors) 9109 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10874 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 11008; (experimental farm, repairs, &c.) 10907; (quarantine stations) 11008 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Knowlton) 7292 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask., &c. (Edmonton) 8580; (Humboldt) 8587 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (Old Man's River) 12142 (vii).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11076 (vi).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12765 (vii).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2373 (ii).

White Pass Ry. Co., Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade, &c. (Ques.) 10736 (vi).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6183 (iii).

HUGHES, Mr. J. J., *Kings (P.E.I.)*

Address, The, 380 (i)

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3878 (ii).

Budget, The, 6097 (iii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1709 (i).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name of I.C.R., &c. (prop. res.) 6243, 6284 (iv).

I.C.R. Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2449 (ii).

Labour Organizations *re* Ry. Employees, Par. in Halifax 'Herald,' Ques. of Priv., 8289 (v).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12826 (vii).

Nipissing Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 170) 1°, 8694 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3258 (ii).

—— Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 12635 (vii).

—— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2747 (ii).

P.E.I., Ice-Breaker, Contract for Construction, &c. (Ques.) 365, 1734 (i); 5796 (iii); 8444 (v).

—— Telegraphic Communication, Com. from Commercial Cable Co. *re* (remarks) 8515 (v).

—— Winter Comunication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4628 (iii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7752 (iv).

S.A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3762 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2943, 2953; (wrecks) 3191 (ii).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2212 (ii).

HUGHES, Mr. S., *Victoria and Haliburton.*

Advertisements in Montreal 'Star' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7479 (iv).

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4030 (ii).

Balsam Lake and Gull River Ret., Incomplete, &c. (remarks) 6059 (iii).

Balsam Lake Section, Trent Canal, Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10308(vi). *See* 'Trent,' &c.

Battlefields of Quebec B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 3902 (ii); in Com., 4399, 4417, 4527 (iii).

'Bessie Butler,' Str., Dimensions, &c., Use of by R. C. Clergy (Ques.) 12411 (vii).

Board of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11988 (vi).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, Protection *re* (prop. res.) 2992 (ii).

—— Transfer of Power Plant, &c. (Ques.) 1114 (i).

Booms in International Streams, Regulation B. 105 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 1°, 3655 (ii).

Canadian Naturalization and British Rights, on M. for Sup., 12084 (vii). *See* 'Naturalization.'

C.P.R. Papineauville Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

C.P.R., Saskatchewan Bridge Construction, Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13305 (vii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Canadian Patriotic Funds B. 216 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 13320 (vii).

Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2769 (ii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11256 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10745 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 11317; in Com., 11544, 11639 (vi).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigations, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7579, 7596 (iv)

Cornwall Canal, Breakage, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 13085 (vii).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup., (remarks) 10136 (v).

Debates, Official (translators) 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10247 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11808, 11837 (vi); 12955 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B.181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11127; in Com., 11170, 11950; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11978 (vi).

Drill Shed, Lindsay, Date of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1111 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13281 (vii).

Fishing Licenses in B.C., Grants to Japanese (Ques.) 7445 (iv).

Fruit Inspection, Apples, &c., Complaints *re*, 2757 (ii).

G.T.R., Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12078 (vii).

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6657 (iv).

——— (remarks) 6850 (iv).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12680 (vii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10396 (vi).

G.T.P., Supplies, Transportation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10378 (vi)

——— Ties purchased in U.S. (remarks) 1448 (i).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6653 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6435 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6706 (iv).

Immigration Regulations *re* British Subjects, Deportation, &c. (Ques.) 9772 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Indian Dept., Extravagent Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11045 (vi).

I.C.R., Accidents, Letter *re* (read) 6986 (iv); ——— Audit System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10218 (v).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4422 (iii).

Japanese Immigration, on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1601 (i).

Labour unemployed, Protection to (Ques.) 10735 (vi).

Lancaster, Cadet, R.M.C., Investigation *re* Conduct, &c., on M. for Sup, 1019 (i).

Lee-Enfield Rifles, Accident at Rockliffe Range (Ques.) 10014 (v).

Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 606 (i).

Lumber Duties from U.S., on M. for Sup., 9504 (v).

Lumber Industry, Duty, &c. (remarks) 10259 (v).

Militia Rations, Cost per Day (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13505 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com.,11992 (vi).
See 'Canadian Naturalization.'

Newmarket Canal, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi).

Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., on M. for Sup., 10403 (vi).

Peace River Timber Limits, Cor., &c., *re* Granting (M. for copies) 3851 (ii).

Peace River Valley and Land Co., Cancelling of Grant (remarks) 11018 (vi).

——— Homesteads leased, sold, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2769 (ii), 6010 (iii).

Peace River Valley Lands, Terms and Regulations *re* Sale, &c. (Ques.) 1111 (i).

Postal Service in the House of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, Ques. of Order, 12629 (vii).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, in Com. on B. 215 (remarks) 13485 (vii).

Prince Rupert Customs Collector, Transfer of Mr. B. R. McDonald (Ques.) 6401 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4953 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Militia (remarks) 8696 (v).

——— City Corps., &c. (remarks) 8386 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Quebec Tercentenary, Transportation of Volunteers (remarks) 8377, 8384 (v).
Ques. of Priv. *re* Doukhobors, &c., 7321 (iv).
Railway Act (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3413 (ii).
Rama Indian Fund, Payments *re* (Ques.) 8610 (v).
Religious Fanatics (remarks) 12161 (vii).
Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re* (Ques.) 11494 (vi).
——— Contract for Bayonets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vii).
——— Deficiency in Manufacture, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 9028 (v).
——— Par in Ottawa Citizen, *re* Accident at Rockliffe Ranges (Ques.) 10515 (vi).
——— Ques. of Priv. *re* Mr. Bergeron's denial of Stmnt., 9330 (v)
——— Tests, &c. (remarks) 8169 (iv).
See 'Lee-Enfield,' &c.
R.M.C., Investigation *re* Conduct of Cadet Lancaster, on M. for Sup., 1019 (i).
School Statutes *re* Saskatchewan Prov., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6864 (iv).
Seed Grain for Settlers in N.W., Extension, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2903, 2935 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn.,1360 (i).
Seed Grain for Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2775 (ii).
Shipping Rings, Combinations, &c. (remarks) 5919 (iii).
S. A. Contingent, Medals for 3rd Contingent (Ques) 1110 (i).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) on prop. Res., 3759 (ii); in Com. on Res, 12596 (vii).
S. A. War, Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c. (Ques.) 1110 (i).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1930 (i).
Stewart, James, Inspecting Auditor, I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10152 (v).
Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Agriculture (dairying, &c.) 10399 (vi).
Canals—Cornwall (repairs to bank) 12768 (vii).
Canals—Generally (statistical branch) 10319 (vi).
Canals—Trent (damages) 12768 (vii); (repairs, &c.) 10305 (vi).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 12219 (vii).
Customs—Miscellaneous (printing, &c.) 9577 (v).
Excise (methylated spirits) 823 (i).
Geological Survey (oil borings) 13162 (vii).
Indians—N.B. (schools) 13170; Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12751 (vii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4030 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 10293 (v); (customs dues) 12156; (Dom. arsenal) 12154; (provisions, &c.) 12152; (R. M. College) 12152 (vii).
Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13156; (Civil Service Commission) 13168; (cotton strikers) 13158; (Olympic Games) 13167; (Oriental immigration) 13156 (vii); (seed grain) 2775 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7495 (iv); (Kingston, magazine) 10907; (Kingston) 10913 (vi); (London, military) 7707; (Markham) 7709; (North Bay) 7712 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1459 (i); (ventilation) 11010 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10885 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11210; (Porter's Lake) 11263; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hilford) 11267; (Port Hood) 11270; (Yarmouth) 11291 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Beaverton) 12090; (Belle River) 12090; (Blanche River) 12090; (Chute à Blondeau) 12092; (Colborne) 12095; (Collingwood) 12096; (Winnipeg River) 12138 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11093; (engineering branch) 11095; (unprovided items) 11119 (vi).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11071 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraphs (operating) 13178; (Yukon) 13179 (vii).
Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10384; (inspection) 10390 (vi).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12765 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton-Truro, additional line) 12760; (Petit Rocher spur) 12760; (Sydney Mines diversion) 12759 (vii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (Que. Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Tobacco Prohibition, &c., Ques. of Order *re* Resolution from Moral Reform Associations, 11302 (vi).
Trent Canal, Cameron Lake Water Level, Purchase of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 9772 (v).
——— Extension to Gull River, Reps., Plans, Surveys, &c. (M. for copies) 2991 (ii).
See 'Balsam,' 'Bobcaygeon,' 'Newmarket.'
——— Tributary Works, Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 1115 (i).
——— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 1114 (i).
Wilberforce Dam., Obstruction to Traffic, &c., Cor., Plans, &c. (M. for copies) 2988 (ii)

HUNT, Mr. A. B., *Compton.*

Pulp Wood Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4818 (iii).

JACKSON, Mr. S. J., *Selkirk.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8242 (iv); in Com., 13007 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11173, 11442, 11526, 11954 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act, Man. Voters' Lists, Polling Divisions made by Judges (remarks) 13139 (vii).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10819 (vi).

Grazing Lease of H. Riviere, Location, &c. (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

Hudson Bay Ry., Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6386 (iv).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11035 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12583 (vii).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Ques. of Priv., 10793 (vi).

Ques. of Privilege, Letter from Mr. Cyr (read) 8460 (v).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1365 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12611 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents) 9881 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8526; (Selkirk) 8548; Sask. (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8602 (v).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12767 (vii).

JACKSON, Mr. W., *Elgin, W.*

Address, The, 412 (i).

Budget, The, 5959 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12899 (vii).

Cattle sold at Central Experimental Farm, Sale of (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Experimental Farm (Central) Amounts paid for seeds, &c. (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

—— Sale of Cattle, &c. (Mr. for ret.*) 2795 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4003 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6900 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Amount of Expenditure for Cleaning, &c. (Ques.) 8888 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5076 (iii).

JACKSON, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Port Stanley Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 239 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Vehicle Traffic (Ques.) 10739 (vi).

St. Lawrence River Route, Wrecks and Collisions (Ques.) 10739 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10576 (vi); (live stock) 12899 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4758 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4086 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3220 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 1077 (i); (naval schools) 3224; (wrecks) 3205 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Yarmouth) 7181 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8594 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Stanley) 12136 (vii).

'Vigilant' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision (Ques.) 682 (i).

JOHNSTON, Mr. A., *Cape Breton, South.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13056 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5254 (iii).

Committee Meeting, Rep. *re,* on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) Ques. of Order, 2383 (ii).

Co-Operation B. 5 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 4565 (iii).

Debates, Official (translators) 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10248 (v).

Fort William Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6180 (iii).

Govt. Employees, Interference in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 615 (i).

'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9129 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6651 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1337 (i).

I.C.R., Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4487 (iii).

Keewatin Diocese Synod incorp. (B. 179) 1°*, 9330 (v).

Kun, Agnes Ballum, Release of from Gaol (remarks) 9335 (v).

Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal (B. 185) 1°*, 10008; M. for 2°, 10122 (v).

JOHNSTON, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries, Purchase of Supplies for 1892-1896 (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

Metal Shingle and Siding Co.'s Patent (B. 210) 1° m., 12649 (vii).

Obstruction to Supply, Ques. of Order, 10024 (v).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2429 (ii).

Presbyterian College, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7667 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3128, 3139 (ii).

——— 3rd Rep. (M.) to conc., 9890 (v).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4949 (iii).

Public Works, &c., in N. S., Irrelevancy of Debate (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7129 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) on order for 2° (remarks) 5211 (iii).

Sessional Papers and Returns: Number ordered, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2796 (ii).

——— Number presented, &c. (Ques.) 2592 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7748 (iv).

Supplies purchased for Govt., &c., Ques. of Order, *re* Investigation by Pub. Accounts Com., 5830 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5667 (iii).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9253 (v).

House of Commons (contingencies) 10502 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4759 (iii).

Marine (ice-breakers) 1906 (i).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1053 (i); (ice-breakers) 2958 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Digby) 11226 (vi); Ont. (Stanley Island pier) 5720 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Campbellton) 12258 (vii); (supplies) 10201 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods (B. 178) 1°*, 9330 (v); on M. for 2°, 13509 (vii).

KEMP, Mr. A. E., *Toronto, East.*

Address, The, 434 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3878 (ii).

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12160 (vii).

Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9738 (v).

Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of B. E. Walker (read) 6008 (iii).

KEMP, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12877 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6889 (iv).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9735 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12932; on M. for 3°, 13230 (vii).

Election Corruption, Charges of Hon. Mr. Pugsley, ref. to in debate on Address, 435 (i).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12554 (vii).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).

——— Winnipeg and Moncton Route, Miles Located, &c. (Ques.) 2386 (ii).

I.C.R., &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4422 (iii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11247 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12567 (vii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6894 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9487 (v).

Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13418 (vii).

Port Colborne Elevator and Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12218 (vii).

Postal Arrangements between U. S and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3893 (ii).

Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3346 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3906, 3922 (ii).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4665 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (construtions) 12226; (Port Colborne) 12212; (surveys) 12209 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9738; (salaries) 9699 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5773 (iii); (Point Pelee lightship) 13325 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (cotton strikers) 13162 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt steamers) 5764 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2962; (life-saving stations) 2972 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (new deptl. building) 5701; (post office) 5705; (rents, &c.) 5706 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii); (Montreal,

KEMP, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

postal station B) 7419; (Montreal, post office) 7411; (Montreal, warehouse) 7424; (Point St. Charles) 7419; (St. John's, military) 7440 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's rapids) 5702; Ont. (Stanley Island pier) 5721 (iii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13321 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (salaries) 10146 (v).

Thanksgiving Day, Change from Thursday to Monday (remarks) 13085 (vii).

Toronto Harbour, (western entrance) Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 10014 (v).

KENNEDY, Mr. J. B., *New Westminster.*

B. C. Fishing Licenses to Packer's Association, Issue of (Ques.) 8173 (iv).

Customs Defalcations in B. C., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10485 (vi).

—— Ques. of Priv., 9459 (v).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Speakers (remarks) 13537 (vii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1725 (i).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11031 (vi).

Japanese Immigration, &c., Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2144 (ii).

—— on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 748 (i).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9501 (v).

Obstructions *re* Supplies, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9943 (v).

Ry. Act, 1903 (fires, &c.) Amt. (B. 18) 1° m., 350; 2° m., 938 (i).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E., *Assiniboia, West.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11549 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11132; in Com., 11413, 11958 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10826 (vi).

G.T.P., Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8128 (iv), 9382 (v).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. for Sup., 6291 (iv).

Lumber Duties from U. S., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 9510 (v).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C. P. Ry., Extension of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7654 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 9068 (v).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E.—*Con.*

Seed Grain for Settlers in N. W., Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2918 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1368 (i).

Seed Wheat in N. W., Charges by Mr. Macdonell, M.P., Ques. of Priv., 1438 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12595 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 9700 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10976 (vi); Sask. (Humboldt) 8596 (v).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12765 (vii).

Yeomans, Indian Agent, Complaints by John Franklin, &c., Letters, &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9668 (v).

LAKE, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*

Address, The, 459 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4713 (iii).

Autonomy Act Validity, Return, Inquiry for, 5727 (iii).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12740 (vii).

Bonn Post Office, Application *re* Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 10516 (vi).

Buchanan Townsite, Applications *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10079 (v).

Budget, The, 5605 (iii).

Cameron, John, Homestead Inspector, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4769 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry., Erwood and Pas Mission Branch, Rep. of Engineer (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 13309 (vii).

—— Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood and Pas Mission (remarks) 13475 (vii).

C.P.R. Taxation, Test Cases, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 5049 (iii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6882 (iv).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10550 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11367 (vi).

Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 5468 (iii).

Coal Lands, Timber, &c., Dates of Regulation, O.Cs., &c. (Ques.) 12656 (vii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

Coal Mines Royalty, Sums received by Govt. (Ques.) 12391 (vii).

Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).

——— (remarks) 10916 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1637 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1839 (i).

Documents, Original, *re* Timber Berths (M. for papers, &c.) 2855 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8150 (iv), 11791; in Com., (amt.) 11898 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11127; in Com., 11158, 11168 11415, 11505, 11942; on M. for 3° (amt.) 11976 (vi), 12395; Neg. (Y. 39; N. 65) 12395; on Senate Amts., 13522 (vii).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 754 (i).

Dom. Lands, Area disposed of by Govt. (Ques.) 3431 (ii).

——— Sales of during 1907 (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).

——— Return, Inquiry for, 5727 (iii).

——— Total Area disposed of from 1896 to 1905 &c. (M. for ret.) 3852 (ii).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10816 (vi).

Doukhobor Prisoners at Fort William, Pardon by Justice Dept. (remarks) 6847 (iv).

——— Tels. *re* Pardon by Justice Dept. (Ques.) 6983 (iv).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Tel. *re* Conduct, &c. (remarks) 7621 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, 6752 (iv).

Eagle Lake Coal Lands, Surrender of (Ques.) 694 (i).

Estevan Quarantine Lands, Disposal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10093 (v).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3651 (ii).

Grain Commission's Rep., Inquiry for, 2381 (ii), 4224, 4316 (iii).

Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13208 (vii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 9469 (v).

Harbottle, N. F., Emplymt. in Excise Dept., &c. (Ques.) 7730 (iv).

Homestead Cancellations, Unfair Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10100 (v).

Homestead Entries, Declarations, &c., by R. Cruickshank, of N. W. (M. for copies*) 698 (i).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

Homestead Entry for S. W. ¼ Section 16-28-1, Issue of Patent, Duties performed, &c. (Ques.) 2167 (ii).

Homestead Entries N. E. ¼ Sec. 28, Permissions *re* Grants (Ques.) 1941 (i).

Homestead Entries in N. W. Quarter Section 35, &c. (Ques.) 4762 (iii).

Homestead Entry by Mr. Tanguay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).

Homesteads, Sale of in Township 13, Range 13 (Ques.) 7206 (iv).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6368 (iv).

Indian Lands, Sale of, Ret., Inquiry for, 4495 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 962 (i).

Land Patents, Entry of Dates, Applications, Inspections, &c., of ¼ section 16, &c. (Ques.) 3432 (ii).

Land Patents, Sections 36, &c., Issue of (Ques.) 3481 (ii).

Land Sales in N. W. Indian Reserves, Applications, Advertisements, &c. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

Lands in Sections 2, 10, 14, 22 and 24, Disposal of (Ques.) 5083 (iii).

Land Titles Act Assurance B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 8481 (v).

Livingstone, Wm. G., Sale of Sections 22, 28 and 32, &c. (Ques.) 9475 (v).

Lumber manufactured in N. W., Royalties, &c. (Ques.) 3835 (ii).

McKenzie, Mr. K. W., Apptmt. as Dom. Lands Agent at Edmonton (Ques.) 6981 (iv).

Mackinnon Post Office, Establishment of, &c. (Ques.) 10516 (vi).

McLeod, Roderick, Date of Homestead Entry (Ques.) 6401 (iv).

Mail Matter lost in C.P.R. Accident at Kenora, Rep. *re* (remarks) 9281, 9723 (v).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12559, 13221 (vii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6890 (iv).

Moberly, Mr. H. J., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3848 (ii).

Moose Mountain Buffalo Herd (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10102 (v).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9493; (amt.) 9494 (v).

Muskoday Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Sale (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of Lands (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12729, 12737 (vii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

Peace River Colonization and Land Development Co., Surveys, Reps., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10001 (v).

'Phoenix' Saskatoon, Number ordered, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 6920 (iv).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10713 (vi).

Postal Arrangements between Can. and U. S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3166 (ii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry. and SS. Co., Last Deficit, &c. (Ques.) 6459 (iv).

Quarter Sections 35, 31, 6, &c., Public and Private Sale, &c. (Ques.) 8176 (iv).

Railway Act (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3410 (ii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3401 (ii).

Ramsland Homestead Entry, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 5209 (iii).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4664 (iii).

Samovici, A., and H. Bolacan, Applications for Cancellation of Homestead Rights, &c. (M. for copy*) 557 (i).

Saskatchewan Act, May 23rd, 1906, Constitutionality of, Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 3435 (ii).

———.Report *re* (Ques.) 6400 (iv).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Conditions of Sale, &c. (Ques.) 4761 (iii).

See 'Timber,' &c.

School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 8472 (v).

Scrip and Money received by Govt. *re* Lands, Mines, &c. (M. for ret.) 3852 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 3431 (ii).

School, Timber and Coal Lands in Man., &c. Average Price, &c. (Ques.) 3430 (ii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of Payment, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2896; Neg (Y. 58; N. 98) 2937 (ii).

Seed Grain, Distribution to Settlers in N. W. (Ques.) 692 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1352 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2772 (ii).

Six Nation Indians, Negotiations *re*, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 6242 (iv).

——— Refusal of Inspection of Memorials, &c. (Ques.) 6239 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3790, 3831 (ii); in Com. (amt.) 12621; on Senate Amts., 13524 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9764 (v).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10041; (homesteads) 10082; (salaries) 10041 (v).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Survey (specimens) 12261 (vii).

Immigration (agents) 9858; (deportations) 9882; (Doukhobors) 9956; (hospitals) 9983; (relief to settlers) 9983 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12733 (vii).

Inspection of Staples (inspectors) 12264 (vii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2772 (ii).

N. W. M. Police (pay of force) 8869 (v).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5527 (iii).

Post Office (inspection) 9114 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally Experimental Farms (repairs, &c.) 10906 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8531 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10957 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10976 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston) 10910 (vi); (North Bay) 7715 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Alta (Edmonton) 8579; (Battleford) 8577; (Estevan) 8581; (Humboldt) 8582; (Regina) 8602 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W.T. (Lesser Slave) 5719 (iii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 12764; I.C.R. (surveys, branch lines) 12764 (vii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1220-1272, on Order for Ret. (amt.) 849 (i).

Timber Licenses cancelled from May, 1905, to Nov., 1907, &c. (Ques.) 181 (i).

Timber Licenses, Conditions and Forms in force at present (Ques.) 359 (i).

Timber Licenses and Renewals in N. W., Number of Miles, &c. (Ques.) 181 (i).

——— (M.) for Com. of Investigation, 2260, 2269; Amt. Neg. (Y. 55; N. 111) 2736 (ii).

Timber Sales, &c., on Amt. to Com. of Sup., 8769; (amt.) 8778; Amt. neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 8833 (v).

Vacant Land Reservation, Instructions to Agents *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1935 (i).

Wheat Feed Shipments, Special Arrangements with Ry. Cos. (Ques.) 893 (i).

Wheat Transportation, Financial Assistance, &c. (Ques.) 1938 (i).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10531 (vi).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8484 (v).

LALOR, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*

Address, The, 292 (i).

Apple and Fruit Inspectors, Number of Apptmts. (Ques.) 353 (i).

Apples seized by Inspectors at Montreal, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1508 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6177, 6197 (iii).

Canada-Germany Trade Relations (remarks) 13081 (vii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*

Cattle exported to U. S. during 1900-7, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1507 (i).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11252 (vi).

Cold Storage Cos., Grants to (Ques.) 1937 (i).

Dauphin Public Building, Valuation of Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13039 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13265 (vii).

Fisheries Regulations, Violation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5781 (iii).

Fruit Inspection, Complaints *re* Packing of Apples (remarks) 2760 (ii).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 669 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11249 (vi).

Meat and Canned Food Inspectors, Number of Apptmts. (Ques.) 352 (i).

Militia Stores and Arms, Care of for Rural Battalions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).

Port Maitland, Piers, Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender (Ques.) 690 (i).

——— Apptmt. of W. W. Krick as Inspector (Ques.) 6919 (iv).

——— Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 1294 (i).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10714 (vi).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, &c. (remarks) 8862 (v).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10676 (vi).

St. John Cold Storage Co., Names of Stockholders, &c. (Ques.) 1938 (i).

Seed Inspectors, Number of Apptmts. (Ques.) 353 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, &c.) 677 (i).

Canals, 10319 (vi); Welland (Port Maitland) 5676 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 652 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 5735; (stores, care of) 5736 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Ladysmith) 10867; (Vernon) 10870 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8522 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Leamington) 7815; (Owen Sound) 7822; (St. Mary's) 7826; (Welland) 7832 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hood) 11275; (Pugwash wharf) 11281 (vi).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*

Welland Canal, Feeder, Rep. of Judge Madden *re* Investigation (M. for copy*) 852 (i).

——— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c. (Ques.) 174 (i).

——— Resignation of John R. Scott (Ques.) 6058 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., Financial Aid, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2189 (ii).

Wilson Cordage Co., Charges against A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 657 (i).

Woollen Industry, Deputations *re* (remarks) 13082 (vii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln & Niagara.*

Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 362 (i).

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4865 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G. T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2816 (ii).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3473 (ii).

Campaign Literature, franking by Depts., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10351 (vi).

Canada Shipping Act: *See* 'Masters and Mates.'

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Fielding) on M. to place on Order Paper (remarks) 13494 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6875 (iv).

Cannon, Catherine Ann Relief B. 175, on M. (Mr. Galliher) to remit Fees, 13510 (vii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10744 (vi).

Cooper & White, Payments *re* Rental for Govt. Lands, Welland (Ques.) 3841 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12204 (vii).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on M. for Sup., 1814 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 11726; in Com. (amt.) 11816; (amt.) 11841 (vi), 12967 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11177 (vi).

Electrical and Gas Power Licenses granted under Statute, c. 16, &c. (Ques.) 360 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trades Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3532 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3801 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. McCool) for Plans, &c., 5239 (iii).

——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 12836 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Scheme (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10313 (vi).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8746, 9382 (v).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup. 12707 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12318 (vii).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2246 (ii); in Com., 12076 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3718 (ii).

I.C.R. Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12400 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12566 (vii).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. (B. 2) 1° m., 90 (i); 2° m., 3014; in Com., 3034 (ii).

——— on Order for 2° (remarks) 570 (i).

National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13501 (vii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9367 (v).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3057 (ii).

Niagara Lands, Purchase for Military Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13542 (vii).

Niagara Military Camp, Holding of (remarks) 9779 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 5002 (iii).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9906 (v).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10854 (vi).

Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii).

Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* improvements (Ques.) 4403 (iii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 91; 2° m., 570; in Com., 583 (i); (amt.) on Senate Amts., 12191, Neg. (Y. 42; N. 85) 12192 (vii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3353 (ii).

———(compensation) Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 5247 (iii).

Railway Commission (ass't chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3909 (ii); in Com., 4967 (iii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10645; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 11607; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 11624; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 10784, 11595 (vi).

——— (Ry. Commission) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 10784, 11595 (vi).

Ry. Act (mortgages) Chap. 38, B. 204 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 12550 (vii).

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12601 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Generally (repairs) 10309; (statistical branch) 10319 (vi).

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12195; (Port Colborne) 12221; (surveys) 12208 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9753 (v).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9540; Miscellaneous (legal expenses) 9578; Outside Service (salaries) 9439 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4050, 4103 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Colborne) 12096; (Collingwood) 12096; (Gore's Landing) 12101 (vii).

Railways — Miscellaneous (inspections) 10342 (vi).

Timber Marking Act Amt. (B. 193) in Com., 12408 (vii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13509 (vii).

Waterways Commission *re* International Boundary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9753 (v).

Welland Canal, Cost of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

——— Deepening, Estimated Cost (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10311 (vi).

——— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W., Financial Aid by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2190 (ii).

LANCTOT, Mr. R., *Laprairie-Napierville.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 17 (i).

Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 12653 (vii).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of (Ques.) 516 (i).

——— O.C. *re* (M. for copy*) 557 (i).

Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3373 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay Patrol) 4027 (ii).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*

Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provinces (Ques.) 7990 (iv).

——— Number under Control of Dom. Govt. (Ques.) 3897 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4029 (ii).

LAURIER, Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid (Prime Minister) G.C.M.G., *Quebec East.*

Address, The, (M.) *re* Precedence, 8 (i).

Address, The 40 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 544 (i).

——— (M.) to present, 554 (i).

Adjournment for Christmas: (M.) 754 (i).

See 'Business,' &c.

Advertisements for Tenders of Public Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4706 (iii).

All-Red Line (prop. res.) 12414, Agreed to (Y. 109; N. 47) 12501 (vii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12495 (ii).

All-Red Route, Authority *re* Negotiations, &c. (statement) 366 (i).

——— Canadian Representatives in England, &c. (Ans.) 353 (i).

——— Irish Route, Opposition by Govt. (Ans.) 10254 (v).

——— Letter to Mr. Sifton (remarks) 948 (i).

——— Purposes of Mr. White's Presence in London (remarks) 608 (i).

——— Mr. White's Duties in England (Ans). 694 (i).

——— Resolutions (remarks) 12162 (vii).

——— Mr. Sifton's Address *re* Canada's Attitude (remarks) 947 (i).

——— Tenders, Proposals, Cor. *re* (Ans.) 6460 (iv).

Anglo-American Cable between P.E.I. and Mainland, Breaking of (remarks) 8440 (v).

Anglo-American Treaties, Cor. &c. (remarks) 9715 (v).

——— Further Information *re* (remarks) 7447 (iv), 8516 (v).

——— on Inquiry for Cor., 10120 (v).

——— Submitted to Can. Govt. (remarks) 6926 (iv).

——— Tel. from Mr. Bryce *re* (remarks) 6985 (iv).

Anglo-Japanese Treaty Cor, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 599 (i).

See 'Japanese.'

'Arctic' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4012 (ii).

Ash Wednesday Adjournment (M.) 4221, 4314 (iii).

Australian Mission of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2218 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Bate & Co., and W. C. Edwards & Co., Payments to (Ans.) 3234 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada (B. 111) prop. Res., 3579, 3901; 1° m., 3902 (ii); 2° m., 4376; in Com., 4393, 4408, 4497; 3° m., 4530, 4534, Agreed to (Y. 90; N. 11) 4535 (iii).

Battlefields Commission (lands) Amt. B. 219 1° m., 13495; in Com., 13501 (vii).

Beauharnois Canal Water Power, New Lease (remarks) 947 (i).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., and G.T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2820 (ii).

Binder Twine, Lead, &c., Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 4583 (iii).

Blue Books, Distribution to Members, &c. (remarks) 241 (i).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3471 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5949

Bounties paid by Govt. since 1896 (remarks) 895 (i).

Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c (Ans.) 4583 (iii).

Brier Island Fog Alarm, Contract *re* Installation (Ans.) 9474 (v).

Business of the House (M.) to take in Wednesdays, 5135 (iii), 9480 (v), 11232 (vi).

——— Public Bills, &c. (remarks) 2982 (ii)

See 'Govt. Business,' &c.

Cabinet Appointments, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 44 (i).

Campaign Funds, Charges and Investigation *re* (remarks) in debate on Address 65 (i).

Canada-Australian SS. Subvention, Discontinuance of (Ans.) 941 (i).

——— Yearly Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 1289 (i).

Canada and France SS. Communication, Provision *re* Treaty (Ans.) 12391 (vii.)

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6418 (iv).

Canada and U. S. Treaties, on Inquiry (Mr R. L. Borden) 7835 (iv).

See 'Anglo-American,' &c.

Canadians at Niagara, Indignity by Customs Officer of U. S. (remarks) 11122 (vi).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12849 (vii).

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept. (remarks) 6060 (iii).

——— Conditions *re* Investigation of Marine Dept., 6143 (iii).

——— Cor. *re* Investigation of Marine Dept. Laid on Table, 6464 (iv).

See 'Civil Service,' &c., 'Marine and Fisheries.'

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Cattle Embargo by G. B., Cable *re* Removal (remarks) 13228 (vii).

'Champlain,' Str., Use in Quebec for Political Purposes (remarks) 9127, 9343, 9460 (v).

Chilvers, Messrs., Emplymt. of (Ans.) 8894, 9266 (v).

Chinese Immigration, Decision of N. S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax (Ans.) 514 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on M. to resume adjn. debate, (remarks) 5246, 5251 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11562 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Report, Investigation *re* Depts., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 6148 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7535 (iv).

——— Marine, Deptl. Dismissals (announcement 6003 (iii).

——— Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to Adjn. House, 5887 (iii).

——— Report, (remarks) on Presentation, 5633 (iii).

——— Translation of (remarks) 11312 (vi).

Civil Service List (presented) 93 (i).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9200 (v).

Cold Storage, Papers on, Inquiry for, 3690 (ii).

See 'N.B. Cold Storage, &c.

Colonial Conference (remarks) in debate on Address 41 (i).

See 'Travelling,' &c.

Commercial Travellers Tax, Condition *re* Abolition of (Ans.) 5794 (iii).

Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 6 (i).

——— (M.) to conc. in Rep., 90 (i).

——— Organization of (remarks) 505 (i).

——— (M.) to add Names, 1207 (i), 3315 (ii).

Companies Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5493 (iii).

Co-operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on Order for 2°, 583 (i); (M.) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 3654 (ii).

Copyright Act Amt. B. 28 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 940 (i).

Criminal Code Amendments, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 9283 (v).

Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 2786 (ii).

Debates of the House, Average Price per Column (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

——— 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 7834 (iv).

——— (remarks) 12505 (vii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Debates of the House, 4th Rep. (translaters) on M. to ref. back to Com. (remarks) 8900, 9710, 9889, 10119, 10242 (v).

Debates, Official, French Edition, Delays in Printing (Ans.) 2978 (ii).

——— Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3491 (ii).

——— French Supt. of Printing (Ans.) 2978 (ii), 12411 (vii).

Dillon, Gerald P., Apptmt. to N.W.M. Police Force (Ans.) 6001 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1137 (i).

——— Instruction *re* Laying on Table (remarks) 7810 (iv).

——— Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1623 (i).

——— Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1775 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 1845 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 1927 (i).

——— on Notice being called, 2794 (ii).

See 'Public Documents,' 'Timber,' &c.

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 5247 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8296 (v); in Com., 11807 (vi), 12922; on M. for 3°, 13231 (vii).

Dom. Election Bill, 1903, Preparation of (remarks) &c., 8393 (v).

Dom. Elections Act, and Govt. Measures, Proceeding with (remarks) 7721 (iv).

Dom. Guarantee Co.'s B. 127 (Mr. Pringle) on Senate Amts., 12773 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11977 (vi).

Doukhobors, Prisoners at Fort William (remarks) 6848 (iv).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws (remarks) 7620 (iv).

Dredging Companies, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).

——— O.Cs. *re* Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6747 (iv).

Dredging in Quebec Harbours in 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3240 (ii).

Drury, R. L., Apptmt. as Japanese Agent (remarks) 4769 (iii).

Dunsmuir, Lt. Gov. of B.C., Assent to Natal Act, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) 1738 (i).

——— Tel. of Sec. of State (read) 1859 (i).

See 'Immigration,' &c.

Easter Adjournment (M.) 6464 (iv).

Eclipse Manufacturing Co., Payments to (Ans.) 3239 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13276 (vii).

Elder-Dempster SS. Subsidy to S. Africa (Ans.) 2792 (ii).

Empire Day and Ascension Day, Adjnmt. (M.) 8894 (v).

Employees of Parlt. and Printing Bureau, Names, Salaries, Religions, &c. (remarks) 5206 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5485

Fisheries Act (trials) Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 5249 (iii).

Fisheries Negotiations, &c., between U. S. and Canada (remarks) 2023 (ii).

Fisheries Treaty Boundaries with U.S., Information *re* (remarks) 6632, 6740, 6844 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, Apptmt. to Hague Tribunal (remarks) 8295 (v).

Franco-Canadian Treaty (remarks) in debate on Address, 43 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty Bill (remarks) *re* 3°, 3754 (ii).

See 'Canada and France,' &c.

French Translation of Govt. Documents, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3181 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 4230 (iii).

Govt. Business, (announcement) 7834 (iv).

——— Introduction of Bills (remarks) 10258 (v).

——— Legislation (remarks) 10303, 10511, 11123, 11826 (vi).

——— Stmnt. *re* Legislation, 12049, 12163 (vii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays (M.) 6287 (iv).

Govt. Officials and Interference in Elections (remarks) 11903 (vi).

Govt. Ownership of Rys., &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 51 (i).

Grain Commission, Number of Members, &c. (Ans.) 3486 (ii).

Grain Commissioner's Report (Ans.) 180 (i).

——— on Inquiry for, 609 (i), 2381 (ii).

Grain Inspection, Total Expenditure and Receipts in 1906 (Ans.) 4586 (iii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 9465 (v).

G.T.P. Ry., Eastern Division, Recent Estimate of Cost (Ans.) 5259 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, Amt. to M. to ref. to Special Com., 7320 (iv).

——— Charges *re* Classification (remarks) 6844, 6925 (iv).

——— Statement from Mr. Parent (remarks) 6985, 7097 (iv).

——— (M.) to ref. to Com., 7213 (iv).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., Location, Conference in Montreal, Par. in Toronto 'World' (remarks) 7809 (iv).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2224 (ii); in Com., 12071 (vii).

G.B. and U.S. Treaties, Papers laid on Table, 8694 (v).

See 'Anglo-American,' &c.

Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R. (Ans.) 184 (i).

Halifax Garrison, Disbandment of (remarks) 1208 (i).

Halifax Platform, *re* Conservative Speeches (remarks) in debate on Address, 47 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3695 (ii), 4226 (iii).

Hansard, Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9131 (v).

Hillsborough Bridge Claims, on Inquiry for Ret., 3691 (ii).

Hindus, Immigrants and Contract Labour (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests *re* Treatment (remarks) 5489 (iii).

Hodgins, Major, Retirement of (remarks) 366 (i).

See 'G.T.P.,' &c.

House of Commons Act Amt. B. 66 (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for 2°, 5226 (iii).

House of Commons, Allottment of Rooms in New Wing (remarks) 5729 (iii).

——— Employees, Apptmts. and Recommendations, &c. (Ans.) 3899 (ii).

——— Rules *re* Hours of Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 588 (i).

House of Commons and Senate, Cost of outside of Indemnities (Ans.) 4760 (iii).

Hudson Bay Co., Lord Selkirk's Estate, Original Land Registers, &c. (Ans.) 4403 (iii).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Date of Resignation, Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 166 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5657 (iii); in Com., 6432 (iv).

Immigration Act, B.C., known as Natal Act, Disallowance of (Ans.) 567 (i).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7077 (iv).

——— on Notice of M. (Mr. Monk) 6289 iv).

——— Par. in 'Canadian Gazette' (remarks) 7454 (iv).

Immigrants, Fraudulent Circular issued, &c. (remarks) 607 (i).

Imperial Treaties, Status of Canada *re* Negotiations (Ans.) 1939 (i).

Indian Lands, Sale in Algoma, Tel. from Mr. Sifton (read) 13416 (vii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Indian Lands (remarks) 13532 (vii).
Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6479 (iv).
Insurance, Supt. of, Salary (prop. res.) 12162 (vii).
I.C.R., Claims for Damages by A. W. Belyea (Ans.) 9472 (v).
——— Freight Rate *re* Fredericton, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Cor., 2562 (ii).
——— Moncton Shops, Contractor, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1509 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 7 (i).
International Boundary Line, Representation *re* Placing of Buildings (Ans.) 356 (i).
——— Correction of Answer, 519 (i).
Italy, Commercial Treaty with (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10596 (vi).
Japanese Immigration, Announcement of Mr. Lemieux's Mission (remarks) 1208 (i).
——— (remarks) 1424 (i).
Japanese Immigration into B.C. (remarks) on debate on Address, 58 (i).
——— Debate in Japanese Diet, *re* (remarks) 4738 (iii).
——— Information *re* (remarks) 947 (i).
——— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2090 (ii).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration, O.Cs., Cor., Papers, &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Ret., 864 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1929 (i).
See 'Anglo-Japanese,' &c., 'Dunsmuir.'
Kun, Agnes Ballum, Release of, from Gaol (remarks) 9335 (v).
Labour Rep. (presented) 841 (i).
Library of Parlt., Com. (M.) 312 (i).
Literary Aid Fund, Establishment of, by Govt. (Ans.) 1287 (i).
Lovell, Mr. H., Decease of (remarks) 230 (i).
Lumber Duty, &c. (remarks) 10259 (v).
Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Inland Rev. Dept. at Toronto and Sub-Postal Stations (Ques.) 5798 (iii).
Mackenzie, Mr. Wm., Par. in 'Toronto Globe' *re* (remarks) 6986 (iv).
Major's Hill Park and G.T.R. Hotel (remarks) 1425 (i).
See 'G.T.R.,' &c.
Manitoba Boundaries (prop. res.) 12776 (vii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Consent of Legislature, &c. (remarks) 936 (i).
——— Bill *re* Extension (remarks) 1741 (i).
——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 2882 (ii), 7506 (iv), 11706 (vi).
Marier, J. E., Emplymt. on G.T.P. Commission (Ans.) 2162 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, &c., ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4006 (ii).
——— Dep. Minister, Resignation of (remarks) 7996 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Appointment of Ass't. Judge (remarks) 11312 (vi).
——— Delay in Investigation, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. House, 8453 (v).
——— Delay *re*, on M. for Sup., 9731 (v).
——— Evidence transmitted day by day to House (remarks) 8293 (v).
——— Evidence, Distribution of (remarks) 10789 (vi).
——— Issue of Judge Cassels' Commission (remarks) 6466 (iv).
——— Postponement of by Judge Cassels (remarks) 8385 (v).
Marine Deptl. Officials, Suspension, &c. (remarks) 6003 (iii).
Members appointed to Offices, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 46 (i).
Midland Harbour Dredging, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3240 (ii).
Midland 'Times,' Truro, Amounts paid for Advertising (Ans.) 3235 (ii).
Montreal Directory in Library of House, (Ans.) 4764 (iii).
Montreal Examining Warehouse, on Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).
Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditures *re* for the last fifty years (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3441, (amt.) 3442, Agreed to (Y. 108; N. 53) 3464 (ii).
——— Claim of Govt. *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3465 (ii).
Morning Sittings (M.) 9477; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 9495 (v).
Naturalization Act Amt. (B. 130) 1°*, 5256 (iii); in Com., 11990 (vi).
Naval Defences, Imperial, Contributions by Canada (Ans.) 1118 (i).
N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connections *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9415 (v).
N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3049, 3075 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3675 (ii).
Newspaper Advertising, Amounts paid, &c (remarks) 509 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, pro forma, 3 (i).
Obstruction Tactics *re* Dom. Elections Bill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).
Obstruction to Supply, on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10035 (v).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*
Office Specialty Co., and Eclipse Mfg. Co., Payments to (Ans.) 4244 (iii).
Old Age Pensions (M.) for Sel. Com., 2786 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2423 (ii).
Ontario, Northern Division of Prov. (remarks) 8294 (v).
Order Paper, French and English Editions (remarks) 6852 (iv).
——— Printing in French (remarks) 5407 (iii).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals released since 1896, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2853 (ii).
Peace Interparliamentary Union, Meeting at Ottawa (remarks) 13581 (vii).
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3971 (ii).
Petroleum Bounty Bill (prop. res.) 12162 (vii).
Pinette Harbour Dredging, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 9474 (v).
Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy, &c. (Ans.) 352 (i).
Postmasters, Rural, Salary Increases, &c. (Ans.) 183 (i).
Post Office, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 93 (i).
Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2788 (ii).
P.E.I., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2742 (ii).
——— Mail Service, on M. (Mr. Martin) for Cor., &c., 1206 (i).
P.E.I. and Nova Scotia SS. Service, Re-Establishing of (Ans.) 8383 (v).
P.E.I., Queen's County, Complaints *re* Mail Service (Ans.) 355 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4650 (iii).
Printing and Lithographing outside of Canada, Amounts expended (Ans.) 1732, 1931 (i).
Printing, Supt. of, Apptmt. of a Frenchman (Ans.) 2978 (ii), 12411 (vii).
Printing of Parlt., Joint Com. (M.) 312 (i).
Private Bills Com., Extension of Time (M.) 891 (i).
Private Bills Fees, Discrepancy between Senate and House of Commons (remarks) 10123 (v).
Provincial Subsidies, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 61 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3075 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*
Public Accounts Com., Production of Original Documents (remarks) 1384 (i).
Public Accounts Rep. and Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (M.) to ref. to Public Accounts Committee, 311 (i).
Public Bills and Orders, Priority of Procedure (remarks) 2940 (ii).
Public Documents, Announcement *re* (remarks) 1426 (i).
——— Production in Committees, 1428 (i). *See* 'Documents.'
Quebec Bridge, Change of Plans *re* Height (Ans.) 5203 (iii).
——— Change of Site, &c. (remarks) 7931
Quebec Bridge Co., Govt. Grants, Investigation *re*, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 2557 (ii).
——— Ref. to, in debate on Address, 544 (i).
Quebec Bridge Rep., Ques. of Order, 13403 (vii).
——— (remarks) 3901 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy, Apptmt. of Committee, 8440 (v).
Quebec Judges, Apptmt. of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 12190 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Army and Navy Veterans (remarks) 7448 (iv).
——— Legal Holidays (Ans.) 7934 (iv).
——— Transportation of Volunteers remarks) 8378 (v).
Quebec Tercentenary, and Visit of Prince of Wales, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5210 (iii).
Quebec Tercentenary: *See* 'Battlefields.'
Questions, Precedence of (Ans.) 350 (i).
Railway Act (water mains, &c.) Amt. B. 43 (Mr. Barr) on M. for 2°, 5225 (iii).
——— B. 85 (Mr. A. Lavergne) on M. for 2°, 5243 (iii).
——— (passenger tickets) Amt. B. 90 (Mr. J. D. Reid) on M. for 2°, 5245 (iii).
——— (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10644; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. for 3°, 11605 (vi).
——— (working hours) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. R. Smith)—(remarks) 10121 (v).
Ry. Subsidies (remarks) 12504 (vii).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12772 (vii).
Returns, Inquiry for 569, 1739 (i), 2024 (ii), 6010 (iii). *See* 'Sessional.'
Rolla L. Crain, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 3239 (ii).
Ross Rifle, Report from Public Accounts (remarks) 5914 (iii).
——— Target Practice, Suspension by N. W. M. Police (Ans.) 3818 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to amend, 2986 (ii).

Russian Seizures of Canadian Vessels, Compensation *re* (Ans.) 2391 (ii).

St. Boniface Public Building, Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 4246 (iii).

Ste. Hyacinthe, 84th Regiment, Amount of Pay unpaid, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., 3012

St. Louis, H., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to (Ans.) 2977 (ii).

Saturday Sittings (M.) 11501 (vi).

School Statutes *re* Saskatchewan Prov., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6866 (iv).

Seed Grain Distribution, Extension *re* (remarks) 5408 (iii).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1567 (i).

Sessional Returns, Number presented, &c. (Ans.) 2592 (ii).

Shipping Cos., Pacific Coast, Amount of Subsidies (Ans.) 6920 (iv).

Souris Ry. Wharf, P.E.I., Contract for (Ans.) 2386 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, in Com. on Res., 3757 (ii).

S. A. School Teachers, Recognition by Govt. (Ans.) 2791 (ii).

South Huron Elections Expenses, Payment by Ret. Officer (Ans.) 11935 (vi).

Speech from Throne, Reply from Gov. Gen. (presented) 1584 (i).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8846 (v).

Stanstead By-election Papers, Destruction of (remarks) 8087 (iv).

—— Ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections (M.) 8887 (v).

Sub-Target Machines, on submitting Papers to Pub. Accts. Com. (remarks) 946 (i).

Suburban Mail Delivery, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3286 (ii).

Superannuation and Retirement Acts, Payments under (Ans.) 7989 (iv).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5816 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10594 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Privy Council (salaries, &c.) 611 (i).

N. W. M. Police (compensations) 8870; (pay of force) 8863; (pensions) 8870; (salaries, &c.) 8863 (v).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10364 (vi).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Telegraph and Telephone Bill, and Man. Boundaries (remarks) 3043 (ii).

Thanksgiving Day, Change from Thursday to Monday (remarks) 13085 (vii).

Timber Berths, Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Lake) for Ret. (amt.) 2856 (ii).

—— Returns, on Inquiry for, 1739 (i).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 921; Ques. of Order, 921 (i).

Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 5199 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers to Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3993 (ii).

Treaty Negotiations between Canada and U. S., &c. (remarks) 937 (i).

See 'Anglo-American.'

Trent Canal Extension, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 2992 (ii).

Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c. (Ans.) 3480 (ii).

Turgeon, Hon. A., Apptmt. to Senate (Ans.) 7936 (iv).

U. S. Training Ships passing through St. Lawrence Canals, Number, &c. (Ans.) 5789 (iii).

—— (remarks) 5338 (iii).

—— Inquiry as to Armaments, &c. (Ans.) 7502 (iv).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4582 (iii).

Wednesday Evening Sittings (M.) 9480 (v), 11232 (vi).

Winnipeg Bank Co.'s incorp. B. 19 (Mr. Henderson) in Com., 2788 (ii).

Wood and Pulp Industry, Preservation of (remarks) 7452 (iv).

Woollen Industry Relief, Legislation (remarks) 12772 (vii).

—— Memorandum from Mfg. Ass'n. read 13518-19 (vii).

—— Specific Duties (remarks) 6988 (iv).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9648 (v).

—— Finance Ret., on Inqiury for, 6464

—— Moral Reform, Letter of Rev. Dr. Shearer, on Inquiry for (Mr. Sproule) 10689 (vii).

—— (remarks) 10303 (vi).

Yukon Sunday Observance Law, Instructions to N. W. M. P. (remarks) 565 (i).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A., *Montmagny.*

Address, The, 476 (i).

Battlefields of Quebec B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 3902 (ii); in Com., 4410, 4499; on M. for 3° (amt.) 4533 (iii).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Belgian Syndicate, Commission *re* Investigation (Ques.) 842 (i).

Bellechasse Islet Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).

Cimon, Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

——— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence (Ques.) 2545 (ii).

——— Payments *re* Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

——— Residence in District, &c. (Ques.) 2218 (ii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5900 (iii).

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. B. 161 (Mr. Beauparlant) on M. for 1°, 7319 (iv).

Customs Dues on French Books, Reduction *re* French Treaty (Ques.) 2160 (ii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3487 (ii).

——— Delays in Printing (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

——— French Supt. of Printing, &c. (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1827 (i).

French Language, Par. in 'La Presse,' Ques. of Priv., 8291 (v).

——— Pet. *re* (read) 8886 (v).

——— Ques. of Privilege *re* Par. in 'Le Soleil,' 1209 (i).

——— Use of on Railway Crossings, &c. (B. 85) 1° m., 2021 (ii).

Halifax Garrison, Replace by Imp. Troops (Ques.) 1288 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3716 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6718 (iv).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1303 (i).

Immigration Premiums, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1287 (i).

I.C.R., Notices printed in French, &c. (Ques.) 7936 (iv).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2137 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1603 (i).

Japanese Syndicate *re* Purchasing of Land in Alberta (Ques.) 2162 (ii).

Judges of Supreme Court, Quebec, Apptmnt. on Commissions (Ques.) 357 (i).

Justice, Administration of, in Quebec, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 842 (i).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R. M. C., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Interruption of Services, &c. (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

Marier, J. E., Emplymt. on G. T. P. Commission (Ques.) 2162 (ii).

Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1288 (i).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4070 (ii).

Order Paper, Printing in French (remarks) 5407 (iii).

Postage Stamps, Designs for Quebec Tercentenary, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 7934 (iv).

——— New Series, Issue of (Ques.) 6397 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3095 (ii).

Quebec Superior Court, Apptmt. of Additional Judge (Ques.) 1288 (i).

Quebec Tercentenary, Legal Holidays (Ques.) 7934 (iv).

——— Par. in 'Le Canada,' Ques. of Priv., 4669 (iii).

——— Postage Stamps, Printing in French and English (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

——— Postage Stamps (remarks) 8895 (v).

——— Rep. of Commission (remarks) 7449 (iv).

——— Visit of Prince of Wales, Par. in Halifax 'Chronicle,' Ques. of Priv., 5209 (iii).

Ques. of Privilege, Par. in 'La Presse' *re* Vote on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 2022 (ii).

——— Voting of French Members (remarks) 7993 (iv).

Railway Act (dual language) Amt. (B. 85) 1° m., 2021 (ii); 2° m., 5242 (iii).

——— (scheduled time) Amt. (B. 106) 1° m., 3655 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3914 (ii).

Revised Statutes, French Version, Date of Completion (Ques.) 357 (i).

R.M.C., Investigation *re* Conduct of Cadet Lancaster, on M. for Sup., 1026 (i).

Salvation Army Immigrants, Letter from Dr. Nadeau, Ques. of Priv., 7094 (iv).

School Acts, Saskatchewan, Disallowance of (Ques.) 6644 (iv).

——— Notice of Discussion, 6647 (iv).

——— (M.) to adjn., 6854 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3758 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4131 (ii).

Tercentenary at Quebec, Apptmt. of French Canadians as Commissioners, Ques. of Priv., 4770 (iii).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Turgeon, Hon. A., Apptmt. to Senate (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

LAVERGNE, Mr. L., *Drummond & Arthabaska.*

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10494 (vi).

'La Gazette d'Arthabaska,' Postal Privileges *re* (Ques.) 6058 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, Construction of, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3269 (i).

SUPPLY—

Railways—I.C.R. (St. Cyrille diversion) 12756 (vii).

LAW, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*

Presbyterian College Board (B. 154) 1*, 6525 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4758 (iii); (tidal service) 3215; (wrecks) 3189 (ii).

LEFURGEY, Mr. A. A., *Prince (P.E.I.)*

Adjournment of the House (M.) 4495 (iii).

Alberton Fire, Damage Claims, Inquiry for Ret., 1209 (i).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13053, 13055 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187, on M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Order Paper, 13494 (vii).

Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing, &c. (Ques.) 681 (i).

Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders re Construction, &c. (Ques.) 513 (i).

Charlottetown, Pipe Line to Tank, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 5655 (iii).

Clifton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract (Ques.) 4831 (iii).

Dom. Revenue from 1873 to 1907 (Ques.) 1733 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13276 (vii).

Estimates, Discussion on Resolutions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1726 (i).

Fisheries Jurisdiction between Dom. and Provs., Instructions to Agent (Ques.) 3429 (ii).

——— Conference *re* (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

Fish Island Lighthouse, Name of Present Keeper (Ques.) 6058 (iii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6261 (iv).

Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 8382 (v).

LEFURGEY, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Higgin's Shore, P.E.I., Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension (Ques.) 694 (i).

Hillsborough Bridge Construction, Land Purchases, &c., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1686 (i).

——— Return, Inquiry for, 6160 (iii).

Howard's Cape Wharf, Pet. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 11702 (vi).

Ice-breaker for Northumberland Straits (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2944 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 10254 (v).

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2444 (ii).

——— Motor Cars, Tests *re* Operation, &c. (Ques.) 565 (i).

Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 8444 (v).

Lobster Fisheries, P.E.I., Pet. *re* Issue of Licenses (Ques.) 2388 (ii).

Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts (Ques.) 10256 (v).

Mail Service between Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9502 (v).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2430 (ii).

Postal Arrangements between U. S. and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3892 (ii).

P.E.I. Fisheries Protection Service, Annual Cost, &c. (Ques.) 359 (i).

P.E.I. Life-saving Stations, Establishment of (Ques.) 681 (i).

P.E.I. and Nova Scotia SS. Service, Re-establishment of (Ques.) 8383 (v).

P.E.I. Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1686 (i).

——— (M. for ret.) 2171 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 8696, 9893 (v).

——— (remarks) 11679 (vi).

P.E.I. Ry., Alma Station, Pet *re* Construction (Ques.) 6642 (iv).

——— Branch Lines, Cor., &c., *re* Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3254 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13490 (vii).

P.E.I. Ry., Dundas and Avondale Extension, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 8383 (v).

——— Station Agents, Salaries, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

——— Tenders *re* News Agency (Ques.) 8444 (v).

P.E.I. Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4606 (iii).

——— Rep. *re*, Inquiry for, 9893 (v).

LEFURGEY, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Contract *re* Construction of Steamer (Ques.) 2546 (ii).
—— Discussion, &c, 4496 (iii).
—— Ice-breaker Str., Rep. *re* Plans, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).
See 'Ice-breaker.'
P.E.I. Winter Service, Str. 'Stanley,' Route, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).
—— Withdrawal of Steamer, &c. (remarks) 1208 (i).
Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Contemplated Changes (Ques.) 1940 (i).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3920 (ii); in Com., 4975 (iii).
Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9821 (v).
Returns, Detention of by Members, Ques. of Priv., 5048 (iii).
Seed Grain Purchases, Apptmt. of Agent in P.E.I. (remarks) 3690, 3752 (ii).
S. A. Volunteers Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3777 (ii); in Com., 13047 (vii).
'Stanley,' Str., Passenger Accommodation (Ques.) 687 (i).
Summerside Harbour and Str. 'Stanley' (remarks) 6160 (iii)
SUPPLY—
Marine (ice-breakers) 1899 (i).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2944, 2949 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, P. O.) 8576 (v); Ottawa (Mint) 1459 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Buctouche) 11679 (vi).
Tignish Breakwater Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 3229 (ii).
Tignish Harbour, Pet. *re* Extension (Ques.) 682 (i).
—— Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Tobacco Infractions of Inland Revenue Act. in P.E.I., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 9526 (v).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R. (Postmaster General and Min. of Labour) Gaspe.

Alien Labour Regulations, Pet. *re* from Sault Ste Marie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12159 (vii).
Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid to (Ans.) 12653 (vii).
Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Charges *re* Customs, Montreal (Ans.) 1347 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 134) 2° m., 5763 (iii).
Australian Representative from Canada in 1901, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2168 (ii).
Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 1291 (i).
Bonn P. O., Application *re* Mail Service (Ans.) 10516 (vi).
Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagornis, Charges *re* Political Activity (Ans.) 6642 (iv).
Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 6404 (iv).
Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Connections (remarks) 1436 (i).
Canadian Newspapers, Refund *re* American Surtax (Ans.) 5203 (iii).
C.P.R., Papineauville Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).
Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12489 (vii).
Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster (Ans.) 5654 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11403, 11636 (vi), 12179 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) *re* Distribution to Press, 5723 (iii).
Conciliation Boards, Applications *re* Industrial Disputes Investigations, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
Co-Operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) 2° m., 4547; in Com., 4564; 3°*, 4566 (iii).
Cotton Strikers, Disputes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Criminal Code (ry. mortgages) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13317 (vii).
Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8897 (v).
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Denis des Saintes, Charges *re* (Ans.) 9474 (v).
Desaulniers, Mr. Gonzalve, Emplymt. as Translator, &c. (Ans.) 1121 (i).
Digby to Westport, Mail Contractor, Name, &c. (Ans.) 7203 (iv).
Dom. Coal Co.'s Labour Dispute, Settlement Tel. (read) 4995 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11914 (vi), 13043 (vii).
Drop Letter One-cent Rate (remarks) 3159 (ii).
Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton Mail Contract, Renewal of (Ans.) 5257 (iii).
Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails (Ans.) 7731 (iv).
French Translation of Govt. Documents, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3183 (ii).
Glencoe Post Office Building, Contract *re* (Ans.) 3846 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Govt. Steamers, Number purchased, &c. (Ans.) 10733 (vi).
Harlaka Ry. Connections (remarks) 1437 (i).
Hindoo Immigrants, and Contract Labour (remarks) 4407 (iii).
House of Commons Post Office, Delays in Mails (remarks) 11939; (stmnt.) 12044 (vi).
Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906-8 (Ans.) 11704 (vi).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6444 (iv).
Immigration Agents in France (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9848 (v).
Japanese in B.C., Ques. of Priv. and Political Pamphlets, 12659 (vii).
Japanese Colony in the West, C.P.R. Application *re* (Ans.) 7197 (iv).
Japanese Immigration, Rep. of Mr. King laid on Table, 1550 (i).
——— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2144 (ii).
——— Result of Mission (statement) 1585 (i).
Johnston, Mr. W. J., Extra Remuneration, Leave of Absence, &c. (Ans.) 5201 (iii).
Labour Gazette, Cost of Printing, &c. (Ans.) 6407 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Japanese Investigation) Rep. (presented) 1583 (i).
'Lady Evelyn,' Date and Place of Wintering, &c. (Ans.) 7937 (iv).
Langevin Block Easement, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 3483 (ii).
'La Gazette d'Arthabaska,' Postal Privileges to (Ans.) 6058 (iii).
Letter Carriers, Hours of Service, Pay, &c. (Ans.) 7728 (iv).
Literature distributed through Mail (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9096 (v).
Londonderry and Bass River Mail Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 2980 (ii).
Mackinnon Post Office, Application *re* Establishment (Ans.) 10517 (vi).
Mail from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived, &c. (Ans.) 12653 (vii).
Mail Contract between Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I. (Ans.) 4828 (iii).
Mail Contract at Rimouski, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda' (Ans.) 5799 (iii), 8176 (iv).
Mail Matter, Fraudulent Weighing of, Inspection *re* (Ans.) 4827 (iii).
Mail Matter delayed by C.P.R. Accident (remarks) 9724 (v).
——— (remarks) 9281 (v).
Mail Matter mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 2215 (ii).
Mail Service to Atlantic Steamers, Cost per Annum (Ans.) 5656 (iii).
Mail Service in B.C. (remarks) 3754 (ii).
LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Mail Steamer, Purchase of (Ans.) 4827 (iii).
Mail Service, Soulanges county, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 9278 (v).
Mail Service by Steamers, via Cotcau Landing (Ans.) 9277 (v).
Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Rhoda,' &c. (Ans.) 5799 (iii), 8176 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12830 (vii).
Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence (Ans.) 7200 (iv).
Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 9275 (v).
Montreal P. O. Building Strike, Settlement of (remarks) 8608 (v).
Montreal Post Office Defalcations, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 7198 (iv).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3446 (ii).
N. B. Election, Patronage of Federal Govt., &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3046 (ii).
Newspaper Mail Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery, &c. (Ans.) 11298 (vi).
——— Postal Arrangements *re* (Ans.) 6460 (iv).
Nicolet Post Office, Completion, Postmaster's Name, &c. (Ans.) 11499 (vi).
North Grove Post Office Ret., on Inquiry for, 5491 (iii).
Old Age Pensions Com., Progress *re* (remarks) 7722 (iv), 12660 (vii).
Opium Prohibition (B. 205) prop. Res., 12503; in Com. on Res., 12550; 2° m., 12851; on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 11498 (vi).
Owen Sound Strike, Settlement of (remarks) 8606 (v).
Pakenham Mail Bags, Throwing off of Train (remarks) 1425 (i).
Port au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3232 (ii).
Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 11300 (vi).
Postage Stamps, New Series issued *re* Quebec Tercentenary (Ans.) 6398 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* (Ans.) 7934 (iv).
——— Special Issue (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).
Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., Re-arrangements of (remarks) 3040 (ii).
——— (statement) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3159 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3886 (ii).
Postal Notes Business, Commissions, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 9279 (v).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation (Ans.) 8175 (iv).

Postal Rates on Weekly Newspapers, Tel. *re* (Ans.) 3484 (ii).

——— Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5201 (iii).

Postal Revenue, One Cent Rate (Ans.) 8381 (v).

Postal Service, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7263 (iv).

Postal Service Improvements (Ans.) 8891 (v).

——— Ret., on Inquiry for, 4832 (iii).

Postmasters' Assessments, Amounts collected, &c. (Ans.) 6459 (iv).

Post Office Act (P. O. supt., &c.) Amt. (B. 162) 1° m., 7931 (iv); 2°*, and in Com., 10703 (vi); on Senate Amts., 12393 (vii).

Post Offices built since 1904, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4761 (iii).

Post Office Irregularities in Western Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).

Post Office Returns, Number, &c. (Ans.) 6405 (iv).

Post Offices, Ret., on Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry. Mail Service, Delay in Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9094 (v).

Printing, Postal Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 5472 (iii).

Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).

Quebec Religious Feuds, Letter of Rev. Mr. Dumesnil to Papal Ablegate, signed 'P. M. G., Ques. of Priv., 11501 (vi).

Quebec Tercentenary, Postage Stamps, &c. (Ans.) 7935 (iv), 8895 (v), 12414 (vii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 5491 (iii).

Ricard, Mr., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 11498 (vi).

Riviere du Loup Postmaster, Resignation and Salary (Ans.) 6399 (iv).

Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 11297 (vi).

Ryan, Mr. G. M., Apptmt. of a Successor (Ans.) 7504 (iv).

St. Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. *re* Postmaster, Pet., &c. (Ans.) 5797 (iii).

St. Gabriel de Brandon Post Office Savings Bank, Recommendation *re* (Ans.) 4828 (iii).

St. Irenee des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster (Ans.) 5795 (iii).

St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c. (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

St. Peter's Bay Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1687 (i).

St. Peters Post Office, on Inquiry for Ret., 2787 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of Six Offices (Ans.) 5472 (iii).

Sandy Cove Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 8891 (v).

Scotch Hill East, Post Office, Establishment of (Ans.) 2793 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7747 (iv).

Shortt, Prof., Amounts paid *re* Industrial Disputes, &c. (Ans.) 4766 (iii).

Southvale, N.S., Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal (Ans.) 4829 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10599 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (salaries) 12159 (vii); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8872; (salaries) 8872 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9848 (v).

Labour Dept. ('Gazette') 12261 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (cotton strikers) 13156 (vii); (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii); (Oriental immigration) 13156 (vii); (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5783 (iii).

Post Office (contingencies) 5562; (Durston, R., promotion) 5561 (iii); (extra assistance) 9112; (inspectors) 9092 (v), 13155 (vii); (mail service) 5561 (iii); (North Bay inspectors) 13152 (vii); (outside service) 9092; (stamps, &c.) 9111; (uniforms, &c.) 9111 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7459; (Hamilton, post office) 7697 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Levis) 7298; (Montreal, barracks) 7408; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 7427 (iv); (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5705 (iii); Montreal post office) 7411; (Montreal, station C) 7420; (Montreal station B) 7419; (Quebec drill hall) 7431; (St. Rochs) 7439 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12129 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10371 (vi).

Tenders, Advertisements *re*, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7477 (iv).

Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 2594 (ii).

Town Site, Erection of Public Buildings (Ans.) 1348 (i).

Trent Canal, Clearing of Logs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10310 (vi).

Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route (Ans.) 11297 (vi).

Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster L. C. Smith and Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2887 (ii).

——— Salary, &c. (Ans.) 2794 (ii).

Yukon Mail Service, Complaints *re*, 2022 (ii).

——— Service during Winter (remarks) 5137 (iii).

LENNOX, Mr. H., *Simcoe, S.*

Advertisements for Tenders of Govt. Works, &c., on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4708 (iii).

Alberta Closed Leases, Number granted, &c. (Ques.) 3037 (ii).

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5379 (iii).

Battlefields of Canada (B. 111) in Com. on Res., 3901 (ii); in Com., 4507; on M. for 3°, 4530 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G. T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2818

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7671 (iv).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6522 (iv).

Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission (Ques.) 5474 (iii).

Campaign Literature sent from Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10346 (vi).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6164, 6215 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12874 (vii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Pardee) on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12848 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6875 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12882 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11361; on M. for 1°, 10729; in Com., 11394, 11553, 11659 (vi), 12183 (vii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9203 (v).

Criminal Code (ry. act.) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13318 (vii).

Devil's Elbow, Canal Work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals,, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1155 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1776 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11869 (vi), 13020 (vii).

Dominion Guarantee Co.'s B. 127 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 6231 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 9333 (v).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6750 (iv).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4678 (iii); in Com., 6912 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13263 (vii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4545, 4577 (iii).

Foreign Purchases, Customs Collection *re* (Ques.) 5475 (iii).

Fort William Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6180 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3615 (ii).

Fritz Cirkel, Mining Engineer, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7202 (iv).

Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario Relief B. 129 (Mr. Galliher) on M. for 2°, 6190 (iii); in Com., 7141 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3622, 3794 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5497 (iii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6270 (iv).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 7141, 7667, 8125 (iv), 8609, 8741, 9377 (v).

G.T.P., Classification of District 'B' and 'F,' Inspections *re* (Ques.) 12051 (vii).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12675 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12271; (amt.) Minority Rep., 12291. (Neg. (Y. 53; N. 98) 12388 (vii).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2233 (ii); in Com., 12062 (vii).

Grazing and Irrigation Lands, Reserved by Govt. (Ques.) 3479 (ii).

Grazing Lands Reservations, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).

Grazing Ranches, Names and Addresses of Lessees in Township 12 to 19 (Ques.) 7210 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3226, (M.) to ref. back to Com. on Rys., &c., 3228, in Com., 3692; on M. for 3°, 4540 (iii).

——— on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to ref. back to Com., 3362 (ii).

High Commissioner's Office, Increase of Salaries (Ques.) 10737 (vi).

Holliday, Mr. P., Payments of additional Living Allowance (Ques.) 5475 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10497 (vi).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6446 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt., O.C. *re* (Ques.) 7500 (iv).

——— Inquiry for, 8607, 8696, 9890 (v).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Immigration, O.C. *re* B.C. (remarks) 8171 (iv), 11018 (vi).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7029 (iv).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6902 (iv).

I.C.R. Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4492 (iii).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction *re* B.C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1752 (i).

Japanese and Oriental Immigration, &c., on (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of O.Cs., &c., 881 (i).

Judges' Salaries, Application *re* Payments (remarks) 11018 (vi).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6519 (iv).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 10526; in Com., 10527 (vi).

Lockerby & McCombe, Amounts *re* Extra Harbour Dues (Ques.) 11935 (vi).

Lyall & Sons, Storage of Refuse on Harbour Property (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

McInnes, Hon. W. B., Employment in the Yukon, Total Amount paid to, &c. (Ques.) 5794 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12801 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Brodeur) to Com. of Sup., 7342 (iv).

Members and Senators appointed to Offices of Emolument, &c. (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

Mining Regulations, published in 'Yukon World and Official Gazette' (M. for copy*) 5801 (iii).

Ministers of Crown and Govt. Contracts and Subsidies (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 9415 (v).

National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13501 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11997 (vi).

N.B. Cold Storage Co and Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9398; (amt.) 9415 (v).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Ref. to Mr. Blair's Letter *re* (Ques.) 2392 (ii).

Obstruction to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9935 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10020 (v).

Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4108 (ii).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. Fisher) *re* Montreal Liquor Licenses, 4065 '(ii).

Pacific Coast Insurance B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6182 (iii), 6230 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7932 (iv).

Presbyterian College Board, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7669 (iv).

Quebec Bridge Rep., on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).

Quebec Harbour Improvements, Specification, &c., Stmnt. of Expenditure, &c. (M. for copies*) 5802 (iii).

Quebec and New Brunswick B. 128 (M.) Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).

Quebec Tercentenary, Rural Corps, Letter from Mr. G. W. Stoddart (read) in Com. of Sup., 10292 (v).

Railway Act (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3412 (ii).

———(demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean on M. for 2°, 3369 (ii).

——— (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3905 (ii); in Com., 4964 (iii).

——— (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 10625; in Com., 10639 (vi).

Ross Rifle Factory, Pet. *re* Establishment on Plains of Abraham (remarks) 3903 (ii).

——— Extension of Cove Field Lands, &c. (Ques.) 4404 (iii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7677 (iv).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4546, 4580 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2910 (ii).

Seed Grain Distribution, O.C. *re* Advances (remarks) 6634 (iv).

——— O.C. amending Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 6981 (iv).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5409, 5519; (amt.) 5445 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3767 (ii).

Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2785 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals (repairs) 10306 (vi); Trent (construction) 12225 (vii); (surveys) 10339 (vi).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9257 (v).

Excise—(travelling expenses, &c.) 814 (i).

House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10504 (vi).

Immigration (agents) 9854 (v).

Justice (salaries) 5505 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (pensions) 13324 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol, 3996 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 10292 (v).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (inspectors) 13154 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 13339 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph) 13331; (Markham) 13331; (Walkerville) 13333 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal Barracks) 7409 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Richelieu) 12039 (vi).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (Deep Waterways Commission) 11103 (vi).
Railways (extra clerks) 10346; G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10380; (inspection) 10390 (vi).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12766 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (salaries) 10129 (v).
Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation) 10357 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.,) 10388 (vi); (Quebec Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1413, 1414 and 1415, Applications, Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 2398 (ii).

——— Inquiry for, 4833 (iii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers to Col. Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3996 (ii).

Trent Canal, Bradford, Building of (remarks) 13476 (vii).

——— Engineer's Rep., Inquiry for, 6925 (iv).

——— Newmarket, Extension to Devil's Elbow (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi).

——— Holland River Extension (remarks) 11939 (vi).

——— Surveys, Inquiry for 6988 (iv).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) on Order for 2°, 779 (i); in Com., 4581 (iii).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 77 (Mr. Sloan) on Senate Amts., 6190 (iii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6187 (iii).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10275 (v).

Winding-Up Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6523 (iv).

Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster L. C. Smith, and Interference in Elections, on M. for Sup., 2889 (ii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10531 (vi).

Yukon, Judges Salaries (remarks) 11123 (vi).

——— Official Administrators, Charges against *re* Settlement of Estates, &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Yukon Placer Claims, Renewals by Gold Commissioner, Fees, &c. (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 4588, 4589 (iii).

——— Public Administrators, Charges against, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2170 (ii).

LEONARD, Mr. J. E. E., *Laval.*

Bridge Subsidies to Rys. (amt.) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies Res., 13310 (vii).

Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster (Ques.) 5653 (iii).

Chambly Common, Area, Rental &c. (Ques.) 5652 (iii).

Lobster Fishery Overseers in Lunenburg, &c., Names, &c. (Ques.) 2793 (ii).

Montreal Directory in Library of House (Ques.) 4764 (iii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3442 (ii).

Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 5654 (iii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Holidays for Officers (Ques.) 2791 (ii).

——— Officials interfering in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5538 (iii).

——— Votes of Officers in Municipal Affairs (Ques.) 2791 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4029 (ii).
Penitentiaries— (binder twine) 5522, 5530; St. Vincent de Paul (meat contracts) 5519; (officials) 5538 (iii).
Public Works — Buildings—Que. (Longueuil) 7305 (iv).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N., *Huron, W.*

Address, The, 242 (i).

Civil Service Commission Report, Distribution to Press (remarks) 5723 (iii).

Criminal Code Amendments, Placing on Govt. Orders (remarks) 9281 (v).

Criminal Code (offensive weapons) Amt. (B. 78) 1° m., 1668 (i).

——— (assaults) Amt. (B. 79) 1° m., 1670 (i).

——— (hunting) Amt. (B. 93) 1° m., 2590 (ii).

——— (motors) Amt. (B. 140) 1° m., 5993 (iii).

Immigration Act (concealed weapons) Amt. (B. 65) 1° m., 1284 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12789 (vii).

Pulp Wood, Export Duty on (prop. res.) 4774 (iii).

Railway Commission (Ass't. Chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3923

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1530 (i).

Wood and Pulp Industry, Preservation of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7449 (iv).

LOGAN, Mr. H. J., *Cumberland.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12480 (vii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4386 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3512 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 1992 (i).

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2460 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4460 (iii).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3066 (ii).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2417 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Pugwash wharf) 11280 (vi); Railways—I.C.R. (train service) 10165 (v).

LOGGIE, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*

Budget, The 6553 (iv).

Canada and France Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6169 (iii).

Canada Eastern Ry., Cattle killed, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).

Cigarettes, Sale and Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5253 (iii).

France and Canada SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6195 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7230 (iv).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4863 (iii).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6522 (iv).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12648; in Com., 13056 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5895 (iii).

Conciliation Boards, Application *re* Industrial Disputes Investigations Act, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1160 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13012 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3626 (ii).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6256 (iv).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 9467 (v).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12723 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12340 (vii).

——— counsel fees, payment of (M.) 13578 (vii).

I.C.R., Employees and Municipal Elections, on M. (Mr. Sproule) to Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4479 (iii).

MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11222 (vi).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12827 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel, for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7381 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9489 (v).

Phoenix Assurance Co.'s (B. 167) 1°*, 8603 (v).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2745 (ii).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4647 (iii).

Railway Act (liability) Amt. (B. 27) 1° m., 430 (i); on Order for 2°, 5211; in Com., 5246 (iii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7745 (iv).

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3783 (ii); in Com., 12602 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4138 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (icebreakers) 2966 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston military buildings) 10909 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Caribou Island) 11225; (Round Hill) 11286 (vi).

Railways—I. C. R. (Campbellton) 12258; (double tracking) 12250; (Moncton, additional line) 12760; (Moncton, car shops) 12250 (vii); (rolling stock) 5558 (iii).

Railways—Railway Commission (Quebec Bridge) 12770 (vii).

Sutherland Rifle Sight Co., Patent Relief (B. 63) 1°*, 1283 (i).

MACDONALD, E. M.—*Con.*
Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2712 (ii).
Timber Sales to Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8778 (v).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C., *Toronto, S.*
Canada-Australian SS. Subvention, Continuance of (Ques.) 941 (i).
Canadian Naval Stations, Maintenance of, Arrangement with G. B. (Ques.) 1117 (i).
Canadians entering U.S., Deportation of Macedonians, &c. (remarks) 2738 (ii).
——— Letter form Messrs. Allen, Cassels & Defries (read) 2739 (ii).
Copyright Act Amt. (B. 28) 1° m., 508; 2° m., 939 (i).
Cosgrave, Mr. J. J., Total Cost of Investigation (Ques.) 5797 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. (B. 29) 1° m., 508 (i); 2° m., 5247 (iii).
Dom. Notes Outstanding, Total Amount 1907, &c. (Ques.) 691 (i).
Dredging Contract, Basis of Payments, &c. (Ques.) 9710 (v).
Drop Letter, One-cent Rate (remarks) 3158 (ii).
Electrical Power exported at Niagara Falls, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).
Fisheries Protection, Amounts expended since 1885, &c. (Ques.) 1118 (i).
Foss, C. O., Apptmt. on G.T.P. Engineering Staff, &c. (Ques.) 358 (i).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3500 (ii).
Garrison Commons, Toronto, Date of Sale, &c. (Ques.) 353 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Number purchased, &c. (Ques.) 10731 (vi).
G.T.P., Apptmt. of Engineer at Kenora (Ques.) 895 (i).
——— Changes in Engineering Staff (Ques.) 509, 681 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).
——— Resignation of Major Hodgins, Appointment of Successor (Ques.) 358 (i).
G.T. Ry., Entrance into Toronto, O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 556 (i).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3194, 3700 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4358 (iii).
Hydrographic Surveys, Amounts expended, &c. (Ques.) 1128 (i).
Immigrants, Bulgarians, Stranded in Toronto, Tel. (read) &c. 185 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Questions, 242 (i).
Immigration Act, B.C., known as Natal Act, Disallowance of (Ques.) 567 (i).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Insurance Bill, Introduction of (Ques.) 9272 (v).
Insurance Commission, Exhibits of Commercial Travellers' Mutual Benefit Society, Originals, asked for, 7988 (iv).
Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c. (Ques.) 241 (i).
Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7 (Ques.) 897 (i).
Letter Carriers, Hours of Service, Pay, &c. (Ques.) 7728 (iv).
Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Toronto Inland Revenue Dept. (Ques.) 5797 (iii).
Militia—Board of Officers, Rep. *re* Pay and Allowance, &c. (Ques.) 2165 (ii).
Militia Permanent Corps, Commission *re* Pay, &c. (Ques.) 1292 (i).
Naval Defence, Imperial, Contributions by Canada, &c. (Ques.) 1118 (i).
Naval Instructions, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c. (Ques.) 1119 (i).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4996 (iii).
Postal Arrangements between Canada and the U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3166 (ii).
Printing and Lithographing, Expenditure by Govt. outside of Canada (Ques.) 1506, 1732, 1931 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 2397 (ii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8851 (v).
Railway Commission (Ass't Chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3928 (ii); in Com., 4985 (iii).
Railway Commission, Total Expenditure in Counsel Fees, &c. (Ques.) 10256 (v).
Returns, Inquiry for, 569 (i), 2885 (ii).
Smith, Wm. R., Patent Relief (B. 198) 1°*, 12393 (vii).
S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3820 (ii).
Standard Accident and Guarantee Co.'s incorp. (B. 132) 1°*, 5337 (iii).
Standard Plate Glass Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 41) 1°*, 754 (i); in Com., 6183 (iii).
Sugar Manufacture, Regulation *re* Saccharine Standards (Ques.) 351 (i).
SUPPLY—
Militia (annual drill) 5745 (iii).
Temperance Colonization Society, Land Grants to, Term of Settlement, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4774 (iii).
Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans by Militia Dept. (Ques.) 7203 (iv).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Toronto Harbour Life Saving Station, Establishment of (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

Toronto Harbour, Murray & Cleveland's Contract *re*, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

Toronto Harbour (eastern gap) Amount of Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 354 (i).

——— Date of Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Total Cost, Changes, &c. (Ques.) 1507 (i).

Toronto Harbour (western gap) Construction of Entrance, &c. (Ques.) 354, 518 (i), 4587 (iii).

——— Delay in Contract (remarks) 5915 (iii).

Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 2594 (ii).

Winding-Up Act Amt. (B. 95) 1° m., 2974 (ii).

Woollen Industry, Number of Employees, Value of Output, &c. (Ques.) 7504 (iv).

Yukon Gold Co., Holdings by Guggenheims, &c. (Ques.) 7725 (iv).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8486 (v).

MACLAREN, Mr. A. F., *Perth, N.*

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11255 (vi).

Goderich Military Camp, Holding of (remarks) 9779 (v).

Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R. (Ques.) 184 (i).

International Tunnel, Windsor, Customs Duty *re* Construction Material, &c. (Ques.) 3840 (ii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11248 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11080 (vi).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K., *Lunenburg.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12870, 13052 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) 5648 (iii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1718 (i).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3021; in Com., 3035 (ii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9363 (v).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3113 (ii).

——— Ques. of Order, 3083 (ii).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge Commission, Rep., Evidence, &c. (M.) to ref. to Special Committee, 10401 (vi).

——— Rep. of Sel. Com. (M.) to conc., 13353; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 13373 (vii).

Rules of the House, Amendments to (prop. Res.) 2984 (ii).

Shipping Act Amt. (B. 12) 1° m., 313 (i).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7754 (iv).

Supplies purchased by Govt., &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5834 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 7136 (iv); Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (dredging) 13341 (vii); (Tancook island) 11230 (vi).

MACLEAN, Mr. M. Y., *Huron S.*

Budget Speech by Fin. Min., Distribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10351 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11871 (vi).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F., *York (O.) S.*

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10935, 10941 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 3902 (ii); in Com., 4504; on M. for 3°, 4532 (iii).

Belleville and Hastings Ry., Cor. with G.T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2808 (ii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Connections (remarks) 433 (i).

Buildings, Administrative, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Business of the House, Precedence on Tuesday (remarks) 2982 (ii).

——— Public Bills, &c. (remarks) *re* Procedure, 2786 (ii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12845; in Com., 12849 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10718, 10729; in Com., 11635 (vi).

Companies Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5493 (iii).

Criminal Code (trade restraint) Amt. B. 96 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 2976 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11126; in Com., 11170 (vi).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1692 (i).

Foresters' Subsidiary High Court B. 62 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 5175 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. *re* (remarks) 12836 (vii).
G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6658 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3726 (ii).
—— on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to ref. to Com., 3362 (ii).
Hindus in B.C., Protest *re* Treatment (remarks) 5490 (iii).
House of Commons Chamber, Ventilation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10979 (vi).
I.C.R., Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4484 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12787 (vii).
Marconi System, Regulation of Rates, &c. (Ques.) 174 (i).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3031 (ii).
Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C.P. Ry., Extension, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7657 (iv).
Public Bills and Orders, Precedence of (remarks) 2939, 3405 (ii).
Ry. Act (demurrage, &c.) Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 93; on Order for 2° (remarks) 938 (i); 2° m., 3320 (ii).
—— (tel. cos.) Amt. (B. 11) 1° m., 231 (i).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3904 (ii).
Ry. Act (ry. comn.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 10783; (amt.) 11602; on M. for 3°, 11613; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11619; on Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) 11633 (vi).
Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2903 (ii).
Seed Grain purchased, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ques.) 8185 (iv).
Standard Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 71) 1°*, 1424 (i).
Suburban Mail Delivery, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3282 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents, &c.) 9851 (v).
Militia (annual drill) 10291 (v).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2965 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents, &c.) 10981 (vi); Ont. (Guelph, armoury) 7678 (iv).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., 907 (i).
Toronto and Schomberg Ry. Blockade (remarks) 3901 (ii).
Toronto Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13417

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Water Carriage of Goods Bill (remarks) 13415 (vii).

MACPHERSON, Mr. R. G., *Vancouver City.*
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12472 (vii).
Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5380 (iii).
Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9741 (v).
British Columbia Chartered Bank incorp. (B. 59) 1°*, 1283 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10745 (vi).
Chinese Immigration, Decision of N. S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax (Ques.) 513 (i).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5132 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11384 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13032 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4578 (iii).
Fort William Terminal Ry. and Bridge Co.'s (B. 101) 1°*, 3477 (ii); in Com., 6180 (iii), 6223 (iv).
G.T.P., Supplies to Prince Rupert via Seattle (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10376 (vi).
Hindus, Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (remarks) 5337 (iii).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6435 (iv).
Indian Dept., Extravagent Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11031, 11062 (vi).
Indian Lands, B.C. Provincial Rights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 627 (i).
Japanese entering B.C., Passports, &c. (Ques.) 4243 (iii).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration into B.C., Restriction of, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 719 (i).
—— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2087 (ii).
—— on Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1605 (i).
Japanese Immigration Restriction and B.C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1760 (i).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3018 (ii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6894, 7231; on M. for 3°, 7219 (iv).
Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 40) 1°*, 754 (i); in Com., 6182 (iii), 6227 (iv).
Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4983 (iii).

MACPHERSON, Mr. R. G.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle, Defects, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 9086 (v).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 627 (i); Interior (astronomical surveys) 9741 (v).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3187 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cumberland) 10865; (Quesnel) 10868; (Vancouver) 10868; (Vernon) 10871 (vi); N.S. (Antigonish) 7121 (iv).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10703 (vi).

Vancouver Bank incorp. (B. 32) 1°*, 606 (i); in Com., 4589 (iii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 125) 1°*, 5255; in Com., 6183 (iii).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9662 (v).

McCARTHY, Mr. L. G., *Simcoe, N.*

Canada Shipping Act (marine engineers) Amt. (B. 17) 2° m., 3414 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11360; in Com., 11382 (vi).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1143 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12986 (vii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10762 (vi).

Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario Relief B. 139 (Mr. Galliher) on M. for 2°, 6190 (iii).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to Messrs. Birnie and Noble (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 987 (i).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12405 (vii).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3017 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3012 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 17) 1° m., 349 (i).

SUPPLY—

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2947, 2949 (ii).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10379 (vi).

Supreme Court Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5497 (iii).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*

Buffalo imported from Montana for Game Preserve, Alberta, Payments *re* (Ques.) 847 (i).

Buffalo Herds for Parks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

Buildings in Man. and N.W., Amounts paid by Govt., &c. (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

Calgary Town Sites (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9775 (v).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546 (vi).

'Coquitlam,' Str., Seizure of, Compensation *re* (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11133; in Com., 11159, 11177, 11426, 11524, 11957; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 11975 (vi).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Game Preserve, Alberta, Buffalo imported from Montana, Payments *re* (Ques.) 847 (i).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6326 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6443 (iv).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 955 (i).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4671 (iii).

Irrigation in West, Investigations *re* Measurements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9989 (v).

Japanese Immigration, &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 881 (i).

Japanese and Oriental Immigrants in B.C., Number, &c. (Ques.) 692 (i).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10527 (vi).

Life-Boats in B. C., Purchase of, from U. S. (Ques.) 683 (i).

McDougall, Rev. John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 688 (i).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4981 (iii).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4666 (iii).

Russian Seizures of Canadian Vessels, Compensation *re* (Ques.) 683 (i), 2391 (ii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1376 (i).

S. A. Veterans, Land Grants to, &c. (Ques.) 563 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12605 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands (forest reserves) 10049; (surveys) 9989 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9967; (Doukhobors) 9956 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12750 (vii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5756 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10979 (vi).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

Timber Berths in Man. and N. W. Ters., under Licenses, Applicants' Names, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 852 (i).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2347 (ii).

Wireless Tel. Station on Pacific Coast, Erection of (Ques.) 683 (i).

McCOLL, Mr. J. B., *Northumberland, W. (O.)*

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

Budget, The, 6073 (iii).

Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 14) 1°*, 350 (i).

Quebec Tercentenary Postage Stamps, Issue of Denominations (Ques.) 12414 (vii).

McCOOL, Mr. C. A., *Nipissing.*

Copper Cliff Postmaster and Elections (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11916 (vi).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, on M. for Sup., 7805 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11914 (vi), 12973 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3626 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Plans, Reports, &c. (M.) for Copies, 1941 (i).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5438 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7811 (iv); Ottawa (Museum) 1503 (i).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E., *Saskatchewan.*

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11988 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11463, 11948 (vi).

Doukhobors, Manner of Living (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6323 (iv).

Keewatin Diocese incorp. (B. 179) 1°*, 9889 (v).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C. P. Ry., Extension of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7658 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 153) 1°*, 6525; in Com., 7675, 7722 (iv), 8560, 8610, 9068, 9166 (v).

Seed Grain for Settlers in N. W., Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2924 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1363 (i).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Immigration (general expenses) 5752 (iii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 652, &c., Applications, &c., &c., (M. for copies*) 4589 (iii).

—— Nos. 645, &c., Original Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).

McINTYRE, Mr. G. H., *Perth, S.*

Address, The, 455 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5130 (iii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5482 (iii).

Hogs slaughtered, Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13094 (vii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6842, 6928 (iv).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1024 (i).

Patent Medicine B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12623 (vii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4970 (iii).

Rules of the House, Amendments to, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2986 (ii).

Senate Reform (prop. res.) 1513 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12607 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1458 (i).

Wheat Transportation in N. W., Financial Aid by Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2211 (ii).

McINTYRE, Mr. W., *Strathcona.*

Address, The, 445 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 81) 1°*, 1732 (i); in Com., 4231 (iii).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 891 (i).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2585 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11171, 11420, 11502 (vi).

Dom. Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage (Ques.) 8182 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4577 (iii).

Hudson Bay Ry., Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6436 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6735, 6956 (iv).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11034 (vi).

Inspection and Sale Act (oats) Amt. (B. 114) 1° m., 4312 (iii).

McINTYRE, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Postal Services, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7262 (iv).

Ruthenian Catholic Mission, &c., incorp. (B.69) 1°*, 1424 (i).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 70) 1°*, 1424 (i); in Com., 4231, 4546, 4579 (iii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1358 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3760 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5528 (iii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2327 (ii).

McKENZIE, Mr. P. H., *Bruce, S.*

Agriculture Com.'s Rep. (M.) to conc., 12409 (vii).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) 191 (i).

Budget, The, 6573 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12883 (vii).

G.T. Ry. and C.P.R., Connection at Wingham (remarks) 191 (i).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Address, The, 420 (i).

'Arctic,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4168 (ii).

Bear River Station Dwelling, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

Brier Island Fog Alarm, Installation of, Contract *re* (Ques.) 9473 (v).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6204 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12648 (vii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12842 (vii).

Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7246 (iv).

Charlottetown Ry. Station, Contract Price *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 517 (i).

——— (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11984 (vi).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Operation at Canso, &c. (Ques.) 5651 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii).

Draper, Mr., and Mr. Pepper, Candidates for Municipal Offices (Ques.) 687 (i).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8503 (v).

Fishing Licenses, River John, Inquiry for Ret., 10511 (vi).

Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor, &c. (Ques.) 3427 (ii).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6252 (iv).

Gunnip, Mr. James, Pet. *re* Claims for Injuries (Ques.) 3844 (ii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10490 (vi).

——— Post Office, Delays in Mails (remarks) 11939 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act, Violations, Inquiry for Ret., 4964 (iii).

I.C. Ry. Rates, Increase in Winter to P. E. I. (Ques.) 5995 (iii).

Legal Agents for Govt. in P. E. I., Names, &c. (Ques.) 4764 (iii).

Lobster Fisheries, Pet. from Fishermen's Union of N. S. *re* Regulations (Ques.) 6644 (iv).

Lobster Fishing in Lunenburg, &c., N.S. Reps. *re* Undersized Fish (Ques.) 2792 (ii).

Lobster Hatchery, License to E. H. McLennan and G. A. Redmond, Pets., Cor. &c. (M. for ret.*) 2983 (ii).

Louisburg, Harbour, N.S., Amount of Harbour Dues, 1906, &c. (Ques.) 7503 (iv).

——— Harbour Master, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 3428 (ii).

——— Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c. (Ques.) 4401 (iii).

McLeod, Alex., Dismissal from Valleyfield, P.E.I., Post Office (M. for cor.*) 5087 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12813 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4002 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7333 (iv).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6892 (iv).

Mess Pork, Quantity imported from U. S., &c. (Ques.) 5650 (iii).

'Montague,' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 182 (i).

Naval Schools, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9221 (v).

Pinette Harbour Dredging, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 9474 (v).

Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 3898 (ii).

Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 10254 (v).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Port Hood Harbour Works, Closing of Northern Entrance (Ques.) 10255 (v).

P.E.I., Lighthouse Supplies, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 358 (i).

——— Souris Breakwater, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1685 (i).

——— Subsidy, Deduction *re* Hillsborough Bridge (Ques.) 5079 (iii).

——— Terms of Union with Dom., Nonfulfilment of, &c., Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 5801 (iii).

——— Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4620 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry., Bear River Station Master's Dwelling, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1737 (i).

——— Branch Lines, Construction re, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3261 (ii).

——— Construction of Freight Sheds, &c., Specifiations, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 5086 (iii).

——— Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 12631 (vii).

——— Mail Service, Delay in Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v).

——— Stanley Bridge Branch, Surveys, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 850 (i).

——— (Ques.) 4829 (iii).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10715 (vi).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3907 (ii).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9806 (v).

Scotch Hill East Post Office, Establishment of, &c. (Ques.) 2793 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c., on M. for Sup., 7732 (iv).

Souris Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 1939 (i).

Souris Ry. Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 2386 (ii).

——— Permission to Build, &c. (Ques.) 7728 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3767, 3825 (ii); in Com., 12611 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9770 (v).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9221, 9237 (v).

House of Commons (accommodation) 10490 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (wireless stations) 5045 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5768 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2947, 2949; (obstructions) 3212; (winter mail service) 3216; (wrecks) 3195 (ii).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (inspectors) 9092 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Experimental Farms (repairs, &c.) 10905 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Elmwood) 13335 (vii); (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8572 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston, militia clothes) 10908 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 12027 (vi).

Public Works—Marine (ship channel) 5038 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (claims dept.) 10177 (v) P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claims) 12763 (vii).

Tobacco, Customs Seizure at Charlottetown, Penalties *re*, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2982 (ii).

Tobacco Infractions of Inland Rev. Act in P.E.I., on M. for Sup., 9514 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9237 (v).

Tobacco Manufacturers in Mar. Provs., Amounts of Fines and Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 363 (i).

Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction (Ques.) 5472 (iii).

Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River, &c. (Ques.) 9476 (v).

Travelling Expenses of R. A. Wiallard *re* Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3987 (ii).

Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 5471 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6136 (iii).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c. (M.) 10259 (v).

——— Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 5996 (iii).

McLEAN, Mr. P. D., *Centre York.*

Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c. (Ques.) 2981 (ii).

McLENNAN, Mr. A., *Inverness.*

Ancoin *vs.* The King, Cor. *re* Suit in Supreme Court, N.S. (M. for cor.*) 558 (i).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2589 (ii).

Dog Fish Reduction Works at Canso, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 5790 (iii).

Inverness County and Increased Ry. Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7744 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9546 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Inverness) 7173 (iv); (Lake Ainslie) 11228; (Margaree) 11229; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hood) 11268 (vi).

McLENNAN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton, additional line) 12761; (stations) 12233 (vii).

MARCIL, Mr. C., *Bonaventure.*

Interprovincial Ry. Bridge Co. of N. B. (B. 76) 1°*, 1584 (i).

MAJOR, Mr. C. B., *Labelle.*

C.P.R., Papineauville to Little Nation River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).

MARSHALL, Mr. D., *Elgin, E.*

Aylmer, Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1506 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6206 (iii).

Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

Cold Storage, Assistance *re* East Elgin Establishment (Ques.) 351 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1242 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3604 (ii).

Fraser, A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel *re* Sussex St. Property Purchase (Ques.) 3478 (ii).

Fruit Inspection, Complaints *re* Apple Packing, &c. (remarks) 2766 (ii).

Fruit and Vegetable Inspectors, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 516 (i).

Govt. Securities *re* Dom. Notes, &c. (Ques.) 6235 (iv).

Immigration Agents in East Elgin, Number employed (Ques.) 692 (i).

Meat and Canned Foods B. 149, in Com., 7227; on M. for 3°, 7215 (iv).

Port Bruce Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Port Burwell Harbour, Contracts, Payments, &c. (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3924 (ii).

Salmon Fishing Licenses in Gardner's Inlet, &c. (Ques.) 5652 (iii).

Salvation Army Immigrants, Stmnt. of Genl. Booth (Ques.) 2390 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Meats and Canned Foods Act) 12893 (vii).

Militia (annual drill) 5750 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10894 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7493; (Leamington) 7815; (St. Mary's) 7828; (Owen Sound) 7824 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (improvements, &c.) 5708 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii).

MARTIN, Mr. A., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Anglo-American Cable between P.E.I. and Mainland, Breaking of, &c. (remarks) 8439 (v).

Belle River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 685 (i).

Budget, The, 6113 (iii).

Charlottetown Board of Trade, Pets. *re* Sailing Vessels (M. for copy*) 6240 (iv).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5099 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10723; in Com., 11559 (vi).

Coal Deposits in P.E.I., Boring for, &c. (Ques.) 515 (i).

Coal Shipments from N.S. and Cape Breton, Res. of Board of Trade, P.E.I. (Ques.) 5470 (iii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13273 (vii).

Express Charges in Mar. Provinces, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 518 (i).

Fisheries Dispute between Dom. and Mar. Provs., Jurisdiction *re* (Ques.) 2395 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10563 (vi).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6250 (v).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of to Agents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1342 (i).

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2450 (ii).

——— Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10157 (v).

Little Sands Wharf, Repairs, &c., Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

Lobster Fishing and Packing Licenses, Granting in P.E.I. (M. for cor.) 5475 (iii).

Lobster Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 4404 (iii).

McDonald, Archibald, Dismissal from Whim Road P. O. (M. for cor.*) 5087 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12798 (vii).

Murray Harbour Branch Ry. Improved Service, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 6239 (iv).

——— Inquiry for, 10123 (v).

Peat for Fuel, Deposits in Canada, Industry, &c. (Ques.) 515 (i).

Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging (Ques.) 685 (i).

Pisquid Post Office, Removal of, Cor., Tels., Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 4588 (iii).

Port Vernon Bridge, P.E.I., Completion of Work, &c. (Ques.) 4404 (iii).

MARTIN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Postal Arrangements between U. S. and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3895 (ii).

P.E.I. Fishing Bounties, Stmnt. of Payments (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).

P.E.I., Post Offices in Queens County, Complaints *re* Mail Service (Ques.) 355 (i).

——— Steam Communication between P.E.I. and C. B. (remarks) in Com. on Sup., 12754, 13353 (vii).

——— Tunnel, Information *re* (Ques.) 562 (i).

P.E.I., Winter Communication, Freight carried, Freight Rates, &c. (M. for ret.*) 936 (i).

——— (Ques.) 843 (i).

P.E.I., Winter Communication, Mail Service, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 1203 (i).

——— Tunnel Construction, Tels., Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 4589 (iii).

——— Withdrawal of Steamers from Georgetown Route, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

——— (remarks) 1207 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1109 (i).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, Cor., &c., *re* Construction (M. for copies) 3242, 3272 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Claims of Mr. James Maher, &c. (Ques.) 3834 (ii).

——— Complaints *re* Excessive Charges, &c. (Ques.) 1123 (i).

——— Freight Rates, Delegates from P.E.I., Reps. *re* (M. for copies*)6240 (iv).

——— Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 12408; on M. for 2°, 12628; in Com., 12631 (vii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2745 (ii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Mr. Haney's Claim, Progress *re* (remarks) 7100 (iv).

——— Mail Service, Delay in Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9094 (v).

——— Murray Harbour Branch, Expenditure and Earnings, &c. (Ques.) 848 (i).

———Time-Table, Protest *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1123 (i).

——— Train Service between Charlottetown and Murray Harbour (Ques.) 568 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11630 (vi).

Railway Commission (Ass't. Chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 1926 (ii); in Com., 4978 (iii).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 981 (v).

Returns, Inquiry for, 5491 (iii), 7722 (iv).

MARTIN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Returns, Unopposed (remarks) 5914 (iii).

St. Peter's Bay, Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 1686 (i).

St. Peter's Bay Post Office, Charges against Mrs. Finlay, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1687 (i).

——— (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2786 (ii).

Seed Grain, Distribution *re*, Purchases in P.E.I. (remarks) 3157 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7738 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3812 (ii); in Com., 12610 (vii).

Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12754 (vii).

Militia (annual drill) 5736 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1085 (i); (obstructions) 3213; (winter mail service) 3218 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 13339 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (New London) 11292; N.S. (Port Hood) 11276; P.E.I. (repairs) 11292; (Rustico) 11293 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (salaries) 10157 (v).

Toronto Island Tunnel, Deputation *re* Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 5564 (iii).

Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route (Ques.) 11297 (vi).

Wednesday Evening Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).

West India Trade, Reciprocity Negotiations (remarks) 1860 (i).

MARTIN, Mr. M., *Montreal (St. Mary's).*

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6728 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6511 (iv).

Monteal Excise Officers, Increases to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4911 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13393 (vii).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 100) 1° m., 3316 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5539 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Excise (provisional allowances) 817 (i).

MICHAUD, Mr. P., *Victoria, N.B.*

G.T.P., Madawaska Right of Way (remarks) 12661 (vii).

MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7176 (iv).

MICHAUD, Mr. P.—*Con.*

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3068 (ii).

Quebec and New Brunsick Ry. Co.'s (B. 128) 1°*, 5255; in Com., 6181 (iii), 6225 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563 (v).

MILLER, Mr. H. H., *Grey, S.*

Address, The, 148 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3860 (ii).

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. B. 141 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

Budget, The, 5567 (iii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11256 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5104 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 11707; in Com., 11844 (vi), 12944 (vii).

Fruit Inspection *re* Apple Packing, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 2764 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6825 (iv).

Indian Department, Extravagent Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11068 (vi).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Postal Services, Delays, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 7261 (iv).

Presbyterian Widows' and Orphans' Fund B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2789 (ii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3102 (ii).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H McIntyre) 1533 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12620 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12749 (vii); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4058 (ii); Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Owen Sound) 7817; P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7185 (iv).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2359 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10693 (vi); on Sen. Amts., 13045 (vii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W., on M. Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2194 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost of Construction (Ques.) 6232 (iv).

Address, The, 535 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3875 (ii).

——— All-Red Line, Irish Route, Opposition by Govt. (Ques.) 10253 (v).

——— Letter to Mr. Sifton from Prime Minister (remarks) 948 (i).

——— Negotiations, Canadian Representatives in England, &c. (Ques.) 353 (i).

——— Tenders, Proposals, &c., Cor. *re* (Ques.) 6460 (iv).

Anglo-American Treaty, Submitted to Can. Govt. (remarks) 6926 (iv).

Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative (Ques.) 8611 (v).

——— Purchase of Goods, &c. (Ques.) 8443 (v).

——— Total Expenditure by Govt. (Ques.) 8443 (v).

Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Cor. Rep., &c. (M. for copies) 594 (i).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4395 (iii).

Becancour, Blanche, &c., Dredging at during 1907, &c. (Ques.) 3040 (ii).

Bonus System, *re* Immigration (notice of motion) 6288 (iv).

Bridge Subsidies to Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com., 13311 (vii).

B.C. Appeal Court B. 165 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 8466 (v).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6169, 6174, 6192 (iii), 6409 (iv).

Canada and France SS. Communication, Provision *re* Treaty (Ques.) 12391 (vii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12868 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5125 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10724; in Com., 11573 (vi).

Clarke City, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ques.) 2394 (ii).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup, 1001 (i).

Co-operative Societies (B. 5) 1° m., 2; on Order for 2°, 583 (i).; on M. for 2°, 4558; in Com., 4564 (iii).

——— (M.) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 3654 (ii).

Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to (Ques.) 9277 (v).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 2544 (ii).

Cumberland Railway and Coal Co.'s (B. 46) 1°*, 891; 2°*, 1109 (i).

Debates, Official, 4th Rep. (translators) Notice to ref. back to Debates Com., 9709 (v).

——— M. to ref back to Com., 10225; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 94) 10252 (v).

——— (remarks) 9889, 10119 (v).

Deschambault Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction, Contractor, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5801 (iii).

——— (Ques.) 5464 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8116, 8138 (iv).

Dredging Works at Nicolet River, &c., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3896 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).

Dredging in Quebec Prov., Claims pending, &c. (Ques.) 7200 (iv).

Dredging in Vaudreuil Co., Supt.'s Salary, &c. (Ques.) 4587 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10763 (vi).

Fisheries Treaties, Boundaries with U. S. (remarks) 6632 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1397 (i); on M. for 2°, 2221 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4317 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, Consideration of Proposed Convention, (M.) for Sel. Com., 923 (i).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 12651 (vii).

——— Shipments from Canada, &c. (Ques.) 4763 (iii).

See 'Can. and France,' &c.

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3794 (ii).

Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 3423 (ii).

Govt. Vessels, Pay of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 10736 (vi).

Govt. Works, Emplymt. of Technical Students (prop. res.) 3288 (ii).

G.T.P. Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10772 (vi).

G.T.P., Winnipeg to Moncton, Number of Miles completed, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 6643 (iv).

House of Commons, Rules for Hours of Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr, Wright) 592 (i).

Hudson, Dredging,, Total Expenditure, 1907 (Ques.) 4587 (iii).

Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8 (Ques.) 11703 (vi).

Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906-07 (Ques.) 11704 (vi).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Immigrants landed in Canada to June, 1907, Number deported, &c. (Ques.) 3839 (ii).

Immigrants reported by SS. 'Montreal,' Bonuses paid, &c. (Ques.) 6921 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B.135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5658 (iii); in Com., 6436 (iv).

Immigration Agents in France, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9840 (v).

——— (notice of motion) 4769 (iii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of *re* Agents, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6663; Amt. neg. (Y. 42; N. 95) 7092 (iv).

Immigration Frauds at Halifax, Par. in Press (remarks) 4834 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6491, 6514 (iv).

I.C.R., Amqui Station, Cost of Construction (Ques.) 10012 (v).

——— Vote *re* Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 12774 (vii).

Italy, Commercial Treaty with (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10593 (vi).

Japanese and Oriental Immigration, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for copies of O.Cs., &c., 872 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Recent Entries into B. C. (remarks) 3751 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1605 (i).

——— from U. S., Deportation, &c. (remarks) 3900 (ii).

Lachine Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12097 (vii).

La Compagnie de Publication du Canada, Amount paid by Govt. (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

Lac Saumon Station, I.C.R., Amount expended (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Montreal, Pet. *re* Assistance, &c. (Ques.) 4244 (iii).

——— (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Lighthouses in Nicolet River and Fort St. Francois, &c. (Ques.) 3837 (ii).

Loans, Temporary, by Govt., Names of Lenders, Rates of Interest, &c. (M. for ret.*) 554 (i).

——— (Ques.) 314 (i).

Mail Service, Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton, Renewal of Contract (Ques.) 5257

Mail Service by Steamers via Coteau Landing, &c. (Ques.) 9277 (v).

Mail Service, Soulanges County, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 9277 (v).

Marine, Deptl. Officials, Suspension of *re* C. S. Report (remarks) 6004 (iii).

——— Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3988 (ii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4066 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Montreal Turnpike Roads, Claim of Govt., &c. (prop. res.) 3465 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c. (prop. res.) 3436; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3452 (ii).

——— Amounts collected and expended, &c. (M. for ret.) 1688 (i).

——— Payment of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 1931 (i), 2979 (ii).

——— Rep. of Auditor General (M. for copy*) 2983 (ii).

Nicolet County, Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4588 (iii).

Nicolet Post Office, Contract, Tender, Extras, &c. (Ques.) 3838 (ii).

Nicolet River Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 3840 (ii).

Nicolet River Protection Walls, Repairs, Expenditure *re* (M. for ret.*) 4588 (iii).

Nicolet River Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3478 (ii).

Order, Ques. of, *re* answering questions by Govt., 234 (i).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii).

Pointe Aux Trembles Wharf, Date of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 9267 (v).

——— Number of Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1734 (i), 2394 (ii).

——— Tender of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau, &c. (Ques.) 8838 (v).

Quebec Bridge Commission, on M. (Mr. Maclean) to ref. Rep., Evidence, &c., to Special Com., 10401 (vi).

——— Rep. of Sel. Com., on M. (Mr. Maclean) to conc. (amt.) 13363; Amt. neg. (Y. 52; N. 103) 13414 (vii).

Quebec Bridge Commission's Report, Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 8608 (v), 10302 (vi).

Quebec Bridge Co., Govt. Grants, Investigation *re* (M.) for Sel. Com., 2547 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Co., ref. to in debate on Address, 535 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Construction Materials, Customs Duties collected (Ques.) 5200, 5793 (iii).

Ques. of Priv., Par. in 'Le Soleil,' 7994 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, 10688; (amt) 11603, neg. (Y. 36; N. 89) 11608 (vi).

Ry. Act (working hours) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. R. Smith)—(remarks) 10120 (v).

Railway Commissioners' Board, Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8513 (v).

Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re* (Ques.) 4587 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5658 (iii).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Rimouski County Public Works, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 10013 (v).

St. Gabriel de Brandon, Post Office Savings Bank, Opening, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 4589 (iii).

——— (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

St. Francois Port Wharf, Construction, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 3423 (ii).

Ste. Hyacinthe, 84th Regiment, Total Amount of Pay unpaid, &c. (Ques.) 844 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5541 (iii).

Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of six Offices, &c. (Ques.) 5472 (iii).

Sauve, Alfred, Rep. of Investigation *re* Charges, &c. (Ques.) 9278 (v).

Seven Islands, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ques.) 2394 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Commissioner Boyer, (Ques.) 12413 (vii).

——— Electric Power, Contract with Govt., &. (Ques.) 10011 (v).

——— Expenditure *re* Investigation by Messrs. Sauve and Boyer (Ques.) 10513 (vi).

——— Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Boyer, Inquiry for, 9890 (v).

——— Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Boyer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3805 (ii).

Suburban Mail Delivery (prop. res.) 3276 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10585 (vi).

Canals—Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13175 (vii).

Canals—Soulanges (investigation) 10304 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 9698 (v).

Immigration (agents, G.B.) 9840 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 3988 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2943 (ii).

Post Office (boots for letter carriers) 8877 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12128 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11081 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362 (vi).

Technical Students, Emplymt. on Govt. Works (prop. res.) 3288 (ii).

Temporary Govt. Loans, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 233 (i).

Tobacco Excise Taxes, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 566 (i).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., *re*

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Amt. to Inland Revenue Act, 904; on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 921 (i).

Toll Gates upon Island of Montreal, Abolition of (prop. res.) 3299 (ii).

Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6123 (iii).

Wharfage Dues in Soulanges County, Amounts received, &c. (Ques.) 9276 (v).

Wheat, frozen, Shipments from Man., &c., on M. (Mr. Blain) to adjn., 826 (i).

Whisky, Illegal Distribution at Thetford Mines (remarks) 9894 (v).

MORIN, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester.*

Bic Wharf, Material supplied, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ques.) 9713 (v).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 189 (i).

Butter and Cheese exported from Prov. of Quebec, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 2162 (ii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10505 (vi).

Fortier, Mr. Eugene, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 8613 (v).

G.T.P., Contracts, Safeguard Clause, &c. (M. for copies*) 2398 (ii).

——— Medical Officer Parent, Payments to (Ques.) 8618 (v).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10493 (vi).

I.C.R., Connection with Quebec Central at Levis (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10179 (v).

——— Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connections (remarks) 189, 434, 1436 (i), 3317 (ii).

——— Riviere du Loup Station Master, &c. (Ques.) 7445 (iv).

Lake Francois Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).

Pulp Wood Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4813 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, Lifting of Ruins (remarks) 10303 (vi).

Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Riviere du Loup Wharf, Total Expenditure *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 6462 (iv).

Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. Johns, Tenders *re* Supplies (Ques.) 5788 (iii).

Saguenay Dredging, Purchase of Coal *re*, &c. (Ques.) 8380 (v).

——— 'Storm King,' Tug, Employment of (Ques.) 8381 (v).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5414; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5448 (iii).

MORIN, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents) 9875 (v).

Marine—(ice-breakers) 1913 (i).

Miscellaneous (charwomen) 10508 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (obstructions) 3213; (tidal service) 3216 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings — Ottawa (Museum) 1495 (i).

Public Works—Que. (Montreal post office) 7413; (Quebec, citadel) 7430; (Quebec, drill hall) 7431; (Levis) 7295 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (train service) 10179 (v).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *Hastings, E.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12476 (vii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4505 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., Cor. with G.T.Ry. Co. (M. for copies) 2796 (ii).

Crown Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 180) 1°*, 9330 (v).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1190 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1658 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1830; (amt.) 1839; neg. (Y. 50: N. 95) 1882 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11803 (vi).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6753 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13271 (vii).

Govt. Employees at Ottawa, Number of Permanent and Temporary, &c. (M. for ret.*) 558 (i).

G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12323 (vii).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R. M. C., on M. for Sup., 1030 (i).

Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4182 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7371 (iv).

——— Apptmt. of Mr. Perron (remarks) 6926 (iv).

——— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10743 (vi).

Militia and Marine Stationery Supplies, Purchases *re* Book-keeping (Ques.) 6233 (iv).

Niagara Camp, Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 2163 (ii).

P.E.I.Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* M. J. Haney's Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2750 (ii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (Ry. Commission) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°,4659 (iii); in Com., 10647; on M. for 3° (amt.) 10777; on M. for 3°, 11598; Amt. neg. (Y. 36; N. 77) 11600 (vi).

Ross Rifle, Extravagance of Militia Dept., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 8994 (v).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5854 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (subsidies) 12263 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4182 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1923 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8526; Ont. (Glencoe) 7490 (iv).

Watson, Mr. G. H., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Election Frauds (remarks) 6848 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. Frank (Minister of the Interior) *Edmonton.*

Adams Lake, Construction of Dam, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5798 (iii).

Alberta Closed Leases, Number granted, &c. (Ans.) 3037 (ii).

Badgley Island, Trespass by T. H. Jackman (Ans.) 1937 (i).

Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amounts, Price, &c. (Ans.) 4584 (iii).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).

Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9740 (v).

Boyle Concession, Memorial of Dawson Legislature (Ans.) 509, 562, 681 (i).

Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission (Ans.) 5474 (iii).

Buchanan Townsite, Homestead Entry of Mr. Ramsland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10083 (v).

Buffalo Herd located at Elk Park (Ans.) 5208 (iii).

Buffalo Herd for Moose Mountain Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10102 (v).

Buffalo Herd for Parks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).

Buffalo imported for Game Preserve in Alberta, Payments *re* (Ans.) 847.

Buffalo purchased for Parks, Authority for Expenditure (Ans.) 896 (i).

Buffalo purchased for Elk Park, Name of Purchaser (Ans.) 5795 (iii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Calgary Town Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9776 (v).

Cameron, John, Homestead Inspector, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4769 (iii).

Canadian repatriated from U.S. (Ans.) 685 (i).

Chambly Common, Area, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 5652 (iii).

Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 513 (i).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. (B. 184) 1°*, 10008 (v); 2° m., and in Com., 10545, 10744, 11020 (vi).

Clearwater Lake, Half Breeds' Location, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).

——— Squatters' Claims (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).

Clement, W. H. P., Legal Adviser in Yukon, &c. (Ans.) 5650 (iii).

Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants, &c. (Ans.) 5469, 5790 (iii).

Coal and Govt. Lands in Possession of Govt., &c. (Ans.) 843 (i).

Coal Lands, Alberta and Sask., Total Area sold, &c. (Ans.) 9278 (v).

——— Royalty Dues, &c., Sale or Lease of (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

Coal Lands, Disposed of by Govt. (Ans.) 3480 (ii).

——— Leases, Applicants *re* (Ans.) 2395 (ii).

——— Leased by Govt., Original Grantees, &c. (Ans.) 3232 (ii).

——— Purchase Price on Sections 16, 20 and 21, &c. (Ans.) 10513 (vi).

——— Purchases on Sections 27, 28, 33 and 34, Payments *re* (Ans.) 10512 (vi).

——— Timber, &c., Dates of Regulations, O.Cs., &c. (Ans.) 12656 (vii).

Coal Mining Cos. in Sask. and Alberta, Returns made to Govt. (Ans.) 10258 (v).

Coal Mine Royalties, Sums received in Alberta (Ans.) 12391 (vii).

Colonization Lands, Alienations, on Inquiry for Ret., 4317 (iii).

Colonization Societies in Quebec, Amounts paid (Ans.) 684 (i).

Congdon, Mr. F. T., Stmnt. *re* Estates administered (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10111 (v).

——— Investigation *re* Trusts and Estates (Ans.) 12050, 12413 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13420, 13518 (vii).

Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 565 (i).

See 'Yukon.'

Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).

——— (remarks) 10916 (vi).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Cypress Hills Reservation, Homestead Lands, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9992 (v).

——— Reserve, Preservation of, &c. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1133 (i).

——— Examination of, by Members (remarks) 3853 (ii).

——— Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1636 (i).

Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* Immigration Frauds (Ans.) 5655 (iii).

See 'Halifax.'

Dokis Indian Reserve, Consent of Chief *re* Sale of Timber (Ans.) 8175 (iv).

——— Commission to Mr. Ryan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).

——— Name of Agent (Ans.) 5084 (iii).

——— Negotiations *re* Surrender (Ans.) 3849 (ii).

——— Protest *re* Sale of Timber (remarks) 10918 (vi).

——— Sale, Notice in Newspapers, &c. (Ans.) 7501 (iv).

——— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender (Ans.) 10512 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8659 (v).

Dom. Lands Survey (B. 9) 1° m., 231; 2°, and in Com., 754, 948 (i); on Senate Amts., 3755 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 181) 1° m., 9333 (v); 2° m., 11125; in Com., 11158, 11165, 11408, 11502, 11940; 3° m., 11970 (vi); on Mr. Lake's Amt., 12394; on Senate Amts., 13522 (vii).

Dom. Lands, Areas disposed of (Ans.) 3431 (ii).

——— Disposed of from 1896 to 1905, on M. (Mr. Lake) for Ret., 3852 (ii).

Dom. Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 8183 (iv).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10806 (vi).

Doukhobors, Bonuses *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9952 (v).

——— Condition of, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (remarks) 2219 (ii).

——— Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5017 (iii).

——— Manner of Living (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).

——— at Yorkton, Violation of Laws, &c. (remarks) 7630 (iv).

Doyle, Mr. P., Superannuation, &c. (Ans.) 6923 (iv).

Eagle Lake Coal Lands, Surrender of (Ans.) 694 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Estevan Quarantine Lands, Disposal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10093 (v).

Fence Post Fees on Permits, &c. (Ans.) 10258 (v).

Fire Guardians, Number employed in Alberta, &c. (Ans.) 3433 (ii).

Foreign Purchases, Customs Collections *re* (Ans.) 5475 (iii).

French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c. (Ans.) 177 (i).

French Immigrants, Number and Expenditures, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).

Gaetz Brothers, Payments to (Ans.) 10514 (vi).

Girouard, J. E., Resignation from Yukon Council (Ans.) 11938 (vi).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. (B. 203) 1°*, 12594; in Com., 13048, 13208 (vii).

Grazing Lands leased to Brown, Bedingfield & Co., Number of Acres (Ans.) 13062 (vii).

Grazing Leases, Application of Messrs. Woods, Fleck and Finnie (Ans.) 238 (i).

——— Irrevocable for 21 Years, Applications for, &c. (Ans.) 1512 (i).

Grazing and Irrigation Lands reserved by Govt. (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

Grazing Lease of H. Riviere, Location, &c. (Ans.) 13060 (vii).

Grazing Ranches, Names of Lessees, &c. (Ans.) 7211 (iv).

Griffith Island, Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 1508 (i).

Halifax Frauds, Rep. of Mr. Robertson (remarks) 9127 (v).

——— Dismissal of Mr. Bernstein (remarks) 8605 (v).

See 'Dodds.'

Hindus Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (remarks) 5337 (iii).

See 'Immigration,' 'Japanese,' &c.

Hintz, Fred., Homestead Location, &c. (Ans.) 3235 (ii), 6238 (iv).

Holliday, Mr. P., Additional Living Allowance (Ans.) 5475 (iii).

Homestead Application of Mr. John C. Haddock (remarks) in Com. on B. 181, 11200 (vi).

Homestead Cancellations, Unfair Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10090, 10101 (v).

Homestead Entries, Granted for Quarters 10-17-17 W. of 4th Meridian (Ans.) 9773 (v).

Homestead Entry for S.W. Quarter-Section 16-28-1, Issue of Patent, Duties performed, &c. (Ans.) 2167 (ii).

Homestead Entries in Quarter-Section No. 35, History of (Ans.) 4762 (iii).

Homestead Entries on Quarter Section 16, &c., Applications, Inspections, &c. (Ans.) 3432 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Homestead Entries, N.E. Quarter-Section 28, Permission *re* Grants (Ans.) 1941 (i).
Homestead Entries in Man., &c., Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 6921 (iv).
Homesteaders on Sections 15, 16 and 27, Issue of Patents, &c. (Ans.) 7503 (iv).
Homesteading in Section 18, Extension of Time Allowance, &c. (Ans.) 8382 (v).
Homestead Sale of Township 13 (Ans.) 7206 (iv).
Hough, Campbell and Ferguson, Sales of Lands, &c. (Ans.) 364 (i).
Hough, Mr. J. S., and Hough, Campbell and Ferguson (Ans.) 568 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6394 (iv).
——— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5789 (iii).
Immigration Act Amt. (B. 135) 1° m., 5657 (iii); in Com., 6429 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt., O.C. *re* (Ans.) 7500 (iv).
——— O.C. *re* B.C. (remarks) 8171 (iv).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 8608, 9891 (v).
Immigration Agents in East Elgin, Number, &c. (Ans.) 693 (i).
——— G.B., Names, &c. (Ans.) 2169 (ii).
——— Italy, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4584 (iii).
——— Names of those paid Commissions in Europe, &c. (Ans.) 3845 (ii).
——— N.B., Apptmt. (Ans.) 843 (i).
——— Number of Special Agents, Addresses, &c. (Ans.) 180 (i).
——— Special Prizes, &c. (Ans.) 3484 (ii).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of, to Agents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1311 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6697 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 1298 (i).
Immigration, Central Board, London, Moneys paid to, &c. (Ans.) 2545 (ii).
Immigration, Co-operation with Govt. of N. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
Immigration, Expenditure *re* Maintenance of Immigrants (Ans.) 5084 (iii).
Immigration, Expenditure for March, 1907-8 (Ans.) 5081 (iii).
Immigration Forms, Number received by Farmers, Agents, &c. (Ans.) 3847 (ii).
Immigration Frauds at Halifax, Investigation *re* (statement) 4963 (iii).
——— Further Information *re* (remarks) 5567 (iii).
——— Restitution *re* (remarks) 5659 (iii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Immigration Frauds at Halifax (remarks) 4835, 5567, 5659 (iii), 6465 (iv).
See 'Halifax.'
Immigration from U. S., Total Expenditure (Ans.) 5082 (iii).
Immigration Hall, East Selkirk, Furniture, &c., Disposal of (Ans.) 6403 (iv).
Immigration Officers, Waugh and Perrin, Payments to (Ans.) 514 (i).
Immigration Premiums, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1287 (i).
Immigration Regulations *re* British Subjects, Deportations, &c. (Ans.) 9773 (v).
Immigration Regulations, O.C. *re* (remarks) 11019 (vi).
Immigration Relief to Gimli Galicians, Rep. of Mr. Walker (read) in Com. of Sup., 9979 (v).
Immigration Returns, on Inquiry for, 1108 (i).
Immigrant Bonuses, Increase to Agents, &c. (Ans.) 3429 (ii).
Immigrants, Bulgarians, Stranded in Toronto (remarks) 186, 242 (i).
Immigrants cared for in Toulon Sheds, 1906-7 (Ans.) 892 (i).
Immigrants at Chatham, Complaints *re* Deportation (Ans.) 6922 (iv).
Immigrants deported from Chatham, Names and Causes, &c. (Ans.) 5796 (iii).
Immigrants deported, Expenditure *re* Transportation (Ans.) 5080 (iii).
Immigrants deported, Number, &c. (Ans.) 177 (i).
Immigrants stranded at St. Thomas, Deportation of (Ans.) 567 (i).
Immigrant Detention Hospital, Amount expended (Ans.) 5082 (iii).
Immigrants entering Canada, Number, Bonuses paid on, &c. (Ans.) 5256 (iii).
——— Deportations, &c. (Ans.) 240 (i).
Immigrants from Europe, entering U.S., List furnished to Govt. (Ans.) 5082 (iii).
——— Restriction of (remarks) 5491 (iii).
Immigration from France and Belgium, Premiums paid to Agents (Ans.) 6923 (iv).
Immigrant Inspection of Ships, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1289 (i).
Immigrants reported by SS. 'Montreal,' Bonuses paid, &c. (Ans.) 6921 (iv).
Immigrants landed in Canada to June, 1907, Number deported, &c. (Ans.) 3840 (ii).
Immigrant Passages to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies (Ans.) 5468 (iii).
Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Indian Department, Extravagant Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11045 (vi).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Indian Lands, Acres sold, Total Receipts, &c., since 1896 (Ans.) 4586 (iii).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13122 (vii).

——— Withdrawal from Sale, &c. (Ans.) 2396 (ii).

Indian Lands and Islands owned, sold, &c., by Indians (Ans.) 5079 (iii).

Indian Lands, B.C., and Provincial Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 628 (i).

Indian Lands at New Westminster, B.C., Disposal of, &c. (Ans.) 3037, 3839 (ii).

Indian Lands, Sale of, on Inquiry for Ret., 4495 (iii).

Indians in Man. and Sask., Investigation by Mrs. Paget and Miss Ferguson, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 6919 (iv).

Indian Schools, Rep. of Dr. Bryce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).

Interior, Deptl. Rep., (presented) 7 (i).

Irrigation (B. 10) 1°*, 231; 2° m., 766; in Com., 767, 953 (i); (M.) to withdraw, 2974 (ii).

——— (B. 99) 1° m., 3315 (ii); in Com., 4671 (iii).

Irrigation in Western Provs., Investigations *re* Measurements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9990 (v).

Japanese and Oriental Immigrants in B. C., Number, &c. (Ans.) 692 (i).

Japanese entering B. C., Passports, &c. (Ans.) 4243 (iii).

Japanese Immigrants entering from U.S. into Canada, Deportation, &c. (remarks) 3900 (ii).

Japanese Syndicate purchasing Land in Alberta, &c. (Ans.) 2162 (ii).

Kananaski Falls Water Power, Granting of Rights, &c. (Ans.) 3036 (ii).

——— on Inquiry for, 6464 (iv).

La Compagnie de Publication du Canada, Amount paid by Govt. (Ans.) 5082 (iii).

Lands applied for by Mr. Alwyn under Irrigation Regulations (Ans.) 7209 (iv).

Land Entries of T. J. Oliver and Fred Hintz, Cancellation of, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 3235 (ii).

Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N. W. Ters., Area reserved on July 1st, 1896 (Ans.) 13512 (vii).

Land Grants to Rys., Selections, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 4766 (iii), 6920 (iv).

Lands leased by Govt. in Section 11, Twp. 8, Original Grantee, &c. (Ans.) 3235 (ii).

Land Patent issued for E. ½ S.E. ¼ Section 2, Name, &c. (Ans.) 2169 (ii).

Land Patents for Section 8, Twp. 53, Present Owner, Occupation, &c. (Ans.) 3430 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Land Patents for Sections 10 and 17, Applicants for (Ans.) 9475 (v).

Land Patents, Section 36, &c., Issue of (Ans.) 3481 (ii).

Land Sales in N. W., Purchasers' Names, Prices paid, &c. (Ans.) 3835 (ii).

Lands, Section 2, 10, 14, &c., Disposal of (Ans.) 5083 (iii).

Land Subsidies to Rys., Areas granted from 1892-6 (Ans.) 8614 (v).

Land Titles Act Amt. (B. 113) 1° m., 4221 (iii); in Com., 6517 (iv).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund (B. 168) prop. Res., 7094 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8480 (v); 2° m., 10525; in Com., 10526 (vi).

Lands withdrawn for Settlement or Colonization Purposes, &c. (Ans.) 2393 (ii).

La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Assistance *re* (Ans.) 4244 (iii).

Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re* (Ans.) 8444 (v).

Livingstone, Wm. G., Sale of Sections 22, 28 and 32, &c. (Ans.) 9475 (v).

Lumber manufactured in N. W., Royalties, &c. (Ans.) 3835 (ii).

McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants (Ans.) 8617 (v).

McDougall, Rev. John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 688 (i).

McInnes, Hon. W. B., Emplymt. in the Yukon, &c. (Ans.) 5794 (iii).

McKenzie, Mr. K. W., Apptmt. as Dom. Lands Agent, Edmonton (Ans.) 6981 (iv).

McLeod, Roderick, Date of Homestead Entry (Ans.) 6401 (iv).

Manchester, Dr., Misappropriation of moneys of Mr. Walter Dick (Ans.) 11937 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. (B. 188) 1°*, 10717 (iv); in Com., 12559, 13215 (vii).

Man. Lands owned by Govt., Number of Acres (Ans.) 1289 (i).

Menzies, Mr. James, Emplymt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 1349 (i).

Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Ret., on Inquiry for, 2381 (ii).

Mining Rights on Sections 20, 28 and 32, Original Grantees, Transfers, &c. (Ans.) 3238 (ii).

Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T. P. Ry. Co. (Ans.) 5257 (iii).

Muskoday Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Sale (Ans.) 5083 (iii).

Newspapers, Payments to (Ans.) 1512 (i).

Nolan, Wm. Howard, Issue of Patents to (Ans.) 8182 (iv).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid, Claims, &c. (Ans.) 167 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses paid by Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 773 (i).

——— Ref. to Mr. Blair's Letter, &c. (Ans.) 2392 (ii).

Northwest Gold Dredging Co., Assignment of, &c. (Ans.) 11703 (vi).

Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12731 (vii).

Patterson, J. W., Govt. Lands in B. C., Sale to (Ans.) 6002 (iii).

Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., on M. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 10408 (vi).

——— Surveys of Lands (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).

Peace River Exploratory Surveys, Rep. (presented) 3834 (ii).

Peace River Timber Limits, Granting of Leases, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 3851 (ii).

Peace River Land Co., Cancellation of Grant (remarks) 11018 (vi).

——— Terms and Regulations *re* Sale, &c. (Ans.) 1111 (i).

'Phœnix,' Saskatoon, Number ordered, paid, &c. (Ans.) 6920 (iv).

Piegan Reserve, Cattle Shipments, Weighing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).

Preston, W. T. R., Employmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 360 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Production of Original Documents, on Inquiry for, 4495 (iii).

Quarantine Lands, Sask., Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 3482 (ii).

Quarter Sections, 35, 31 6, &c., Public and Private Sale, &c. (Ans.) 8176 (iv).

Railway Land Grants in Man., Alberta, Sask., Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 6920 (iv).

Rama Indians Fund, Payments *re* (Ans.) 8611 (v).

Ramsland Homestead Entry, Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 5209 (iii).

See 'Buchanan,' &c.

Ranchvale Homestead Entries, Receipts, Number, &c. (Ans.) 5258 (iii).

——— Sub-Land Agency, Closing of (Ans.) 4830 (iii).

Rattenbury & Co., Purchasers of Seed Oats, Assignment, &c. (Ans.) 12392 (vii).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 2309, 2384, 3318 (ii).

——— Questions, &c., ordered by the House, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4243 (iii).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications *re* Homesteads (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9994 (v).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Entry for Homesteaders (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7654

——— Squatters' Rights, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Robbins Irrigation Co., Amount expended to Date (Ans.) 4763 (iii).

Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion in Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).

Rocky Mountain Park, Revenue, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).

St. Peter's Reserve, Extinguishment of Title, Issue of Patents (Ans.) 1933 (i).

——— Instruction to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers (Ans.) 2217 (ii).

——— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors (Ans.) 7990 (iv).

Salvation Army Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).

——— Stmnt. of Genl. Booth (Ans.) 2391 (ii).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Conditions of Sale &c. (Ans.) 4761 (iii).

——— (stmnt.) 10402 (vi).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 9280 (v).

——— Sale of Homestead Lands, &c. (remarks) 9127 (v).

School Lands Exchange (B. 163) 1° m., 8086 (iv); 2° m., 8467; in Com., 8478 (v).

School Timber and Coal Lands, Average Price, &c. (Ans) 3431 (ii).

Scrip and Money received by Govt. *re* Lands, &c., on M. (Mr. Lake) for Cor., 3852 (ii).

Scrip received on Account of Lands, Mines, &c. (Ans.) 3431 (ii).

Section 32, Report *re* (Ans.) 8383 (v).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1377 (i).

——— Apptmt. of Mr. R. A. E. Leech (remarks) 3041 (ii).

——— Duties assigned to Mr. Leech (remarks) 3158 (ii).

——— Distribution of (Ans.) 692 (i).

——— O.C. amending Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 6981 (iv).

——— O.C. *re* Advances (remarks) 6634 (iv)

——— in N. W., Extension of time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2901 (ii).

——— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10121 (v).

——— Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2771 (ii).

Seed Grain Distribution, Purchases from P.E.I. (remarks) 3158, 3752 (ii), 12392 (vii).

——— Corrected answer, 13066 (vii).

Seed Grain purchased, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ans.) 8185 (iv).

Selkirk, Lord, Land Register, State Papers and Register 'B,' Custody of, &c. (Ans.) 1685 (i).

Six Nations Indians, Refusal *re* Inspection of Memorials, &c. (Ans.) 6239 (iv).

Smith, O. B., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4765 (iii).

S. A. Veterans, Land Grants to, &c. (Ans.) 563 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

S. A. Volunteers Land Grant Bounty (B. 109) Res. prop., 3316, 3756 (ii); 11938 (vi); in Com. on Res., 3823 (ii) 12595; in Com., 13047; on Senate Amts., 13524 (vii).

Southern Alberta Land Co., Application *re* Change of Lands (Ans.) 7729 (iv).

Squatters on Turtle Mountain Forest Reserves (remarks) 4741 (iii).

Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2784 (ii).

Supply—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 623 (i); Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v); (salaries) 616 (i), 9693 (v).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10044; (forest rangers) 10049; (forest reserves) 10060; (homesteads) 10083; (salaries) 10038; (surveys) 9987 (v).

Immigration (agents, G. B.) 9840: (agents in U. S.) 9965; (deportations) 9882 (v); (general expenses) 5753 (iii); (hospitals) 9983; (literature) 9949; (relief to settlers) 9983 (v); (U. S. labourers) 13169 (vii).

Indians—B. C. (land sales) 12752 (vii).

Indians — Generally (destitute) 5762; (printing, &c.) 5762 (iii).

Indians—N. B. (salaries) 12736, 13170; (schools) 13170 (vii).

Indians—N.W.T. (Sioux) 5762 (iii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5755 (iii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2777 (ii).

N.W. Ter. (Govt. salaries) 10117; (school grants) 10117 (v).

Public Works—Telegraphs (towers) 13178 (vii).

Yukon—(Govt. salaries) 10107 (v).

Surveys of Public Lands: *See* 'Dom. Lands.'

Swamps Lands in Man. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10106 (v).

Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt. (Ans.) 693 (i).

——— Sale (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).

——— Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).

Tanguay, Mr., Homestead Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10090 (v).

Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. in Yukon (Ans.) 1126 (i).

Timber Berth, East Saskatchewan, Conditions of Sale, &c. (Ans.) 3839 (ii).

Timber Berths granted in Man. and N.W. T., Retention by Original Grantees (Ans.) 2546 (ii).

Timber Berth, No. 1100, Area, &c. (Ans.) 364 (i).

——— No. 1168, Area, &c. (Ans.) 364 (i).

——— Nos. 1220, &c., on Order for Ret. (remarks) 849 (i).

Timber Cutting by Sawmill Owners, Applications, &. (Ans.) 2168 (ii).

Timber Lands, Sales to Messrs. Rutherford, &c. (Ans.) 1294 (i).

Timber Licenses cancelled from May, 1905, to Nov., 1907, &c. (Ans.) 181 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Timber Licenses, Conditions and Forms in force at present (Ans.) 359 (i).

Timber Licenses granted under Mackenzie Govt. (Ans.) 3038 (ii).

Timber Licenses issued in Man. and N.W.T. during 1896-7 (Ans.) 2396 (ii).

Timber Licenses and Renewals in N. W., Number of Miles, &c. (Ans.) 182, 691, 1127 (i).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2486 (ii).

——— Grants to Messrs. McLeod, Lundy, &c. (Ans.) 237 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 3581 (ii).

Timber Permits to Sawmill Owners, O.C. *re* (Ans.) 179 (i), 11496 (vi).

Torrens Land Title Fund, Information *re* (remarks) 10916 (vi).

Turtle Mountain Reserve, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4741 (iii), 7649 (iv).

Vacant Land Reservations, Instructions to Agents *re* (Ans.) 1935 (i).

Water Power Sales or Leases in Alberta, &c. (Ans.) 8378 (v).

Waugh, James, Immigration Agent, Refund to Govt. (Ans.) 4765 (iii).

Whitehorse Town Site, Portions sold and retained (Ans.) 11496 (vi).

Wood, Mr. David, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 568 (i).

Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c. (Ans.) 1127 (i).

Yukon Act Amt. (B. 169) 1° m., 8604 (v); 2° m., 10528; in Com., 10529; on Senate Amts., 11634 (vi).

Yukon, Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).

——— Finnie-Perron Case, Investigation *re* (remarks) 4316 (iii).

——— Gold Co., Holdings by Guggenheims, &c. (Ans.) 7726 (iv).

——— Liquor Permits, Agents, &c., Corrected Answer, 5048 (iii).

——— Lithgow, Girouard and Congdon, Messrs., Apptmt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 5999 (iii).

See 'Congdon,' &c.

——— Officials, Re-arrangement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).

——— Placer Claims, Renewals by Gold Commissioner, Fees, &c. (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

——— Placer Mining Act Amt. (B. 150) 1°*, 6221 (iv); 2° m., 8481; in Com., 8483 (v), 10518 (vi).

——— Whiskey Permit Agents, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1127 (i).

——— Wiley *vs.* Congdon, Amt. *re* Return (remarks) 1691 (i).

OSLER, Mr. E. B., *Toronto W.*

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1800 (i).
Dry Docks, Construction, B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4687 (iii).
Goodwin Car Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 60) 1°*, 1283 (i).
I.C.R. Audit System (remarks) in Com. on Sup., 10214 (v).
Lead Bounties B. 91 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11238 (vi).
Montague Moore and T. J. Haskett Patent Relief (B. 61) 1°*, 1283 (i).
Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4908 (iii).
Seed Grain for Northest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1362 (i).

SUPPLY—
Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10209 (v).

OWEN, Mr. C. L., *Northumberland, E., Ont.*

Brighton Wharf, Rep. of Mr. Sing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
——— Repairs *re* (remarks) 5913 (iii).
Cambellford, Lake Ontario & Western Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
Cattle Embargo in G B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12889 (vii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11820 (vi).
Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13469 (vii).
Fruit Inspection, *re* Apple Packing, Complaints *re* (remarks) 2761 (ii).
House of Commons Clerks, Changes, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).
——— Recommendations *re* Apptmts., &c. (Ques.) 3899 (ii).
Japanese Immigration, on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1611.
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7248 (iv).
Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9894 (v).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3930 (ii).
Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10640 (vi).
Shipping Rings, Combination *re* (remarks) 5915 (iii).

SUPPLY—
Canals—Trent (Buckhorn dam) 12227; (construction) 12226 (vii).
Justice—Supreme Court (registrar's uniform) 5507 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4087 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 5735 (iii).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5533 (iii).

OWEN, Mr. C. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Vancouver) 10868; (Vernon) 10879; (Victoria Immigration) 10879 (vi).
Public Works — Buildings — Ont. (Owen Sound) 7823; (St. Mary's) 7827 (iv).
Public Works — Buildings — Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Brighton) 12133 (vii).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11078 (vi).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10697 (vi).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2507 (ii).
Trent Bridge Post Office, Re-opening of (remarks) 609 (i).
Woolen Industry, Specific Duty (remarks) 6988 (iv).

PAQUET, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*

Address, The, 505 (i).
Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).
Canadians repatriated from U. S. (Ques.) 684 (i).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3490 (ii).
Experimental Farm in Quebec District, Establishment of (Ques.) 2593 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3545 (ii).
French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).
French Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number, &c. (Ques.) 177 (i).
Immigrants, Number settled in Canada in 1905-6-7, &c. (M. for ret.*) 697 (i).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6945 (iv).
I.C.R., Cold Storage Cars for Dairy Produce, Number, &c. (Ques.) 1688 (i).
'Montcalm,' Str., Services as an Ice-breaker, in Com. of Sup., 2941 (ii).
Quebec Colonization Societies, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 684 (i).
Quebec Port Improvements, Expenditure, since Confederation (M. for ret.*) 697 (i).
——— Sums expended for Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).

SUPPLY—
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4038, 4172 (ii); Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2941 (ii).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F., *Lambton W.*

Budget, The, 5364 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12859 (vii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1424 (i); on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5910 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11834 (vi).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett)—(remarks) 6749 (iv).

Erie, London & Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s (B. 51) 1°*, 1108 (i).

'Golspie,' Str., Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3020 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4137 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2955; (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12106 (vii); (Tiffin) 5711 (iii).

PARENT, Mr. G., *Montmorency.*

Quebec Bridge Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13411 (vii).

PARMELEE, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*

Printing of Parliament, 5th Rep. of Com. (peresented) 10915 (vi).

PATERSON, Hon. W. (Minister of Customs) *Brant.*

Absinthe and Brandy imported, Total Amount, &c. (Ans.) 689 (i).

Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, (Ans.) 1112 (i).

American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c. (Ans.) 3485 (ii).

Anthracite Coal, Quantitv imported from U. S. and other Countries (Ans.) 1511 (i).

'Arctic,' Str., Payments *re* Supplies (remarks) 4163 (ii).

Aylmer Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1506 (i).

Bernier, Capt., Customs Ports opened, &c. (Ans.) 5208 (iii).

Brass, Quantity and Quality, Importation into Can. (Ans.) 6232 (iv).

Budget. The, 5296 (iii).

Butter and Cheese exported from Prov. of Quebec, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 2163 (ii).

Butter Imports, Quantity, and Countries of Origin (Ans.) 1116 (i).

Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 3847 (ii).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Cattle, Exports and Imports from Canada to G. B. (Ans.) 6460 (iv).

Cattle exported to U. S. during Years 1900-07, Value &c. (Ans.) 1508 (i).

Cattle Registered, Importations from U. S. (Ans.) 6238 (iv).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10746 (iv).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9139 (v).

Coasting Trade *re* Norwegian Ships (Ans.) 6237 (iv).

Coasting Trade, O.Cs. *re* Foreign Vessels, &c. (Ans.) 4586 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. (B. 194) Res. prop., 11233, in Com. on Res., 11312, 1°*, of B., 11315; in Com., 11980 (vi).

Customs Brokers, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).

Customs Defalcations in Huntingdon, B.C., Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9442 (v).

Customs Dept., Criticism by Civil Service Rep., 10448 (vi).

Customs Dept., Criticism, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10448 (vi).

Customs Duties on Militia Uniforms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Supply (remarks) 10133 (v).

Customs and Excise Revenue, Amount received from June 1 to 15, 1908 (Ans.) 10791 (vi).

Customs Frauds in Montreal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9563 (v).

Customs Inspectors, and Rep. of Civil Service Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9555 (v).

Customs Officers at Niagara Falls, Fort Erie, &c., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 6980 (iv).

Customs Officers at Windsor, Age and Salary (Ans.) 12656 (vii).

Customs Outside Service, Ports, &c., 9220 (v).

Cotton, Raw, Imported from U. S. during 1905-7, &c. (Ans.) 1511 (i).

Customs, Receipts and Expenditures for 1907-8 (Ans.) 12655 (vii).

Customs Statistics, Duplicating with Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).

Detroit River Tunnel, Materials entered free of Duty (Ans.) 10254 (v).

—— Material imported, &c. (Ans.) 4583 (iii).

—— Duties on Construction Materials (Ans.) 1117 (i), 3841 (ii).

—— (statement) 13524 (vii).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. at Windsor Customs (Ans.) 7201 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12951 (vii).

Dredging Companies, Insinuations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Customs Duties, &c. (Ans.) 13061 (vii).

Fire Extinguishers File, Cor., &c., quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7792 (iv).

Fish Exportations from Man., to March, 1907, Value, &c. (Ans.) 4240 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 1257 (i); on M. for 1°, 3507, 3567; in Com. 3588 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Products, &c., on M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 852 (i).

Fraser, Donald, Customs Collector, Investigation *re* Defalcations (Ans.) 5200 (iii).

—— Dismissal from Customs Service (Ans.) 5474 (iii).

See 'Customs Defalcations.'

French Books, Reduction of Customs *re* French Treaty (Ans.) 2160 (ii).

German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 689 (i).

Glucose, Quantity imported from G. B. (Ans.) 6980 (iv).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2249 (ii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4226 (iii).

Honey Imports from 1898-1908, Amount, Value. &c. (Ans.) 8177 (iv).

Hoppins, Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Horses and Cattle imported from U. S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of (Ans.) 6001 (iii).

Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8 (Ans.) 11703 (vi).

Imports and Exports, Sept. 30 and Oct. 30th, 1907 (Ans.) 350 (i).

—— Values from June to Dec., 1907 (Ans). 1113 (i).

Imports from France for last five years, &c. (Ans.) 1124 (i).

Imports for Home Consumption, Value, &c., for 1897-8 (Ans.) 13063 (vii).

Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7 (Ans.) 898 (i).

Literature distributed through Customs and Mails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9104 (v).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).

Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 8442 (v).

Mess Pork, Quantity imported from U. S. (Ans.) 5650 (iii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4067 (ii).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9220 (v).

Opium, Amount of Duty received, Pet. from B. C. *re* Prohibition (Ans.) 8614 (v).

Pacaud, Benj., Apptmt. to Customs at Windsor (Ans.) 5200 (iii).

Pepin, J. E., Emplymt. at Customs Office in Windsor (Ans.) 7202 (iv).

Pork, Fresh, Imported for Home Consumption (Ans.) 5650 (iii).

Port, South Bar, C. B., Number of Vessels entered for Customs, &c. (Ans.) 9271 (v).

Posters, Prohibition *re* Indecent Ones, Tariff *re* (Ans.) 6462 (iv).

Prince Rupert Customs Collector, Transfer of Mr. McDonald (Ans.) 6402 (iv).

Pulp Wood exported to U. S., Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 1511 (i).

Quebec Bridge Material, Total Amount of Customs Duties *re* (Ans.) 5200, 5793 (iii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4977 (iii).

Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils imported from G. B. in 1904-5-6-7 (Ans.) 1506 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Port, Quantity of Farm Produce entered, &c. (Ans.) 898 (i).

Seed Grain for Settlers in N. W., Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2932 (ii).

Sugar Imports for 1898, Total Amount (Ans.) 13065 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 637 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9536; Miscellaneous (Guarantee Cos.) 9577; (cruisers) 9578; (legal expenses) 9578; (printing, &c.) 9577; Outside Service (salaries) 9226, 9442 (v).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2964 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8530 (v); Ont. (Brantford) 7465 (iv).

Trade and Nav. Returns (presented) 7 (i).

Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties (Ans.) 8616 (v).

Venoit, Mr. P. G., Complaints *re* Interference in Politics (Ans.) 6406, 7730 (iv).

Wallace, Michael J., Employment in Customs at Windsor (Ans.) 7500 (iv).

Wheat Transportation from N.W. and Financial Aid, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2196 (ii).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada (Ans.) 5201 (iii).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil.*

Address, The, 449 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3873 (ii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12866 (vii).

Chicoutimi Boom, Payments from Pulp Co., &c. (Ques.) 8174 (iv).

Civil Service Commission's Report, Inquiry for, 90 (i).

Coal Lands, Purchases on Sections 27, 28, 33 and 34, &c., Payments *re* (Ques.) 10512 (vi).

Corry Building, Total Rental by Govt., Taxes, &c. (Ques.) 11938 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1818 (i).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Consent from Chief *re* Sale of Timber (Ques.) 8175 (iv).

——— Notice of Sale, Names of Newspapers, &c. (Ques.) 7500 (iv).

——— Sale of Timber, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7801 (iv).

——— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender (Ques.) 10512 (vi).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2256 (ii); in Com., 12073 (vii).

Mining Rights in Sections 17, 20, 21, &c., Applications, Leases, &c. (M. for copies*) 3851 (ii).

Mining Rights on Sections 20, 28 and 32, Original Grantees, Transfer, &c. (Ques.) 3238 (ii).

Postal Stamps, Special Issue (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).

Public Works Dept. Expenditures, on M. for Sup., 4868; (amt.) 4886; Neg. (Y.43; N. 99) 4959 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10637 (vi).

Saguenay Boom and Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amounts paid Govt. *re* (Ques.) 183 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4140 (ii).

Post Office (inspection) 9115; (mail service) 9119 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg military) 10971 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N. W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10978 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11010 (vi); (mint) 1453 (i); (rents, &c.) 10999; (telephones) 11012 (vi).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Timber Licenses in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Renewals, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).

Timber Limits, Leasing, Alienation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2310 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c. (explanation) *re* Mr. McDonald's letter, 2679 (ii).

PICKUP, Mr. S. W. W., *Annapolis.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12874 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10559 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Annapolis) 11211; (Round Hill) 11283 (vi).

PORTER, Mr. E. G., *Hastings, W.*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4851 (iii).

Belleville City, Flood Investigation by Govt. (remarks) 3319 (ii).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4744 (iii).

Belleville Drill Hall, Negotiations for Site, &c. (Ques.) 1509 (i).

——— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley (Ques.) 1737 (i).

Belleville Harbour, Issue of Bonds, &c. (Ques.) 6237 (iv).

——— Revenue and Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2983 (ii).

——— Delay, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).

——— Total Revenue, for 1903-7, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2592 (ii).

Belleville Hospital Lot, Purchase Price, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 5211 (iii).

Belleville Post Office, Excessive Postage, &c. (remarks) 7933 (iv).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s (B. 20) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 7669 (iv), 8552, 8609, 9066 (v).

——— on Order being called for 2°, 681 (i).

Bell Rapids P. O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8883 (v).

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Connection (remarks) 1437 (i).

Buell, W. S., Emplymt. *re* Telephone Commission (Ques.) 10011 (v).

Commissions appointed between 1896 and 1908, Costs, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).

——— Ret., Inquiry for, 6288, 7447 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (amt.) 11892 (vi).

Fruit Marks Act Prosecutions, Violation *re* Apples, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii)

Hintz, Fred., Location of Homestead (Ques.) 3235 (ii), 6238 (iv).

PORTER, Mr. E. G.—*Con.*

Homestead Entries, Records of Payments, of Scale by Peter Luenson to F. Heintz, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1294 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (milk) Amt. (B. 64) 1° m., 1283 (i); on Order for 2°, 5226 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4673 (iii).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R. M. C., on M. for Sup., 1031 (i).

Land Entries of T. J. Oliver and Fred. Hintz, Cancellation of, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

N.B. Cold Storage Plants, Bonuses by Govt. (Ques.) 9272 (v).

——— Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9372, 9390 (v).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4701 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8862 (v).

Section 32, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 8383 (v).

SUPPLY—

Post Office (clerical assistance) 8883 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8525 (v); (Winnipeg hospital) 10967 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 7455 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11078 (vi).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11072 (vi).

Trent Valley Canal Contracts, Deposits, &c. (Ques.) 1734 (i).

POWER, Mr. W., *Quebec, W.*

Quebec Ry. Light and Power Co.'s (B. 73) 1°*, 1584 (i).

PRINGLE, Mr. R. A., *Stormont.*

Audit and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12658 (vii).

Bank Act Amendment (prop. res.) 4248 (iii).

Banking Systems, Par. in 'Financial Post,' Ques. of Priv., 4770 (iii).

——— Ques. of Privilege *re* Newspaper Reports, 2306 (ii).

See 'Wheat.'

Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of Mr. E. B. Walker, Ques. of Priv., 6005 (iii).

Civil Service Bill, Physical Fitness (remarks) 11017 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Arrangements with Mfg. Cos. *re* Water Power (remarks) 13084 (vii).

——— Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. on Sup., 12201 (vii).

——— Opening (remarks) 12660 (vii).

——— Payment of Dues on Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).

PRINGLE, Mr. R. A.—*Con.*

Deep Waterways Commission, Damming St. Lawrence River at Long Sault (remarks) 13146 (vii).

Dominion Guarantee Co.'s (B. 127) in Com., 6183 (iii), 6231 (iv); on Senate Amts., 12772 (vii).

——— (B. 211) M. to suspend Rule, 12836 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13270 (vii).

London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Co.'s incorp. (B. 129) 1°*, 5255 (iii).

'Montcalm,' Str., Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1899 (i).

Old Age Pension Scheme (M.) for Sel. Com., 2398 (ii).

——— Progress *re* (remarks) 12660 (vii).

——— (remarks) 7722 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Marine—(ice-breakers) 1899 (i).

Wheat Transportation from West, Financial Aid *re* (Ques.) 173 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2204 (ii).

PROULX, Mr. E., *Prescott.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Chute à Blondeau) 12094 (vii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W. (Minister of Public Works) *St. John City and County.*

Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6232 (iv).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4723 (iii).

Allan, Mr., Interference in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 615 (i).

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. B. 141 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Anse. St. Jean Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).

Architects on Public Works, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).

Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 2392, 3040 (ii).

Bell Memorial Association (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11207 (vi).

Bell River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 685 (i).

Belleville Drill Hall, Negotiations for Site, &c. (Ans.) 1509 (i).

——— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley (Ans.) 1738 (i).

Belleville Hospital Lot, Purchase Price, &c. (Ans.) 4830 (iii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 8557, 9067 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Bic Wharf, Materials supplied, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ans.) 9713 (v).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5943 (iii).

Booms in International Streams, Regulation (B. 105) 1° m., 3654 (ii).

Brighton Wharf, Repairs to (remarks) 5913 (iii).

Bronze Coat-of-Arms, Duty *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7151 (iv).

Buildings, Administrative, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Buildings, Construction of, Papers laid on Table, 12771 (vii).

Burlington Channel Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman (Ans.) 4404 (iii).

Campbellton Wharf, Contract *re* Piling (Ans.) 8612 (v).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).

C.P.R., Plaster Rock Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).

Canadian Timber used in Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11208 (vi).

Caron and Thiberge, Messrs., Employmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 10517 (vi).

Cement Testing Laboratory, Cost. &c. (statement) in Com. of Sup., 11250 (vi).

—— Purposes of Vote (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11206 (vi).

'Challenge,' Dredge, Quantity of Material removed (Ans.) 12651 (vii).

Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 686 (i).

Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection (Ans.) 5202 (iii).

Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Construction (Ans.) 7937 (iv).

Chicoutimi Boom and Pulp Co.'s Payments, &c. (Ans.) 8175 (iv).

Chicoutimi Dredging Contract, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ans.) 7203 (iv).

Chicoutimi Public Expenditure, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Taylor) 13204 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5895 (iii).

Clarke City, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ans.) 2394 (ii).

Clerk of Works *re* Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).

Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 695 (i).

Clinton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract, &c. (Ans.) 4832 (iii).

Cloutier, J. E., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 8380 (v).

Cobourg Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 359 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Colchester Point, Pier, Essex County, Amt. expended (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

Conry Building, Total Annual Rental, Taxes, &c. (Ans.) 11938 (vi).

Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to (Ans.) 9277 (v).

Côté, Boivin & Co., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 12650 (vii).

Dauphin Public Building, Valuation of Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).

Deep Waterways Commission, on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) *re* Progress (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services, &c. (Ans.) 1736 (i).

Deschambault Wharf, Tenders, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 5465 (iii).

Documents, Production of Originals, Announcement *re* (remarks) 1426 (i).

—— Production in Committees, 1428 (i).

—— Taken from Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 2308 (ii).

Dorval, Dredging at St. Lawrence Yacht Club (Ans.) 13060 (vii).

Dredges, registered in Canada (Ans.) 11497 (vi).

Dredging at Becancour, Blanche, &c., during 1907 (Ans.) 2392, 3040 (ii).

Dredging at Fort William, Amount paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co. (Ans.) 8839 (v).

Dredging at Port Arthur and Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 8618 (v).

Dredging Contract, O.C. *re*, on Inquiry for, 6927 (iv).

Dredging Contracts at Midland, &c., Advertisements for Tenders (remarks) 7195 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments (Ans) 9711 (v).

—— O.C. *re* (remarks) 6853 (iv).

—— O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6745-6816 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co. (Ans.) 1737 (i).

Dredging Contracts (remarks) 7105 (iv).

—— Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6633 (iv).

—— Tenders *re* (remarks) 9773 (v).

Dredging in Ont. and Que., for 1907-8, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 10008 (v).

Dredging in Quebec Prov., Claims Pending, &c. (Ans.) 7200 (iv).

Dredging Instructions to Inspectors, Circular (read) in Com. of Sup., 12043 (vi).

Dredging Tenders, on Inquiry for Ret., 8696 (v).

Dredging Work at Nicolet River, &c. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).

Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c. (Ans.) 178 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Drill Halls, Ret., on Inquiry for, 4834, 5659 (iii), 6222 (iv).

Eclipse Co. of Ottawa, Payments to (Ans.) 6461 (iv).

——— Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13279

Fair Wages Schedule on Dredging Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 7200 (iv).

Farnham Post Office, Vote *re* Improvements (Ans.) 6399 (iv).

'Fielding,' Dredge, Number of Days working (Ans.) 7199 (iv).

Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., Number, &c. (Ans.) 1510 (i).

——— Explanation *re* Purchases, 5658 (iii).

——— Ret., on Inquiry for, 4833 (iii).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7643 (iv).

Floods at Chatham and Belleville (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4745 (iii).

Fortier, Mr. Eugene, Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 8613 (v).

Foster, Frederick, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

Garthby, Govt. Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c. (Ans.) 3844 (ii).

Gatineau Point Bridge, Amount contributed by Govt. (Ans.) 355 (i).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 654 (i).

Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) on Conc., 13568 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Report *re* Estimated Cost (remarks) 12053 (vii).

——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 12836 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Survey, Final Report, &c. (Ans.) 240 (i), 5465 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for, 1740 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 8378 (v).

——— Rep. of Surveys, on Inquiry for (Mr. White) 11827 (vi).

Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3423 (ii).

Govt. Employees, and Provincial Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10989 (vi).

Grand Bend Pier, Final Estimate *re* (Ans.) 8891 (v).

——— Ret., Delays, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).

Grand Manan Telegraph System, Application *re* Leasing (Ans.) 6463 (iv).

Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 8382 (v).

Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 13059 (vii).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale (B. 89) M. for Com. on Res., 2221; 1°*, 2260 (ii); in Com., 12060 (vii).

See 'Major's Hill Park.'

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8130, 8745, 9462 (iv).

——— Ques. of Order *re* 'Imputing Motives,' 8134 (iv).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).

Gravenhurst Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).

Hackett Dock, Purchase of (Ans.) 7730 (iv).

Halifax Customs House, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 7212 (iv).

Higgin's Shore Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension (Ans.) 695 (i).

Hillsborough Bridge Return, on Inquiry for, 6160 (iii).

Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10498 (vi).

——— Allotment of Rooms in New Wing (remarks) 5729 (iii).

——— Ventilation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10978 (vi), 13340 (vii).

See 'Postal,' 'Restaurent.'

Howard's Cape, Wharf, Pet. *re* Investigation (Ans.) 11702 (vi).

Hudson, Dredging, 1907, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4587 (iii).

Hunter, Mr. J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1459 (i), 5698 (iii).

Indian Lands, B.C., Provincial Rights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 631 (i).

Inspectors of Public Works, Apptmts. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5678 (iii).

Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond (Ans.) 5792 (iii).

Inverness Public Building, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5998 (iii).

I.C.R., Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13489 (vii).

——— Hard Pine Tenders, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3233 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4451 (iii).

Interprovincial Ry. Bridge Co., N.B., Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Jesus River, Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan (Ans.) 6980 (iv).

Juvenile Delinquents, B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12406 (vii).

'King Edward,' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour (Ans.) 13063 (vii).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1038 (i).

Lachine Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12098 (vii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of (Ans.) 8176 (iv).

Lafferty, Thos., Payment for Removal of Snags in St. John River (Ans.) 8379 (v).

Lake Francois Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12139 (vii).

Lake Megantic, Public Works, Total Cost to date, &c. (Ans.) 11299 (vi).

Leonardville Wharf, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ans.) 6463 (iv).

Loggieville, Dredging, Payments *re* (Ans.) 9472 (v).

'Lord Kitchener,' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services (Ans.) 7198 (iv).

Major's Hill Park and G.T.Ry. Co.'s Hotel, Sale (B. 89) prop. Res., 1584 (i).
See 'G.T.R.'

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12799 (vii).

Matchedash Bay, Dredging done at Fesserton, &c. (Ans.) 566 (i).

Medicine Hat, Building, Contract *re* Heating System (Ans.) 10791 (vi).

Midland and Tiffin Dredging, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 3428 (ii).

—— Expenditure *re* Dredging, 1907 (Ans.) 8181 (iv).

Midland Harbour, Tenders for Dredging (Ans.) 8893 (v).

Milford Haven Wharf, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 13060 (vii).

'Montague,' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 182 (i), 8172 (iv).

Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction of, &c. (Ans.) 1288 (i).

Montmorency Falls, Walls, Length, &c. (Ans.) 12410 (vii).

Montreal-'Gazette,' Building, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 3900 (ii).

Montreal Harbour and St. Lawrence River, Dredging and Elevator Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

Montreal Post Office Addition, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 6922 (iv).

Monuments to McGee and Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13352 (vii).

N. B. Cold Storage Co., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9376 (v).

N. B. Inland Water Wharfs, Construction Policy (Ans.) 5465 (iii).

N. B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3663 (ii).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7134 (iv).

Nicolet County, Govt. Expenditures from 1896-1908 (Ans.) 12775 (vii).

—— Dredging, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4588 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Nicolet Post Office, Contracts, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3838 (ii).

Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

—— Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3840 (ii).

Nicolet River Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

North East Harbour Wharf, Total Length (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

Notre Dame du Portage Wharf, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 6460 (iv).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7725 (iv).

Office Specialty Co., Quantity of Goods supplied Govt. (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

Ont. and Quebec Dredging, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 9276 (v).

Order, Ques. of, Withdrawal of word 'grafter,' 10994 (vi).

Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging (Ans.) 11496 (vi).

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. at Nicolet Post Office (Ans.) 11702 (vi).

Ottawa Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Owen Sound Public Building, Contract *re* Extension (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

—— Inspector, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

—— Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 2792 (ii).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6231 (iv).

Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of (Ans.) 1940 (i).

Petawawa Dock, Tenders *re* Improvements (Ans.) 685 (i).

Petit Rocher Breakwater, Return (remarks) 7108 (iv).

—— Incomplete Return (remarks) 5725 (iii).

—— on Inquiry for, 6464 (iv).

—— Papers laid on Table, 10402 (vi).

—— Statement as to Missing Letters (remarks) 9716 (v).

Pictou Post Office, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost (Ans.) 10518 (vi).

Pinette Harbour, Pets. *re* Dredging (Ans.) 685 (i).

Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Construction, &c. (Ans.) 3898 (ii).

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau (Ans.) 8839 (v).

—— Date of Contract (Ans.) 9268 (v).

—— Tenders, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1734 (i)

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Number of Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2394 (ii).

Port Arthur Dredging, Contracts, Securities, &c. (Ans.) 697 (i).

Port Bruce Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2389 (ii).

Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* Improvements (Ans.) 4403 (iii).

Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10513 (vi).

Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4828 (iii).

Port Hood Harbours, Closing of Northern Entrance (Ans.) 10255 (v).

Port St. Francois Wharf, Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3424 (ii).

Port Stanley Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 240 (i).

Port Vernon Bridge, Completion of Works, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 4404 (iii).

Postal Service in House of Com. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).

Presbyterian College, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7669 (iv).

P.E.I., Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1686 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Ret., 2172 (ii).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 8696, 9893 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).

P.E.I., Souris Breakwater, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 1685 (i).

Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7192 (iv).

Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Public Works Dept., New Apptmts. (Ans.) 13061 (vii).

——— Employees at Hamilton, Delay in Pay (remarks) 10016, 10119 (v).

——— Estimates, Discussions *re* (remarks) 5661 (iii).

——— Ret., on Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).

Quebec County, Govt. Expenditures, on M. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4896 (iii).

Quebec County, Govt. Expenditures, on M. (Mr. Robitaille) for Ret., 3853 (ii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).

Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13291 (vii).

Quebec Port, Sums expended for Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10649 (vi).

Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re* (Ans.) 4588 (iii).

——— correcting answer, 5658 (iii).

Red Head Wharf, N.S., Total Expenditure (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Reinhardt, Paul, Emplymt. in Provincial Elections, Hull (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10988 (vi).

Representation from the Mar. Provs., Ques. of Priv., 9892 (v).

Restaurant of House of Com. and Senate, Joint Com. (M.) 13224 (vii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 2385, 3581 (ii).

Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary as Port Physician (Ans.) 6000 (iii), 6232 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vi).

Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5467 (iii).

Rimouski Dredging, &c., *re* Landing of 'Lady Evelyn' (Ans.) 7727 (iv).

Rimouski Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10013 (v).

Rivard, Mr. S., Apptmt. as Supt. of Nicolet Post Office (Ans.) 11702 (vi).

Rivière à la Graisse, Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 686 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 3689 (ii).

Rivière du Loup Post Office, Improvement to Grounds (Ans.) 6399 (iv).

——— Wharf, Total Amount of Dredging (Ans.) 6462 (iv).

Ruscomb River Works, Estimate of Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1122 (i).

St. Andrews Rapids Improvement Co., Land Grant to Great Falls Power Co. (Ans.) 238 (i).

St. Anicet Wharf, Expenditure by Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

St. Boniface Public Building, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 5999 (iii).

St. Francis River, Melbourne Pier, Removal of Rock, &c. (Ans.) 6918 (iv).

——— Richmond Pier, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 6641, 6919 (iv).

St. Fulgence Pier, Signatures on Pay List, &c. (Ans.) 1116 (i).

St. John, N.B., Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co. (Ans.) 11700 (vi).

St. John Port, Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 11497 (vi).

St. John River, Snags, Removal of, Tender *re* (Ans.) 3478 (ii).

St. Joseph's Wharf, Payments to *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 8890 (v).

St. Laurent Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 896, 1121 (i).

St. Laurent Wharf, Lake Manitoba (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).

St. Mary's Post Office, Total Cost (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

——— Items *re* Expenditure of $658.03 (Ans.) 11937 (vi).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Saguenay and Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amounts paid for Use of Boom, &c. (Ans.) 183 (i).

Saguenay Dredging, Purchase of Coal, &c. (Ans.) 8380 (v).

——— 'Storm King,' Tug, Emplymt. of (Ans.) 8381 (v).
See 'Chicoutimi.'

Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c. (Ans.) 7201 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7675, 7722 (iv), 8563, 9068 (v).

Scotch Town Wharf, Application (Ans.) 7202 (iv).

Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ans.) 6463 (iv).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5425, 5520 (iii).

'Sir Wilfrid Laurier,' Dredge, Completion, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 5207 (iii).

Skinner's Cove, Boat Channel, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10012 (v).

Snag Boat, Red River, Construction of, &c. (Ans.) 567, 891 (i).

Souris Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 1939 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12599 (vii).

Spanish River Dredging, Amount expended (Ans.) 4764 (iii).

'Speedy,' Str., Purchase, Commission, &c. (Ans.) 565 (i), 3844 (ii).

Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, (Ans.) 2392 (ii).

Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5564, 5787 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 638 (i), 12917 (vii).

Indians—N. B. (salaries) 12737; (schools) 13172 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5766 (iii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13153 (vii).

Public Works—(Ass't. Dep. Minister) 5698 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Chilliwack) 13338 (vii); (Cranbrook) 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii); (Cumberland) 10864 (vi); (Fernie) 5706 (iii), 10866 (vi); (Grand Forks) 13338; (Greenwood) 13338 (vii); (Ladysmith) 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii); (Quesnel) 10867 (vi); (Revelstoke) 13339 (vii); (Vancouver) 10868 (v), 13339 (vii); (Vernon) 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii); (Victoria) 10883; (Victoria, immigration) 10874; (William's Head) 10883 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886; (cattle quarantine stations) 11008; (experimental farms, repairs) 10904 (vi), 13339 (vii); (furniture) 11007; (immigration, repairs) 11008; (post office fittings) 11007; (quarantine stations)

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

11008; (rents, &c.) 10981; List read, 10998; (repairs) 10886 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 8517 (v), 10953, 10974; (Dauphin) 8519 (v); (Elmwood) 13335 (vii); Emerson) 8534 (v), 13335 (vii); (Neepawa) 8536 (v), 13336; (Portage la Prairie) 13336 (vii); (St. Boniface) 8566; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Souris) 13336; (Winnipeg) 13336 (vii); (Winnipeg hospital) 10955 (vi); (Winnipeg immigration) 8573 (v); (Winnipeg military) 10969 (vi); (Winnipeg P. O.) 8575; (Winnipeg warehouse) 8566 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 13328; (Fredericton) 13328; (Grand Falls) 13328; (Hillsborough) 13328; (Moncton) 13328 (vii); (quarantine, steam sterilizer) 7187; (quarantine, water service) 7186; (St. John) 7186 (iv), 13329 (vii); (St. John, military) 7186 (iv); (St. John, quarantine station) 5703 (iii); (Tracadie Lazaretto) 7187 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10975 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Antigonish) 7110; (Bridgewater) 7135; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax, customs) 7144; (Halifax, immigration) 7143; (Halifax, military) 7143; (Halifax, quarantine) 7171; (Inverness) 7172 (iv); (Lunenburg) 13326; (Parrsboro) 13327 (vii); (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv); (Wolfville) 13327 (vii); (Yarmouth) 7180 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Arnprior) 7454; (Belleville) 7678; (Belleville armoury) 7455; (Brantford) 7455; (Dom. renewals) 7467; (Glencoe) 7473 (iv), 13331; (Guelph) 13331 (vii); (Guelph, armoury) 7678; (Hamilton, drill hall) 7692; (Hamilton, post office) 7696 (iv); (Harriston) 13331 (vii); (Kincardine) 7698; (Kingston) 7814; (Kingston, artillery park) 7701; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700; (Kingston, hospital) 7702 (iv); (Kingston, magazine) 10907; (Kingston, militia stores) 10907 (vi); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7702 (iv), 10907 (vi); (Leamington) 7705, 7815 (iv), 13331; (Listowel) 13331 (vii); (London, magazine) 7705; (London, military) 7706; (Markham) 7709 (iv), 13331; (Mitchell) 13332; (Mount Forest) 13331; (Niagara) 13332 (vii); (North Bay) 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii); (Owen Sound) 7817 (iv); (Park Hill) 13332 (vii); (Peterborough) 13332 (vii); (Port Arthur) 7825 (iv), 13332 (vii); (Renfrew) 7825 (iv); (St. Mary's) 7826 (iv); (Sarnia) 7829 (iv), 13333; (Seaforth) 13332 (vii); (Simcoe) 7830 (iv), 13333; (Sudbury) 13333 (vii); (Tilsonburg) 13333 (vii); (Uxbridge) 13333 (vii); (Walkerville) 13333 (vii); (Waterloo) 13333 (vii); (Welland) 7830 (iv); (Whitby) 7833 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives) 5700 (iii); (deptl. buildings) 1505 (i), (eastern block) 1504 (i); (elevator attendants) 11011 (vi); (grounds) 11012 (vi); (heating, &c.) 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii); (House of Commons, addition) 1486 (i); (improvements, &c.) 5707 (iii); (lighting) 11011 (vi); (Major's Hill park) 11015 (vi); (mint) 1451, 1474 (i);

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(museum) 1489 (i), 13477 (vii); (new deptl. building) 5701 (iii); (observatory) 1450, 1485 (i); (post office) 5705 (iii); (printing bureau, motors) 7817 (iv); (rents, &c.) 5706 (iii); (repairs, furniture. &c.) 10981 (vi); (Rideau Hall) 11005 (vi); (skylights) 7816 (iv); (telephones) 11012 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7183 (iv)..

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaskaville) 13329 (vii); (Chicoutimi) 7279 (iv); (Cookshire) 7281 (iv); (Dominion, renewals) 7286 (iv); (Dundee) 7286 (iv); (Farnham) 7287 (iv); (Grand Mere) 13329 (vii); (Grosse Isle) 7289, 7290 (iv); (Joliette) 13329 (vii); (Knowlton) 7290 (iv), 13329 (vii); (Lachute) 7293 (iv). 13329 (vii); (Lake Megantic) 7294 (iv); (Levis) 7294 (iv), 13329 (vii); (Longueuil) 7304 (iv); (Magog) 7306 (iv); 13329 (vii); (Marieville) 7306 (iv); (Megantic) 13330 (vii); (Montreal, barracks) 7407 (iv); (Montreal, examining warehouse) 7423 (iv); (Montreal, military) 7418 (iv); (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5703 (iii); (Montreal, postal station) 7418 (iv); (Montreal, post office) 7410 (iv); (Montreal, station C) 7419 (iv); (Nicolet) 7428 (iv); (Plessisville) 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii); (Point St. Charles) 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii); (Quebec Citadel) 7430 (iv); (Que. Dominion arsenal) 7435 (iv); (Quebec, drill hall) 7431 (iv); (Quebec, hospital) 7433 (iv); (Quebec, immigrants) 7432 (iv); (Quebec, warehouse) 7432 (iv); (Roberval) 13330 (vii); (St. Henri) 7439 (iv); (St. Hyacinthe) 7440 (iv); (St. John's, military) 7440 (iv); (St. John's, post office) 7444 (iv); (St. Rochs) 7438 (iv); (St. Therese) 13330 (vii); (Shawenegan) 13330 (vii); (Sherbrooke) 13330 (vii); (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 7439 (iv); (Three Rivers) 13330 (vii); (Westmount) 13331 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 8576 (v); (Calgary) 8578 (v); (Edmonton) 5706 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii); (Estevan) 8581 (v), 13336 (vii); (Humboldt) 8582 (v); (Lethbridge) 13336 (vii); (Maple Creek) 8600 (v), 13337 (vii); (Medicine Hat) 8601 (v); (Moose Jaw) 13336 (vii); (Prince Albert) 13337 (vii); (Prince Albert, penitentiary) 8601 (v); (Regina) 8602 (v); (Saskatoon) 8602 (v), 13337 (i); (Strathcona) 13338 (vii); (Wetaskiwin) 13338 (vii); (Yorkton) 8603)v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's residence) 10883 (vi); (Dawson) 13339 (vii); (maintenance) 11005 (vi).

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (North Thompson river) 13352 (vii); Mar. Provs. (new plant) 12143 (vii); Ont. and Que. (generally) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Spillumcheen) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 11694, 12032 (vi); (graving docks) 5731 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Grand Marais) 12140 (vii); (Lake Dauphin) 12141 (vii); (St. Andrew's rapids) 5701 (iii), 12145 (v); Winnipegosis Lake) 12141 (vii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 12028 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Beaver) 13344 (vii); (Buctouche) 11679 (vi); (Campbellton) 13344 (vii); (Campbellton wharf) 11685 (vi); (Caraquet) 11685 (vi); (Dorchester) 13344 (vii); (Dover wharf) 11692 (vi); (Harvey) 13344 (vii); (Leonardsville) 13344 (vii); (Lorneville) 13344 (vii); (Lower Newcastle) 11696 (vi); (Madawaska) 11696 (vi), 13344; (Miscou) 13344 (vii); (Moncton) 11696 (vi); (New Mills) 13345 (vii); (Richibucto) 11698 (vi); (St. Andrews) 12011 (vi); (St. John) 11698 (vi); (St. John, harbour) 12011 (vi); (St. John, improvements) 5708 (iii); (St. John, surveys) 13346 (vii); (St. John, tidal waters) 12000 (vi); (St. John, wharfs) 13345 (vii); (Shippegan) 12027 (vi); (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11207 (vi); (Baddeck) 11219 (vi); (Barachois) 11224 (vi); (Bay St. Lawrence) 11224 (vi); (Big Lorraine) 11224 (vi); (Breton Cove) 11224 (vi); (Cape St. Mary) 11224 (vi); (Caribou Island causeway) 11224 (vi); (Charlos cove) 11225 (vi); (Church Point) 11225 (vi); (Cow Bay) 11225 (vi); (Digby) 11226 (vi); (dredging) 13340 (vii); (Glace Bay) 11228 (vi); (Hall's Harbour) 11228 (vi); (McPherson's cove) 11229 (vi); (Margaree) 11229 (vi); (Middle River) 11230 (vi); (New Glasgow) 11257 (vi); (Oyster Pond) 11258 (vi); (Parker's Cove) 11258 (vi); (Parrsborough) 11259 (vi); (Poirierville pier) 11260 (v); (Porter's Lake) 11260 (vi); (Port Hastings) 11265 (vi); (Port Hilford) 11267 (vi); (Port Hood) 11268 (vi); (Port Joli West) 11279 (vi); (Port Royal) 11278 (vi); (Portuguese cove) 11279 (vi); (Pugwash wharf) 11280 (vi); (Round Hill) 11282 (vi); (Skinner's cove) 11290 (vi); (Sydney wharf) 11230 (vi); (Tancook island) 11230 (vi); (Tatamagouche) 11291 (vi); (Yarmouth) 11291 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Beaverton) 12090 (vii); (Belle River) 12090 (vii); (Blanche River) 12090 (vii); (Blind River) 12091 (vii); (Bronte) 12092 (vii); (Bronte, dredging) 5708 (iii); (Burlington) 12092 (vii); (Chute a Blondeau) 12092 (vii); (Cobourg) 12095 (vii); (Colborne) 12095 (vii); (Collingwood) 12096 (vii); (Georgian Bay surveys) 13326 (vii); (Goderich) 12101 (vii); (Goderich, breakwater) 13350 (vii); (Gore's Landing) 12101 (vii); (Juniper Island) 13350 (vii); (Lakefield) 13350 (vii); (Little Current) 13350 (vii); (McGregor's Creek) 12103 (vii); (Magnetawan) 13350 (vii); (Meaford) 12103 (vii); (Michipicoten) 13350 (vii); (Midland and Tiffin) 12105 (vii); (Petawawa) 12133 (vii); (Peterborough) 12133 (vii); (Point Edward) 5713 (iii); (Port Arthur, &c.) 12144 (vii); (Port Burwell) 12135 (vii); (Port Colborne) 12146 (vii); (Port Credit) 12102 (vii); (Port Hope) 12135 (vii); (Port Stanley) 12136 (vii); (Rainy River) 12136 (vii); (Roche's Point) 12136 (vii); (Ron-

PUGSLEY. Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

deau) 12137 (vii); (Rossport) 12137 (vii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 12137 (vii); (Severn) 12137 (vii); (Smeeth and McGillicuddy) 13350 (vii); (Southampton) 12137 (vii); (Stanley Island pier) 5720 (iii); (Temiskaming Lake) 13350 (vii); (Tiffin) 13351 (vii); (Tiffin, dredging) 5709 (iii); (Tobermory) 13351 (vii); (Toronto) 12137 (vii); (Victoria) 12137 (vii); (Winnipeg River) 12138 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (McPherson's cove) 11292 (vi); (New London) 11292 (vi); (repairs) 11292 (vi); (Rustico) 11293 (vi); (Souris) 13341 (vii); (Summerside) 13343 (vii).

Public Works Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a la Barbe) 12028 (vi); (Anse a l'Ilot) 12029 (vi); (Baie St. Paul) 12029 (vi); (Barachois de Malbaie) 12029 (vi); (Batiscan) 12029 (vi); (Batiscan, river) 12036 (vi); (Berthier) 12029 (vi); (Bic wharf) 12030 (vi); (Bonaventure) 12036 (vi); (Cap St. Ignace) 12030 (vi); (Chateauguay) 12030 (vi); (Chicoutimi) 12030 (vi); (Clarke City) 12031 (vi); (East Templeton) 12031 (vi); (Escoumains) 12031 (vi); (Father Point) 12031 (vi); (Grand Mechins) 12031 (vi); (Grande Riviere) 12031 (vi); (Lake Aylmer) 12032 (vi); (Lake Megantic) 12032 (vi); (Lake St. Francis) 12033 (vi); (Lake St. John) 12033 (vi); (Lavaltrie) 12033 (vi); (Les Eboulements) 12033 (vi); (Lotbiniere) 12033 (vi); (Magdalen Islands) 12034 (vi); (Malbay) 12034 (vi); (Matane) 12034 (vi); (Montmagny) 12034 (vi); (Nicolet) 12034 (vi); (Notre Dame de Portage) 12034 (vi); (Peribonka) 12035 (vi); (Petite Decharge) 12034 (vi); (Piche Point) 12035 (vi); (Pointe aux Trembles) 12035 (vi); (Quebec, harbour) 12144 (vii); (Richelieu) 12037 (vi); (Rimouski) 12035 (vi); (Riviere du Lievre) 12037 (vi); (Riviere du Loup) 12036 (vi); (Riviere Maskinonge) 12037 (vi); (Riviere Ouelle) 12037 (vi); (St. Alphonse) 12041 (vi); (Ste. Anne des Monts) 12042 (vi); (St. Francis) 12041 (vi); (St. Francois) 12042 (vi); (St. Ignace de Loyola) 12042 (vi); (St. Jacques) 12041 (vi); (St. Jean des Chaillons) 12042 (vi); (St. Jean Orleans) 12042 (vi); (St. Laurent) 12042 (vi); (St. Louis) 12040 (vi); (St. Maurice River) 12041 (vi); (St. Omer) 12042 (vi); (St. Pierre les Becquets) 12042 (vi); (St. Simeon) 12042 (vi); (Saguenay) 12040 (vi); (Sorel) 12042 (vi); (Three Rivers, deep water wharf) 13349 (vii); (Varennes) 12042 (vi); (Yamaska, dredging) 12043 (vi); (Yamaska, lock) 12041 (vi); (Yamaska, river) 5708 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (Lesser Slave Lake) 5719 (iii); (Lesser Slave) 13351 (vii); (Old Man's River) 12142 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects' branch) 11096 (vi); (cement testing) 11078 (vi); (clerical assistance) 11099 (vi); (Deep Waterways Commission) 11101 (vi); (engineering branch) 11093 (vi); (gratuities) 5730 (iii); (International Commission *re* Red River) 11118 (vi); (monuments) 11118 (vi); (technical books) 11100 (vi); (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi); (unprovided items) 11119 (vi).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Shellmouth) 12143 (vii).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11071 (vi).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft-Dawson) 5731 (iii); (B. C. Cape Beale Lines) 5732 (iii); (cable service) 5731 (iii); (Chicoutimi) 13179 (vii); (Marconi) 12143 (vii); (operating) 13178 (vii); (Yukon) 13179 (vii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay surveys) 12146 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (St. John accommodation) 12257 (vii).

Sussex St. Property Purchase, Payments to Jos. Riopelle (Ans.) 3844 (ii).

Tache, J. C., Emplymt. in Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 8180 (iv).

Tatamagouche Dredging, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 11701 (vi).

Tenders, Lists of Papers *re* Advertisements (read) in Com. of Sup., 7476 (iv).

Tiffin, Tenders *re* Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 8893 (v).

Tignish Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 3229 (ii).

Tignish Harbour, Pet. *re* Extension (Ans.) 682 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).

Tilbury, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).

Toney River Boat Harbour, Contract Price, Extras, &c. (Ans.) 9712 (v).

Toronto Harbour (eastern gap), Amount of Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 354 (i).

——— Construction of Entrance (Ans.) 355 (i).

——— Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Date, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1507 (i).

Toronto Harbour (western entrance) Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 518 (i), 4587 (iii), 10014 (v).

——— Entrance, Delay in Contract (remarks) 5915 (iii).

Toronto Island Tunnel, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5564 (iii).

Town Site Property, Section 32, Public Works *re* (Ans.) 1125 (i).

Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction (Ans.) 5472 (iii).

Transportation: *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.

Trueman, Mr., and N. B. Cold Storage Co., Ques. of Priv., 9343 (v).

Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring (Ans.) 3429 (ii).

Uniforms and Customs Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9571 (v).

Vaudreuil County, Dredging, Supt.'s Salary, &c. (Ans.) 4587 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Vautelet, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 642 (i).
Ventilation of H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vii).
See 'House of Commons,' &c.
Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 5471 (iii).
Victoria Beach Pier, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 237 (i).
Victoria Harbour, Tenders *re* Dredging (Ans.) 8893 (v).
Welchpool Wharf, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 7935 (iv).
Western Block Extension, Total Expenditure, Area, &c. (Ans.) 512 (i).
Westville Public Building, Total Cost (Ans.) 9475 (v).
Wharfs, Piers and Harbours, Expenditure *re*, on M. (Mr. Blain) for Cor., 5476 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4867 (iii).
Winfield Basin Dredging, Tenders, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 6461 (iv).
White Head Wharf, Report *re* Cost (Ans.) 6463 (iv).
Wiarton Dredging, 1907, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 6236 (iv).
——— Payments to Mr. Bowman, &c. (Ans.) 6407 (iv).
Yarmouth, Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 11500 (vi).
Yukon Telegraphs, Receipts and Expenses (Ans.) 512 (i).
——— Service to Prince Rupert, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1934 (i).

REID, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*
Acetylene Gas Works at Prescott, Emplymt. of Political Officers (remarks) in deb. on Technical Education, 3292 (ii).
Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4504 (iii).
Beauharnois Canal, Lease of Water Power (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
Belleville—Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 8553 (v).
Blue Books, Distribution of (remarks) 432 (i).
Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2993 (ii).
Boneless Meat, Frozen, Imported into G.B., Par. in English Newspapers, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).
Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 188 (i).
Canada Shipping Act Amt., B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12853, 13052 (vii).
Canned Foods Inspection Act, Enforcement of (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6871 (iv).
Catharine C., Incomplete Return (remarks) 5727 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11566 (vi).
Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5891 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5627 (iii).
Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).
Cypress Hills, Timber Reserve, Preservation of, &c. (Ques.) 3841 (ii).
Deep Waterways Commission, St. Lawrence River Dam (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).
——— Damming of St. Lawrence at Long Sault (remarks) 13151 (vii).
Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1638 (i).
——— on M. for Sup., 1875 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12941 (vii).
Doukhobors, Religious Fanatics, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 12161 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13270 (vii).
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3798 (ii).
Gilmore, Edith May Relief (B. 164) 1°*, 8377; 2°*, 8610 (v).
Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6269 (iv).
Govt. Works, Emplymt. of Technical Students, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3292 (ii).
G.T.Ry., Connections at Prescott (remarks) 433 (i).
Halliday Bros., Supplies to Lighthouses, Rates, &c. (Ques.) 6236 (iv).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Claims of M. J. Haney, Arbitration *re* (remarks) 1739 (i).
Indian Lands at New Westminster, Sale of (Ques.) 3037, 3839 (ii).
I.C.R., Delays to Maritime Express, &c. (Ques.) 8614 (v).
——— Number of Tons of Steel Rails, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).
——— Rolling Stock in Service on Sundays, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).
——— Rolling Stock, Purchase of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Trains breaking down, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).
——— Train Service, Explanations *re* Delays, &c. (M. for ret.) 6242 (iv).
——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4469 (iii).
Kananaski Falls Water Power, Granting of Rights, &c. (Ques.) 3036 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5491 (iii), 6464 (iv).
Lake Francois Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12139 (vii).
Lighting Buoys on Rideau Canal, Contract *re* (Ques.) 9476 (v).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl., Book-keeping, &c., ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4004 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel (remarks) 7327 (iv).
——— Officers under Suspension (remarks) 6847 (iv).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3018 (ii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6894, 7247 (iv).
Medicine Hat Building, Contract *re* Heating System (Ques.) 10791 (vi).
'Montcalm,' Collision with C.P.R. Steamer, Par. in 'Montreal Gazette' (remarks) 8086 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Contract *re* Cement, &c. (Ques.) 7199, 7499 (iv).
North Grove Post Office, Letters, Pets. *re* Establishment of (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).
——— Return Inquiry for, 5490 (iii).
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4107 (ii).
Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6227 (iv).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of (remarks) 609 (i).
Patterson, J. W., Govt. Lands in B.C., Sale to (Ques.) 6002 (iii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).
Petition. (M.) to introduce, 1682 (i).
Plains of Abraham, Lease to Ross Rifle Co., &c. (Ques.) 1348 (i).
Postal Arrangements between U. S. and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3894 (ii).
P.E.I., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1739 (i), 2740 (ii).
Public Accounts Committee, Meetings, &c., Adjournments, &c. (remarks) 1439 (i).
——— Production of Original Documents (remarks) 4495 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3084 (ii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Public Works Dept., Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4890 (iii).
Quebec and N.B. Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6225 (iv).
Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13291 (vii).
Quebec Troops, Food supplied (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3929 (ii).
Ry. Passenger Ticket Act Amt. (B. 90) 1° m., 2466 (ii); 2° m., 5244 (iii).
——— (remarks) 3404 (ii).
Rideau Canal, Buoys between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids, Contract *re* Lighting (Ques.) 8613 (v).
Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4666 (iii).
See 'Documents.'
Returns unopposed, *re* I. C. R. (remarks) 5914 (iii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 8516 (v).
St. Lawrence Power and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3009 (ii).
See 'Deep Waterways.'
Salmon Licenses, Leases &c., in B.C. (Ques.) 5652 (iii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 5801 (iii).
Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8560, 8610 (v).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5458 (iii).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12598 (vii).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1929 (i).
Spain, Commander, Travelling Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1012 (i).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (seed grain) 5500 (iii).
Canals—Galops (Upper entrance) 5671 (iii).
Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5664 (iii).
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 12223 (vii).
Canals—Soulanges (Manning & Macdonald's claims) 5669 (iii).
Canals—Welland (dredging slide) 5673 (iii); (electric lighting) 12197; (Port Colborne) 12216 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5681 (iii); (widening) 12211 (vii).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (Dep. Minister) 12878 (vii); Interior (salaries, &c.) 616 (i); Marine and Fisheries (ass't. dep. min.) 12915; Sec. of State (C. S. examiners) 12917 (vii).
Marine (ice-breakers) 1909 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5735 (iii); (customs dues) 12155; (Dom. arsenal) 12154; (properties) 12148; (provisions) 12150;

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(R. M. College) 12153; (warlike stores) 12149 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2942, 2950; (life-saving awards) 2972; (masters and mates) 2969 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5522 (iii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13253 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 8517 (v), 10953 (vi); (Neepawa) 8544; (St. Boniface) 8566; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10955 (vi); (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8567 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Antigonish) 7111 (iv).

Public Works — Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7463; (Dom. renewals) 7479; (Glencoe) 7497 (iv); (Kingston) 10913 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 1450; (deptl. buildings) 1505; (House of Com., additions) 1486; (mint) 1451, 1474; (museum) 1490; (observatory) 1485 (i); (skylights) 7816 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Farnham) 7288; (Grosse Isle) 7289; (Knowlton) 7292; (Levis) 7294 (iv).

Public Works — Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8582 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 12141; (St. Andrew's Rapids) 12145 (vii).

Public Works — Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Digby) 11226; (Porter's Lake) 11260 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Brighton) 12134; (Chute à Blondeau) 12092; (Colborne) 12095; (Midland and Tiffin) 12125; (Petewawa) 12133 (vii); (Point Edward) 5713 (iii); (Port Colborne) 12146; (Roche's Point) 12136 (vii); (Stanley Island wharf) 5720 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. Quebec harbour) 12144 (vii).

Public Works — Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11090; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11116; (engineering branch) 11094 (vi); (gratuities) 5730 (iii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay survey) 12146 (vii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Campbellton) 12258; (Moncton car shops) 12250 (vii); (Pictou) 5561; (rolling stock) 5549 (iii); (St. John, increased accommodation) 12257 (vii); (train service) 10223; (Windsor Branch) 10146 (v).

Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation) 10357; (Ry. Commission) 10361 (vi).

Tenders, Advertising, *re* Govt. Works, Supplies, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4702, neg. (Y. 50; N. 95) 4735 (iii).

Timber Lands, Sale of to Messrs. Rutherford, &c. (Ques.) 1293 (i).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

'Victor,' Tug, Repairs by Govt., Ques. of Priv., 9774 (v).

RIVET, Mr. L. A. A., *Hochelaga.*

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., &c., on M. to adjn. House, 5905 (iii).

RIVET, Mr. L. A. A.—*Con.*

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3463 (ii).

ROBITAILLE, Mr. L., *Quebec County.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3866 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4514 (iii).

Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production (Ques.) 12410 (vii).

Experimental Farm, Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade *re* Establishment, &c. (Ques.) 8182 (iv).

French Language, Par. in 'Le Soleil,' on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1212 (i).

Gooderham & Worts Distillery, Deficit in Spirit Production (Ques.) 12411 (vii).

Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 13059 (vii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6976, 6989 (iv).

——— Par. in 'Canadian Gazette' (remarks) 7453 (iv).

Meat and Canned Food Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7237 (iv).

Militia Dept., Quebec, Hours for Masons, &c. (Ques.) 10790 (vi).

Montmorency Falls Retaining Walls, Width, &c. (Ques.) 12410 (vii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3450 (ii).

Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditures for the last fifty years (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

Printing Supt., Apptmnt. of a Frenchman (Ques.) 12411 (vii).

Provincial Elections, and Federal Ministers' Speeches (remarks) 8850 (v).

Public Works Dept., New Apptmts., &c. (Ques.) 13061 (vii).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, Apptmt. of Engineer Hoare (Ques.) 8173 (iv).

——— Names of Jurymen, &c. (Ques.) 7991 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13389 (vii).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. 217 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13491 (vii).

Quebec County Expenditures by Govt. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.) 3853 (ii).

Ques. of Priv., Deputy Minister of Public Works *re* French Canadians, 8465 (v).

Revised Statutes, Completion of French Edition (Ques.) 6983 (iv).

ROBITAILLE, Mr. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10606 (vi).
Excise (methylated spirits) 821 (i).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., 909 (i).

ROCHE, Mr. W., *Halifax.*

Address, The, 267 (i).
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12453 (vii).
Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4285 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8691 (iv); on M. for 3°, 13257 (vii).
Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1719 (i).
G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12323 (vii).
I.C.R., &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4486 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries Accounts, Payments to Mr. Falconer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4120 (ii).
Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10693 (vi).
Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).
Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5847 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4046 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1068 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Porter's Lake) 11264 (vi).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Address, The, 485 (i).
Buffalo purchased for Elk Park, Name of Purchaser, &c. (Ques.) 5795 (iii).
Canadian Associated Press, Govt. Subvention, &c. (Ques.) 5080 (iii).
Clearwater Lake, Half-breeds' Rights, &c. (Ques.) 175 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).
Customs Collectors in Man., Additional Fees charged, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1183 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8012 (iv), 11762 (vi); in Com., 13005 (vii).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 759 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11168, 11422 (vi).
Doukhobors bonused as Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9953 (v).
Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7633 (iv).
Fish Exportations from Man., five years to March, 1907, Value, &c. (Ques.) 4240 (iii).
Garthby Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c. (Ques.) 3844 (ii).
Grain Inspection and Sale Act, Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13211 (vii).
G.T.P., Engineers and Assistant Engineers, Names, &c., Date of Apptmt., Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5802 (iii).
—— Medical Attendance, O.C. regulating Deductions (Ques.) 1937 (i).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6347 (iv).
—— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 5789 (iii).
Immigration, Salvation Army Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
Indian Schools, Prosecutions *re* Riots (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 626 (i).
Internal Economy Board, H. of C., Minutes, &c. (M. for copies*) 2795 (ii).
Land Sales in N. W., Purchasers' Names, Price paid, &c. (Ques.) 3835 (ii).
Leech, Mr. R. A. E., Apptmt. of (notice of motion) 3477 (ii).
See 'Seed Grain.'
Mail Matter delayed in Transmission by C. P. R. Accident (remarks) 9724 (v).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12803 (vii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension (remarks) 6222 (iv).
—— Legislation *re* (remarks) 7506 (iv).
Manitoba Election Frauds, Investigation Com., ref. to in debate on Address, 495 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13222 (vii).
Man. Voters Lists, Polling Divisions, made by Judges (remarks) 13141 (vii).
Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty from 1905-8 (Ques.) 8441 (v).
Military Stores of Rural Battalions, Care of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).
Minnedosa Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10889 (vi).
'Montague,' Dredge, Expenditure *re* Repairs (Ques.) 8172 (iv).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9488 (v).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11991 (vi).

Ranchvale Homestead Entries, Number, Total Receipts, Applications, &c. (Ques.) 5258 (iii).

—— Sub-Land Agency, Closing of (Ques.) 4829 (iii).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications for Homesteads, Letter from Mr. Seaman (read) in Com. of Sup., 9992 (v).

—— Entry by Homesteaders (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7653 (iv).

—— Timber Reserves, Squatters' Claims, &c. (Ques.) 175 (i).

St. Boniface Public Building, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 4246 (iii).

—— Purchase of Land, &c. (Ques.) 5999 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Instruction to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers (Ques.) 2217 (ii).

—— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors (Ques.) 7990 (iv).

—— Title, Extinguish of, Issue of Patents, &c. (Ques.) 1932 (i).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 9167 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Land Grants, Patents, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5801 (iii).

Sawmill Owners, Applications refused *re* Timber Cutting (M. for ret.*) 557 (i).

Seed Grain in N. W., Distribution of, Apptmt. of Mr. R. E. A. Leeh (remarks) 3040 (ii).

—— Duties assigned to Mr. Leech (remarks) 3158 (ii).

Seed Grain for N.W., Charges by Mr. Macdonell, M.P. (remarks) 1442 (i).

Seed Grain for Settlers in N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2909 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1373 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 2775 (ii).

Selkirk, Lord, Land Registers and State Papers, Register 'B' *re* Hudson Bay Co., Custody of, &c. (Ques.) 1684 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3815 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9769 (v).

Customs—Miscellaneous (guarantees) 9577; Inspectors (salaries) 9550 (v).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10046; (forest rangers) 10049; (surveys) 9989 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9860; (deportations) 9883 (v); (general expenses) 5754 (iii); (hospitals) 9982; (literature, &c.) 9952 (v).

Legislation (provincial voters' lists) 10508 (vi).

Militia (annual drill) 5737 (iii); (rifle and artillery grants) 12152 (vii).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2775 (ii).

N.W. Ters. (school grants) 10118 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10889 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon, drill hall) 8518; (Dauphin) 8519; (Neepawa) 8536; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10962 (vi); (Winnipeg, immigration) 8574; (Winnipeg, P.O.) 8575 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7713 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8582; (Saskatoon) 8603; (Yorkton) 8603 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Shellmouth) 12143 (vii).

Timber Berths granted in Man. and N.W.T., Retention by Original Grantees (Ques.) 2546 (ii).

Timber Cutting by Saw-mill Owners, Applications *re* (Ques.) 2168 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2614 (ii).

Timber Permits to Saw-mill Owners, O.C. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 179 (i).

Town Site, Section 32, Man., Erection of Public Buildings, &c. (Ques.) 1125, 1348 (i).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7653 (iv).

Western Rifle Association, Pet. *re* Grant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

ROSS, Mr. A. C., *Cape Breton, N., and Victoria.*

Cement, Sydney, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11227 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baddeck) 11219; (Digby) 11226 (vi).

ROSS, Mr. D., *Yale-Cariboo.*

Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 1283 (i).

Bank Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) M. to adjn. debate, 4312 (iii).

Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 1°*, 606 (i).

B.C. Revenue contributed from 1872-3 to 1905 (M. for ret.) 3435 (ii).

Canadian Naturalization, on M. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order 12089 (vii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10747 (vi).

Criminal Code Amendments, Ques. of Order, 9282 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup. (remarks) 10138 (v).

ROSS, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Customs Outside Service, in Com. of Sup., Members remarks checked, 9451 (v).

Dillon, Gerald P., Apptmt. to N. W. M. Police Force (Ques.) 6001 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1172 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1632, 1653 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8185 (iv); in Com., 11877, 11932 (vi); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 13252 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11176 (vi).

Edmonton, Dunvegan and B. C. Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 754 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4578 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry. Co., Application for Portion of Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1512 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 768 (i).

Immigration Bonuses, Ques. of Order, *re* Discussion of former Speech, 1298 (i).

Indian Lands, B.C., Provincial Rights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 630 (i).

Indian Schools, Dr. Bryce's Report (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 625 (i).

I.C.R. Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 117 (Mr Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).

Japanese Immigration Restriction, B.C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1744 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2066 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1602 (i).

Japanese and Oriental Immigration, O.Cs., &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies, 855, 877 (i).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 732 (i).

Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Ry. Co.'s (B. 39) 1°*, 754 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11244 (vi).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9916 (v).

——— Ques. of Order, 10023, 'Bourinot' quoted, 10030 (v).

Obstruction Tactics, &c., Ques. of Order, 9222 (v).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 131) 1°*, 5337 (iii); in Com., 7724 (iv).

Order, Points of, 'Bourinot' *re* Discussions on, 4103 (ii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4955 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Rep., Ques. of Order, 13401 (vii).

ROSS, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4986 (iii).

——— (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118, Ques. of Order, 10663 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13286 (vii).

Resignation as Member *re* Chinese Question (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11106 (vi).

Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Co.'s (B. 49) 1°*, 891 (i); in Com., 5409, 5519 (iii).

S.A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3773 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 625 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9244; Ques. of Order, 9222 (v).

Legislation (voters' lists) 10508 (vi).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4099 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12126 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Knowlton) 7293 (iv).

Timber Berths, Leasing of, &c., Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2287 (ii).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. *re* Amts., 908 (i).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4520 (iii).

Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ques.) 3240 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8200 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11132; in Com., 11170, 11458, 11521; (amt.) 11943; (amt.) on M. for 3°, 11970; Neg. (Y. 28; N. 58) 11974 (vi).

Fisheries in Lake Winnipeg, Legislation *re* Closing (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Fish Hatchery, Lake Winnipeg, Failure *re* Spawn, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).

Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13210 (vii).

Homestead Entries granted for Quarters 10-17-17 W. of 4th Meridian, &c. (Ques.) 9773 (v).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10492 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction of, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6306 (iv).

Immigrants, Amounts paid for Maintenance, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

——— (Ques.) 5084 (iii).

Immigrants from Europe, entering U.S., List furnished to Govt. (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*

Immigration from U. S., Total Amount expended (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Purchase by Govt., Staff, &c. (Ques.) 3434 (ii).

Land Patents for Sections 10, and 17, Applicants *re* (Ques.) 9475 (v).

Lumber Combine Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 2977 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Papers, Memorials, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 852 (i).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12565, 13220 (vii).

Man. Lands owned by Govt., Number of Acres, &c. (Ques.) 1288 (i).

Montreal Harbour, Expenditure *re* Docks and Elevators (M. for ret.*) 2170 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1683 (i).

'Neptune,' Cruise in Hudson Bay, on order for Copy of Rep. (wthdn.) 850 (i).

Nolan, Wm. Howard, Issue of Patents to (Ques.) 8182 (iv).

Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of (Ques.) 1940 (i).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4976 (iii).

——— (demurrage) B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3366 (ii).

Railway Building to Fort Churchill, &c., Cor., Documents, &c. (M. for copies*) 1689 (i).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1367 (i).

Selkirk Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ques.) 3240 (ii).

Squatters on Forest Reserves in Turtle Mountain (remarks) 4739 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands (coal lands) 10074; (surveys) 10007 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9866; (deportations) 9882 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8519; (Emerson) 8534; (Neepawa) 8540; (St. Boniface) 8566; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10964 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7490 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8582 (v).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2655 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7647 (iv).

SCHELL, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11389 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).

SCHELL, Mr. J. T.—*Con.*

Dredging Contracts, Supplies, &c. (remarks) 7106 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13264 (vii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13298 (vii).

G.T.P., Construction Tenders, Total Amounts, &c. (M. for ret.) 600 (i).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12677 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12364 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4997 (iii).

Quebec and Lake St. John (branch lines) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com on Res., 13291 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12198; (Port Colborne) 12221 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12126 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (piping) 10195 (v).

Transportation Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12221 (vii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W., Financial Aid by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2188 (ii).

SCHELL, Mr. M. S., *Oxford S.*

Budget, The, 5616, 5957 (iii).

Canada Weather Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 37) 1°*, 753 (i); in Com., 5174 (iii).

Co-Operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4563; in Com., 4564 (iii).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10835 (vi).

Fruit Marks Act Inspection Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10560 (vi).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1550 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12598 (vii).

SIFTON, Hon. C., *Brandon.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12439 (vii).

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Connections, Charges against Ry. Commission (remarks) 1435 (i).

Budget, The, 5338 (iii).

Imperial Pulp Co., Denial re Managing Directorship, Par. in Montreal 'Star,' Ques. of Priv., 3578 (ii).

SIFTON, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, Govt. Aid (M.) to adjn., 1349 (i).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2595 (ii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough.*
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv).
Budget, The, 6615 (iv).
Can. Ensign: *See* 'Red,' &c.
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12854 (vii).
Coasting Privileges, prop. Res. (Mr. Black) withdrawn, 2795 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11986 (vi).
Debates of the House, Average Cost per Column (Ques.) 3479 (ii).
Fisheries Act (trials) Amt. Bill, on M. to introduce, 508 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 31) 1°*, 562 (i); in Com., 5248 (iii).
Fisheries Com., Sel. Standing, Apptmt. of (prop. res.) 1691 (i).
Fisheries in Mar. Provs., Violation of Act (M. for ret.*) 1513 (i).
Fishery Officers Jurisdiction, Convictions, Fines, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).
Fisheries Regulations, Violations of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5781 (iii).
I.C.R., Hanlon's Crossing Accident, Investigation *re* (M. for papers*) 5800 (iii).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3027 (ii).
N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) 3680 (ii).
Northwest and Gold Dredging Co., Leases, assigned, &c. (Ques.) 11702 (vi).
Postal Revenue, One Cent Rate (Ques.) 8381 (v).
Presbyterian College, Halifax (B. 154) in Com., 7667 (iv).
Red Ensign, Flying on Merchant Vessels, Authority *re* (uQes.) 12775 (vii).
Shipping, Statistics *re* Tons Registered, &c. (Ques.) 2790 (ii).
SUPPLY—
House of Commons (contingencies) 10503 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4758 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4016, 4169 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 10298 (v).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2957; (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton, additional line) 12761 (vii).

SLOAN, Mr. W., *Comox-Atlin.*
British Columbia Bank incorp. (B. 59) 2° m., 1469 (i).

SLOAN, Mr. W.—*Con.*
'Carlotta G. Cox,' Schr., Seizure, &c.: *See* 'Pelagic Sealing.'
Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c. (Ques.) 1934 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s (B. 15) 1°*, 350 (i).
Japanese Immigration, on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1611 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration into B.C., Restriction of, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 726 (i).
Lighthouse Keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1934 (i).
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, Seizure of Schr. 'Carlotta G. Cox,' on M. for Sup., 3934 (ii).
——— (notice of motion) *re* Discussion, 3156 (ii).
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 2160 (ii); in Com., 4545; on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).
Western Rivers Improvement Co.'s incorp. (B. 55) 1°*, 1108 (i).
Yukon Concession Cases, Appeal from Supreme Court (Ques.) 10301 (vi).
Yukon Telegraph Service to Prince Rupert, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1934 (i).

SMITH, Mr. E. D., *Wentworth.*
Adulteration of Food, Number of Firms penalized, &c. (Ques.) 4402 (iii).
Budget, The, 5375, 5388 (iii).
Burlington Channel Lighthouse, Damages to, &c. (Ques.) 5467 (iii).
Burlington Channel Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman, &c. (Ques.) 4403 (iii).
Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6203 (iii).
Cold Storage Plants, Construction of, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3523; in Com., 3595, 3645 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Maximum and Minimum Rate, &c. (Ques.) 178 (i).
Fruit Inspection, in Closed Packages, &c. (Ques.) 2981 (ii).
Militia Food Supply, Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).
Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3346 (ii).
Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4979 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Excise (travelling expenses) 815 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5774 (iii).
Militia (stores, &c.) 5739 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1477; (museum) 1498 (i).

SMITH, Mr. G., *Oxford, N.*

Address, The, 407 (i).
Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1555 (i).
Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 2866 (ii).

SMITH, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*

Brantford Stove Works Strike, Arrest *re* Picketing (remarks) 9027 (v).
Canada-Australia SS. Service, Yearly Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 1289 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10548, 10745 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11373 (vi).
Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9192 (v).
Coal Land Leases, Applicants *re* (Ques.) 2395 (ii).
Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4685 (iii).
Dunsmuir, Hon. Mr., Lt. Gov. of B.C., Assent to Natal Act, Dom. Interference (remarks) 1738 (i).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrison, Equipment, &c. (Ques.) 1293 (i).
—— Transfer to Canada (Ques.) 1293 (i).
Fisheries, B.C., Negotiations *re* with Mr. Bastedo, Reports *re* (remarks) 6849 (iv).
G.T.P. Workmen Accidents, &c. (remarks) 10624 (vi).
Immigrant Inspection on Ships, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1289 (i).
Immigrants stranded at St. Thomas, Deportation of (Ques.) 567 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6449 (iv).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6729, 7097 (iv).
Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11029 (vi).
Japanese Colony in the West, C.P.R. Application *re* (Ques.) 7196 (iv).
Japanese Immigration Act, Disallowance of *re* B.C. (Ques.) 6642 (iv).
—— Natal Act, Cor., &c., with Lt. Gov., B.C. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration into B.C., Restriction of (prop. Res.) 699 (i).
—— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2081 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 874 (i).
Labour Disputes Bill, Applications, &c., *re* Settlement (M. for ret.*) 605 (i).
Mail Service in B.C., Better Arrangements *re* (remarks) 3754 (ii).

SMITH, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4691 (iii); on M. for 3° (M.) to ref. back to Com., 12053 (vii).
Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2419 (ii).
Railway Act (working hours) Amt. (B. 157) 1° m., 6843 (iv).
Shipping Companies on Pacific Coast, Amounts of Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 6919 (iv).
Spratte, Hattie, Relief (B. 182) 1°*, 9889 (v).
SUPPLY—
Dom. Lands (coal lands) 10066 (v).
Militia (annual drill) 5740 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Ladysmith) 10867; (Quesnel) 10868 (vi).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. R. F. Sutherland), *Essex, N.*

Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Barker) Remarks, 530 (i).
Adjournment of the House, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4495 (iii).
Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) Irrelevancy of Debate, 4730 (iii).
Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) Members addressing Hse. from their Seats without rising (remarks) 10922 (vi).
Banking System, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) Members remarks checked, 2307 (ii).
Battlefields of Canada B. 111, on M. for 3°, 4530 (iii).
Belleville City Floods, Investigation *re*, Members remarks checked, 3319 (ii).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry., &c., on Qes. of Order (Mr. German) 2809; (ruling) 2810 (ii).
Bills, Royal Assent, Mess. from His Ex., 2974, 2995 (ii), 5135, 6157 (iii), 6526 (iv), 10656 (vi).
—— Mess. from Senate, 13587 (vii).
Brantford Stove Works Strike (remarks) 9027 (v).
Cigarette Restraint B. (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13045 (vii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11363, 11535, 11645 (vi).
Civil Service Commission Report, Discussion *re*, Ques. of Order (ruling) 5627-8 (iii).
Colchester Electoral District, Certificate (notification) 680 (i).
Criminal Code Amendments, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 9282 (v).
Cyr, Mr., Letter from, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) (ruling) 8461 (v).
Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8896 (v).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, Members remarks checked, 1195 (i), 2305 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 115) on Senate Amts., 13579 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster)—(ruling) 11717 (vi).

——— on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 13247 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3° (ruling) 11977 (vi), 12394 (vii).

Dredging Contracts, O.C., Rule *re* Producing, 6927 (iv).

——— Ref. to Matters before Committee (ruling) 6749 (iv).

Easter Adjournment (remarks) 6843 (iv).

Eclipse Mfg. Co., Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 7470 (iv).

Electoral Districts, Certificates of Election (notification) 890 (i).

Electoral District of Nicolet, Certificate of Election (notification) 1283 (i).

Electoral District, Vacancies, Issue of Writs (notifications) 2 (i).

Election, New Members, Certificates of Election (notification) 2 (i).

Election Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments (presented) 1 (i).

Fire Extinguishers Ret., Members remarks checked, 4833 (iii).

——— Irrelevancy of debate, 7776 (iv).

French Language, Pet. *re*, Ques of Order, 8886 (v).

Govt. Grounds, Conditions *re*, Members remarks checked, 1741 (i).

G.T. Ry. Co.'s B. 89, Members remarks checked, 2254 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley)—(ruling) 8136 (iv).

G.T.P. Supplies via American Routes, Member's remarks checked, 9026 (v).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25, in Com., on Ruling to ref. back to Com., 3262 (ii).

——— on M. for 3°, 4542 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10491 (vi).

Huron, South Riding, Certificate of Election (notification) 2541 (ii).

——— Vacancy, &c. (notification) 890 (i).

Immigration Bonuses, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1299 (i).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) Member's remarks checked, 13137 (vii).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Indian Lands in Algoma, *re* Mr. Sifton's Telegram (remarks) 13532 (vii).

Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 8 (i).

Japanese Immigration, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* Attacks on Prov. Govt. (ruling) 1763 (i).

Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 6 (i).

Man. Voters' Lists, Affidavits quoted by Member (ruling) *re* Laying on Table, 7948 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries Dept., Misconduct of Officials, Member's remarks checked, 6633

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr .Fisher) on M. for 3°, Member's remarks checked, 7217 (iv).

——— on M. (Mr. Blain) to ref. back to Com., 7227 (iv).

Members introduced, 3 (i).

Mess. from His Ex. (read) 5134 (iii).

——— Suppl. Estimates (read) 12503 (vii).

Moir, Private, Shooting, &c., Member's remarks checked, 7322 (iv).

Montmagny, Electoral District (Notification) Vacancy, 9263 (v).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher), Appeal to the Speaker, 4070; (ruling) 4071; Agreed to (Y. 59; N. 23) 4071 (ii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on Amts. (ruling) 9503 (v).

Motions, Unopposed, and Business of the Hse. (remarks) 8896 (v).

Obstruction *re* Supply, &c., on Ques. of Order (ruling) 9925 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 10024 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) to Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross)—(ruling) 10025, 10031 (v).

Opening of Parliament, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1 (i).

Order Paper, French and English Editions (remarks) 6741 (iv).

Order, Ques. of, re answering Questions by Govt. (ruling) 234 (i).

Peace Interparliamentary Union, Meeting in Ottawa, Com. from Senate (read) 13581 (vii).

Petit Rocher Wharf, Discussion *re* (ruling) 9717 (v).

Petition, on M. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to introduce, 1682 (i).

Postal Arrangements between Can. and U. S., Member's remarks checked, 3164 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry. Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 12629 (vii).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Removal of Steamers from Georgetown Route, Discussion of (remarks) 1109 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Member's remarks checked, 4496 (iii).

Priv., Ques. of (Mr. A. Lavergne) Member's remarks checked, 7993 (iv).

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 13580 (vii).

——— Mess. from Senate, 13587 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Investigations, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 3085 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Johnston) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 9890 (v).

Public Works, Dep. Minister and French Canadians, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Robitaille) 8465 (v).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) Member's remarks checked, 4910 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 4958 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Rep., on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 13401 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 13402 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).

Quebec County Expenditures (remarks) *re* Question, 3847 (ii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Joint Meeting of Members and Senators (remarks) 6061 (iii).

Ques. of Order, *re* Accepting Minister's Stmnt. (ruling) 9352 (v).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) Member's remarks checked, 2382 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) (ruling) 2383 (ii).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Reid)—(remarks) 9774 (v).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Daniel) *re* Representation of Mar. Provs. (remarks) 9892 (v).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 118, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden)—(ruling) 11618 (vi).

——— on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 11602 (vi).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) ref. to deb. in Senate (ruling) 577 (i).

Railway Commissioners' Board Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8511 (v).

Ry. Connections at Brockville, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) Remarks checked, 9 (i).

Returns, Retention of by Members, on Ques. of Priv., Member's remarks checked, 4667 (iii).

Seed Grain Distribution, Member's remarks checked, 6635 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Seed Grain Distribution, Apptmt. of Mr. R. A. E. Leech, Discussion ruled out of Order, 3041 (ii).

Speech from the Throne (read) 3 (i).

Supplies purchased for Govt., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 5830, (ruling) 5831 (iii).

——— Member's remarks checked, 5837 (iii).

SUPPLY—

House of Commons (Clerk of Crown in Chancery) 10508; (contingencies) 10502; (salaries) 10491, 10501 (vi); (salary, increases) 13562 (vii); (Sergeant-at-Arms) 10503 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) Member's remarks checked, 1064 (i).

Senate (salaries, &c.) 10489 (vi).

Timber Berths, on M. for Original Documents (remarks) 2984 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order, *re* Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turrig)—(ruling) 11304 (vi).

Tobacco Prohibition, Resolution *re* Moral Reform Associations, Member's remarks checked, 11302 (vi).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on Ques. of Order *re* Amt. (Mr. Barker) (ruling) 923 (i).

Vacancies in Electoral District (notification) 2 (i).

Vacancy in Stanstead, Issue of Writ (notification) 569 (i).

York, Centre, Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 1018 (i).

SPEAKER, DEP. (Mr. C. Marcil) *Bonaventure.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11828 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, Member's remarks checked, 5025 (iii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 151, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) ref. to Speaker, 8135 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3717 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Member's remarks checked, 11290 (vi).

Lord's Day Act, Violations *re* Horse Racing, Member's remarks checked, 3753 (ii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4066 (ii).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., Discussion *re* M. to adjn., 3656 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5076 (iii).

Ocean and River Service, Irrelevancy of debate, 2943 (ii).

Order, Ques. of, Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 10393 (vi).

SPEAKER, DEP.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch Ry. B. 202, Member's remarks checked, 12632 (vii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Talbot) *re* Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' Member's remarks checked, 4222 (iii).

Restaurant Com., Joint, 1st Rep. (presented) 13510 (vii).

Royal Mint, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup. (ruling) 1461 (i).

School Statutes, Saskatchewan Prov. (remarks) 6854 (iv).

Tobacco, Violation of Act, in Com. of Sup. (ruling) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 9250 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S., *Grey, E.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3855, 3880 (ii).

Anglo-American Treaties, Inquiry for Cor., 10120 (v).

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5379 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°. 5763 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13307 (vii).

Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction (Ques.) 3848 (ii).

Banking Act Amts., on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4272 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 10923; in Com., 10933 (vi).

Banking Systems, Criticisms of Newspaper Report, Ques. of Privilege, 2308 (ii).

Battlefields of Quebec, Tercentenary at Quebec B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 3902 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4388; in Com., 4415, 4511; on M. for 3°, 4532 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G.T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2810 (ii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv), 8552 (v).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6521 (iv).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2994 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

Bonusing System, on Notice of Motion (remarks) 6290 (iv).

Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9740 (v).

Budget, The, 6595 (iv).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6171, 6173 (iii); in Com., 6408 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4231 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Pardee) on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

C.P.R., Papineauville Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

C.P.R., Saskatchewan Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13305 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6872 (iv).

Catholics and Public Offices, Ref. to Speech in the Senate, Ques. of Priv., 5047 (iii).
See 'Employees.'

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11251 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10749, 11021 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5114 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10721; in Com., 11366, 11536, 11635 (vi), 12184 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Number distributed (remarks) 6060 (iii).

——— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5901 (iii).

——— Report (remarks) 5628, 5633 (iii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9162 (v).

Colonization Lands, Alienation of, Inquiry for Ret., 3752 (ii), 4317 (iii).

Co-Operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4556 (iii).

Criminal Code (ry. mortgages) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13317

Criminal Code (trade restraint) Amt. B. 96 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 2976 (ii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9736 (v).

Cyr, Mr., Letter from *re* Statement of Members, Ruling *re*, 8462 (v).

Detroit River Tunnel, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10487 (vi).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1147, 1194 (i).

——— Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1782 (i).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 50 (Mr. Copp) in Com., 4231 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 3°, 13244; (amt.) to M. for 3°. 13255 (vii).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 755 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11466 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10815, 10820 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5027 (iii).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws (remarks) 7639 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6755 (iv).

——— (remarks) 6633 (iv).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6912 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13266; in Com. on Res., 13278 (vii).

Employees of Parliament and Printing Bureau, Names, Salaries, Religions, &c. (Ques.) 5206 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.) 5479 (iii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13470 (vii).

Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7664 (iv).

——— Cor. quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7774 (iv).

Fisheries Treaty, Boundaries with U. S., Information *re* (remarks) 6632, 6739 (iv).

Fishing Rights in Matane River, &c. (Ques.) 7446 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, Apptmt. to Hague Tribunal (remarks) 8294 (v).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3618, 3636 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on Preparation of Stmnt. *re* Duty Units (remarks) 945 (i).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10554 (vi).

Fruit Inspection (apples) Complaints *re* (remarks) 2754 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3623, 3794 (ii), 4230 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12556 (vii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays (remarks) 6287 (iv).

——— Precedence *re* Motion for Want of Confidence (remarks) 6917 (iv).

Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections, Interference *re*, on M. for Sup., 2890 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8552, 8744, 9461 (v).

G.T.P. Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 8836 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Investigation *re* Charges of Major Hodgins, on 1st Rep. of Com., 8515 (v).

——— Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).

——— Policy *re* Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2241 (ii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4224; on M. for 3°, 4536 (iii).

'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9131 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Neglect of Duty as Inspector at Halifax (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6647 (iv).

Hindus in B. C., Protests *re* Treatment (remarks) 5490 (iii).

Hogs saughtered, Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13094 (vii).

Horses and Cattle, Imports to U. S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of (Ques.) 6000 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10492 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) 6302 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6434 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 1299 (i).

Immigration from England, Statements of Mr. Walker and Mr. Smith (remarks) 5491 (iii).

Immigants stranded in Toronto (remarks) 429 (i).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6475, 6482 (iv).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6901 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 1743 (i).

I.C.R., Employees, Circular from Genl. Manager *re* Municipal Politics (read) 2304 (ii).

——— Employees and Municipal Councils (remarks) 2309 (ii).

——— Employees and Municipal Elections, Circular *re* (remarks) 2884 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4484 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 768, 953 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2133 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Japanese Immigration, B. C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1759 (i).
Lands set apart for Settlement since 1896, (M. for ret.*) 2796 (ii).
Lands Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res. 8481 (v).
Lands Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6518 (iv).
Lands withdrawn for Settlement or Colonization Purposes, &c. (Ques.) 2393 (ii).
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 10953 (vi).
MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7177 (iv).
Mackenzie, Mr. Wm., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Apptmt. (remarks) 6985 (iv).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Book-keeping, &c., ref. to Com. of Sup., 4007 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7103 (iv).
——— Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. House, 8454 (v).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3020; in Com., 3035 (ii).
Meaford Harbour B. 158 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8510 (v).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6895, 7238; on M. for 3°, 7218 (iv).
Meat and Food Inspection Act, Names and Number of Establishments, &c. (Ques.) 1505 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).
Militia Dept., and Civil Service Commissioners' Rep. (remarks) 12546 (vii).
Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4065 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3451 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9477 (v).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9495 (v)
Niagara, St Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5067 (iii); on Senate Amts., 10511 (vi).
Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).
Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4631 (iii); in Com., 12054 (vii).
Orangemen and Quebec Provincial Elections, Ministerial Speeches (remarks) 10126 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Orange Order and Quebec Prov. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10355 (vi).
Order Paper, Differences in English and French Editions (remarks) 6740, 6850 (iv).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 138 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 9070 (v).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2837 (ii).
Patent and Proprietary Medicines, B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 2°, 10552 (vi).
Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 10412 (vi).
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3979 (ii).
Petit Rocher Wharf, Inquiry for missing Papers (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9722 (v).
Pork, Fresh, Quantity imported for Home Consumption (Ques.) 5650 (iii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re* (remarks) 10513 (vi).
Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Funds, B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2788 (ii).
Prescott Lighthouse Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3097 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3084 (ii).
Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7191 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 2394 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Rep., on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co., Bridge Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Militia (remarks) 8696 (v).
Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3376 (ii).
Railway Commission (asst. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3903 (ii); in Com., 8512 (v).
——— on M. to introduce, 3751 (ii).
——— B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 11630 (vi)
Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13285 (vii).
Ry. Subsidies, Bridge Subsidies (remarks) in Com., 13309 (vii).
Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary, &c. (Ques) 6000 (iii). 6232 (iv).
Rules of the House, Amendments to, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2988 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7677 (iv), 8562, 9068 (v).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. McIntyre) in Com., 4232 (iii).

School Lands Exchange B 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 8470; in Com., 8478 (v).

Seed Grain Bill, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2781 (ii).

Seed Grain for Settlers in Man., &c., in Com. of Sup., 2773 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2922 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adn., 1361 (i).

Seed Grain Distribution, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10122 (v).

——— (remarks) *re* Purchases, 3158 (ii).

Seed Wheat, Delegation *re* (remarks) 1740 (i).

Sharbot Lake and Bathurst Station, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Shipping Rings, Combination *re*, Cor., &c. (read) 5916 (iii).

Shortt, Prof., Amounts paid *re* Industrial Disputes (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5416 (iii).

Smith, Mr. W. Maxwell, Dom. Fruit Inspector Salary, &c. (Ques.) 2393 (ii), 5085 (iii).

——— (M. for copies) 2398 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3761, 3832 (ii), 12595 (vii).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8849 (v).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5865 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (exhibitions) 10569, 10597 (vi); (seed branch) 5502 (iii).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5673; (slope walls) 5664 (iii).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 12217; (surveys) 12210 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical survey) 9740 (v).

Excise (methylated spirits) 820; (travelling expenses) 815 (i).

Experimental Farms (salaries) 12549 (vii).

House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10503 (vi); (salary increases) 13562 (vii).

Immigration (agents) 13169 (vii).

Indians—N.B. (schools) 13171 (vii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5757 (iii).

Justice (Exchequer Court) 5505 (iii).

Legislation (provincial voters' lists) 10508

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5773; (Thunder Bay ice-breaker) 5043 (iii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 3986 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5741 (iii), 10290 (v); (pay and allowance) 12546 (vii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2773 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3220 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 5765 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2948, 2949; (naval schools) 3222; (obstructions) 3214; (tidal service) 3215; (wrecks) 3184, 3195; (wrecking plant subsidies) 3221 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5510 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings — Dom. (rents, &c.) 10981 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8519; (Emerson) 8535; (Neepawa) 8541; (Selkirk) 8550; (Winnipeg, immigration) 8574; (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8567 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax customs) 7168; (Shelburne) 7177; (Yarmouth) 7180 (iv).

Public Works—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 7455; (Guelph armoury) 7678; (Hamilton drill hall) 7692; (Kincardine) 7698; (Kingston, artillery park) 7702; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7704; (Leamington) 7705; (London, military) 7707; (Markham) 7709; (North Bay) 7715 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Major's Hill Park) 11015; (rents, &c.) 10983; (repairs, furniture, &c.) 10981 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings — Que. (Cookshire) 7281; (dominion arsenal) 7435; (Farnham) 7288; (Montreal barracks) 7407; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 7423; (Montreal, post office) 7410; (Montreal, station C) 7422; (Quebec, drill hall) 7431; (St. John's military) 7440; (St. Rochs) 7439 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Humbolt) 8586; (Maple Creek) 8601; (Medicine Hat) 8601; (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601, 8602; (Regina) 8602 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (maintenance) 11005 (vi).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (new plant) 12142 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12114 (vii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13322 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11079 (vi).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11076 (vi).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Marconi) 12143 (vii).

Quarantine (Public health) 5505 (iii).

Railways—Generally (extra clerks) 10342 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10188; (Windsor branch) 10145 (v).

Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation) 10358 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362; (maintenance, &c.) 10385 (vi).

Senate—(salaries, &c.) 10489 (vi).

Supply, Conc., 5499 (iii).

Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 2864 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10701 (vi).
Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5387 (iii).
Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).
Torrens Land Title Fund, (remarks) 10917 (vi).
Trent Canal, Newmarket (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Sloan) in Com., 4545 (iii).
Ways and Means (tobacco) 6122 (iii).
Wheat Transportation from N. W., Financial Aid by Govt., Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for copies, 2177 (ii).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10536 (vi).
Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9655 (v).
—— Clements, W. H. P., Apptmt. as Legal Adviser, O.Cs., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 5801 (iii).
—— (Ques.) 5659 (iii).
Yukon—Moral Reform, Letter of Rev. Dr. Shearer, Inquiry for, 10623, 10689, 11016 (vi).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8483 (v).
STANFIELD, Mr. J., *Colchester.*
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12647 (vii).
Canso Medical Officer, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 6646 (iv).
—— Successor to Dr. Brine, &c. (Ques.) 1735 (i).
Coasting Trade *re* Norwegian Ships (Ques.) 6237 (iv).
—— O.Cs. *re* Foreign Vessels, &c. (Ques.) 4586 (iii).
'D. H. Thomas,' Tug, Dom. Subsidy Grant (Ques.) 8184 (iv).
Doyle, P., Immigration Agents, Superannuation of (Ques.) 6923 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Captains' Residences, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3241 (ii).
Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6649 (iv).
Hunter, Henry C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1292 (i), 3236 (ii).
I.C.R., Compensation *re* Horses Killed at Truro (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
I.C.R., Employees, Increased Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 2981 (ii).
—— Ice Contract (Ques.) 5259 (iii).
—— Ice supplied by J. A. McDonald, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 7446 (iv).
STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Oxford and Pictou Branch, Total Expenditure *re* Construction (Ques.) 10733 (vi).
—— Pictou Branch, Transfer from Halifax to Sydney Division, &c. (Ques.) 12773 (vii).
—— Pictou Branch, Answer to Question (remarks) 12661 (vii).
—— Pictou to Copper Crown Co., Total Expenditure *re*, &c. (Ques.) 10733 (vi).
—— Pictou Station, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost of Construction (Ques.) 10789 (vi).
—— Revenue from Terminals, &c. (Ques.) 5471 (iii).
—— Stellarton to Pictou, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 10734 (vi).
—— Tatamagouche, Delay of Trains, &c. (Ques.) 1292 (i).
—— Ties delivered, Change *re* Inspection (Ques.) 12052 (vii).
—— Truro Buildings, Name of Tenderers, &c. (Ques.) 6233 (iv).
—— Truro Engine House, Contract to Rhodes & Co. (Ques.) 1936 (i).
—— Truro Ry. Station, Sanitary Condition, &c. (Ques.) 7211 (iv).
Legal Agents in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ques.) 4768 (iii).
Londonderry and Bass River Mail Service, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 2980 (ii).
Louisburg Bait Freezer, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4405 (iii).
Mail from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived, &c. (Ques.) 12653 (vii).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12813 (vii).
'Midland Times,' Truro, Amounts paid for Advertisements, &c. (Ques.) 3235 (ii).
Militia, Apptmts. of Generals, Names and Qualifications (Ques.) 5086 (iii).
Newspaper Mail Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery, &c. (Ques.) 11298 (vi).
Pictou P. O. Building, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 10518 (vi).
Port Mulgrave, N.S., Wharfs, Preventing Boats landing Cargoes (Ques.) 9274 (v).
Port au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3232 (ii).
Port South Bar, C.B., Vessels entered for Customs, &c. (Ques.) 9271 (v).
Ry. Surveys, Colchester County, Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 2980 (ii).
Skinner's Cove Boat Channel, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 10012 (v).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12599 (vii).
Southvale, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 4829 (iii).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—
Canals—Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13174 (vii).
Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9577 (v).
Dom. Lands (Rocky Mountain Park) 9991 (v).
Marine (ice-breakers) 1908 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7117; (Halifax, customs) 7161; (Shelburne) 7173 (iv); (Tatamagouche) 11291 (vi); (Westville) 7179 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Henri) 7439; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 7439 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Pictou) 5559; (rolling stock) 5551 (iii); (salaries) 10180 (v); (Truro) 12231 (vii).

Sydney to Sydney Mines Branch Ry., Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

Tatamagouche, Dredging, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 11701 (vi).

Tenders, Advertisements for (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7477 (iv).

Toney River Boat Harbour, Amount of Contract, Extras, &c. (Ques.) 9711 (v).

Trap-Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, Payments *re* (Ques.) 7204 (iv).

Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring (Ques.) 3429 (ii).

Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c. (Ques.) 3480 (ii).

Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Alarms, &c. (Ques.) 9274 (v).

Westville, N.S., Public Buildings, Total Amount of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 9474 (v).

Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada (Ques.) 5201 (iii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*

Address, The, 383 (i).

Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4297 (iii).

Brass, Quantity and Quality of Imports into Can. (Ques.) 6232 (iv).

Buffalo Herd, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10104 (v).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12881 (vii).

Cattle exported to U. S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2769 (ii).

Cypress Hills Homestead Lands, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8387 (v).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11143; in Com., 11183, 11489, 11531 (vi).

Doukohobors Homestead Lands, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9958 (v).

Fence Post Fees, Memorial from Union of Man. Municipalities, &c. (Ques.) 10258 (v).

Grain Commission, Emplymt. of Members, Distribution of Evidence, &c. (Ques.) 3486 (ii).

——— Report (Ques.) 180 (i).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

Grain Commission Report, Inqiury for, 609 (i).

Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13048, 13209 (vii).

G.T.P. Ry., Medical Fees, Deductions *re* (Ques.) 9473 (v).

Heath Point, Purchase of Cement from A. E. Walberg, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Homestead Entries in Section 27, Cor., Tels., &c. (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10495 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6379 (iv).

Immigration Hall, East Selkirk, Furniture, &c., Disposal of (Ques.) 6402 (iv).

Judges in Man. and Ont., Salaries B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13050 (vii).

'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Crew during Winter, &c. (Ques.) 6403 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12811 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12559, 13215 (vii).

Obstructions *re* Supply, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9932 (v).

Playgreen Lake, Conditions *re* Lease, &c. (Ques.) 6403 (iv).

St. Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. of Postmistress, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 5797 (iii).

St. Laurent Harbour, Lake Manitoba (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).

Seed Grain for Man. Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2771 (ii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1357 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2930 (ii).

Smith, O. B., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Snag Boat, Red River, Construction of, &c (Ques.) 567, 891 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12597 (vii)

Supply (seed grain) B. 96, in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10575 (vi), 12890; (fumigating stations) 12881; (seeds) 12891 (vii); (seed branch) 5503 (iii).
Customs — Miscellaneous (printing, &c.) 9577; (salaries) 9571 (v).
Dom. Lands (forest rangers) 10051 (v).
Immigration (agents) 9880; (agents in U. S.) 9964; (deportations) 9882; (hospitals, Winnipeg) 9982; (literature, &c.) 9950 (v).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (administration) 12729 (vii).
Interior — Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5760 (iii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4212 (ii).
Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2771 (ii).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5529 (iii).
Post Office (inspectors) 13153 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8521; (Emerson) 8534; (Neepawa) 8539; (Selkirk) 8547 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11011; (rents, &c.) 10983 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Grand Marais) 12140; (Lake Dauphin) 12141; (Winnipegosis Lake) 12141 (vii).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11071 (vi).
Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10199 (v).

Swamp Lands in Manitoba, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10105 (v).
Swan Lake, Indian Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt. (Ques.) 693 (i).
——— Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
——— Settlement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Teulon Immigration Sheds, Number cared for, 1906-7 (Ques.) 892 (i).
Timber Berths, Opening of Tenders, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Turriff) 11307 (vi).
———on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2691 (ii).
Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contract *re* Cement, Patent, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).
——— Contracts with Marine Dept. (Ques.) 3843 (ii).
Wood, Mr. David, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 568 (i).

STEWART, Mr. R., *Ottawa.*

Alexander, Mrs. Mary, Relief (B. 177) 1°*, 9126 (v).
Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13572 (vii).
Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to, *re* Govt. Inspections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5944 (iii).
British-Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 21) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 3621 (ii).
Cannon, Mrs. Catherine Ann, Relief (B. 175) 1°*, 9126 (v).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5125 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10728; on M. for 2°, 11350; in Com., 11354, 11567 (vi), 12189 (vii).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Stewart) 6813 (iv).
General Chemical Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 174) 1°*, 9126 (v).

STEWART, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Geologial Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) on Conc., 13568 (vii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 891; 2° m., 1059 (i); in Com., 3622, 3794 (ii), 4230 (iii).
G.T.R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12070 (vii).
Paulding, Mrs. Ada Katurah Stewart, Relief (B. 176) 1°*, 9126 (v).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Alberta Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 44) 1°*, 891 (i).
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12481 (vii).
Campaign Literature (French) sent by Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10353 (vi).
Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6191 (iii).
Civil Service Commission Report, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Ques. of Order, 7598 (iv).
Civil Service System, Ques. of Order, Member reading speech, 9175 (v).
Documents quoted by Ministers, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7763 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 4575 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 13255 (vii).
Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5023 (iii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13266 (vii).
Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5480 (iii).
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Delay *re* Approval, and Imp. Treaty (Ques.) 12655 (vii).
French Language Pet. *re*, Ques. of Order, 8887 (v).
German Development Co., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10580 (vi).
Govt. Grounds, Condition of (remarks) 1741 (i).
G.T.P. Construction, Accidents *re* (remarks) 6850 (iv).
Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connections (remarks) 1437 (i).
I.C.R., Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4459 (iii).
Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12401 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1022 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolishing of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3446 (ii).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E.—*Con.*

Obstruction Tactics, Ques. of Order, 9223 (v).
Orange Order and Quebec Prov. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10355 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' *re* Attack on French Canadian Ministers, 4221 (iii).
Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iv).
Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 4958 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc. in Rep., 13366 (vii).
——— Rep., Ques. of Order, 13402 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Rural Corps, &c. (remarks) 8385 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10579 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4042 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1902 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1090 (i).
Public Works—Generally (armouries) 10899; Ont. (Kingston) 10912 (vi); Ottawa (museum) 1502 (i); Que. (Knowlton) 7293; (Levis) 7296; (Montreal, post office) 7413 (iv).
Timber Limits, Applications, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (ques. of priv.) 3578 (ii).
Tobacco, Violation of Act, in Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 9250 (v).

TAYLOR, Mr. G., *Leeds.*

Accounts, Sums, &c., remaining unpaid by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 352 (i).
'Arctic,' Str., History of Northern Cruise, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).
Bate & Co. and W. C. Edwards & Co., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).
Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4390; in Com., 4519 (iii).
Beauchemin, A., Emplymt. at Sorel (Ques.) 5467 (iii).
Boiler Inspections, Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act by Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5911 (iii).
Brockville and Ottawa, Ry. Service, Connections, &c. (M.) to adjn. Hse., 186 (i).
——— (remarks) 432 (i).
——— Charges against Ry. Commission, 1429 (i).
See 'G.T.R.'
Campaign Literature franked by Depts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10351 (vi).
Canadian Associated Press B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12644 (vii).
Caron and Thiberge, Messrs, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 10517 (vi).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vii).
Chicoutimi Public Expenditures, Ques. of Order, 13203 (vii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5127 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11367, 11558 (vi), 12184 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5909 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5626 (iii).
Cornwall Canal, Accident *re* Ry. Bridge (remarks) 11120 (vi).
Cowie, F. W., Salary, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 5649 (iii).
See 'Govt. Steamers,' &c.
Customs and Excise Revenue, Amount received from June 1, 1908 (Ques.) 10791 (vii).
Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8960 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11882 (vi).
Doukhobors, Letter *re* Manner of Living at Yorkton (read) 5751 (iii).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6794 (iv).
——— Quebec Harbour (remarks) 7100, 7104 (iv).
Drysdale, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of accepting Apptmt. (Ques.) 4768 (iii).
——— Date of Communication of Apptmt. (Ques.) 5084 (iii).
——— (M. for papers*) 5086 (iii).
Falconer, Mr. K., Payments to *re* Bookkeeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3999 (iii).
Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13468 (vii).
Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., Number, Price, &c. (Ques.) 1510 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7639 (iv).
——— File, Cor., &c., quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7782 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4832 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5659 (iii).
Forbes, Mr. Justice, Personal Status, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 899 (i).
——— (Ques.) 2390, 3840 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 1860 (i).
Gananoque Lights and Buoys, Apptmt. of Keeper, &c. (Ques.) 8383 (v).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3630 (ii).
Govt. Business (remarks) 13207 (vii).
Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6266 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Govt. Steamers, Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c. (Ques.) 5467 (iii).
See 'Cowie.'

G. T. Ry., Connections at Brockville (Ques. of Privilege) 9 (i).
See 'Brockville.'

G.T.R. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2222 (ii).

G.T.P. Ry., Eastern Division, Recent Estimates *re* Cost (Ques.) 5259 (iii).

——— Ties purchased in U. S. (remarks) 1448 (i).

——— Town and Development Co., Location of Lands, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5087 (iii).

——— Winnipeg and Moncton Branch, Tenders *re* Contracts, Signatures, &c. (M. for ret.*) 935 (i).

Halifax Garrison, Retraction of Remarks by Fin. Min., 5784 (iii).

House of Commons, Ventilation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10978 (vi).

——— Rules for Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 594 (i).
See 'Postal.'

'Hurona'-'Mongolian' Collision, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 358 (i).

Kingston Military Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12148 (vii).

Lacas, E., Payments to by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 979, 1039 (i).

Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 3483 (ii).

Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Judgments undelivered, Action of Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2594 (ii).

Medicine Hat Building, Contract *re* Heating System (remarks) 10791 (vi).

Menzies, Mr. James, Emplymt. by Govt. in Geodetic Survey (Ques.) 1349 (i).

Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept. (Ques.) 11701 (vi).

Midland Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).

'Montcalm' Ice-breaker, Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1897 (i).

——— Purchase Price, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 8441 (v).
See 'Govt. Steamers.'

Montreal 'Gazette' Building, Amount paid for, &c. (Ques.) 3900 (ii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4066 (ii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9499 (v).

Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9919 (v).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10333 (vi).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Orangemen and Quebec Provincial Elections, Speech of Hon. Mr. Brodeur at Montreal (remarks) 10123 (v).

Orangeville Post Office Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).

Order, Ques. of, Appeal to the Chair *re* Chairman's Ruling, Agreed to (Y. 84; N. 1) 4188 (ii).

Petit Rocher Breakwater, Contracts, &c., O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1294 (i).

——— Incomplete Return (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5723 (iii). 9716 (v).

——— Inquiry for, 6464, 7107 (iv).

Postal Service, H. of C., Delays, &c. (Ques.) 570 (i).

Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr W. C. Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 983 (i).

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony and Elmira Branch Line (B. 202) in Com. on Res., 12409 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3122 (ii).

Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iv).

Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3387 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3905 (ii).

Ry. Connections: *See* 'Brockville,' &c.

Reinhardt, Mr. Paul, Emplymt. by Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 10301 (vi).

——— Emplymt. in Quebec Provincial Elections, Cor., &c. (read) in Com. of Su., 10986 (vi).

Returns, Inqiury for, 2738 (ii).

Riviere du Loup Wharf Dredging, &c. (remarks) 6462 (iv).

Ross Rifles, Number in Use in Canada, Total &c. (Ques.) 5786 (iii).

——— Provisions *re* Bayonets, &c. (Ques.) 3483 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3010 (ii)

St. Louis, Mr., Payments to by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).

Seed Grain for Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2780 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2904, 2920 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1366 (i).

Senate, Cost of, Outside of Indemnities (M. for ret.*) 5087 (iii).

Sorel Irregularities, Final Rep. (remarks) 10795 (vi).

S. A. School Teachers, Recognition of Services (Ques.) 2791 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3782 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Spain, Commander, Travelling Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

—— Expenditure *re* Wreck Investigations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3150 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture, &c. (dairying, &c.) 10397; (exhibitions) 10570; (Imperial Institute) 10623 (vi).
Canals—Chambly (tow paths) 12226 (vii).
Canals—Murray (houses) 12226 (vii).
Canals—Quebec (steam road roller) 12225 (vii).
Canals—Rideau (improvements) 12227 (vii).
Canals—Soulanges (improvements) 12225 (vii).
Canals (statistical branch) 10320 (vi).
Canals—Trent (construction) 12225; (improvements) 12227 (vii).
Canals—Welland (Port Maitland piers) 5674 (iii).
Changes in Procedure (remarks) 1885 (i).
Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 621 (i); Marine and Fisheries (ass't. dep. min.) 12915 (vii); (salaries) 978; Printing and Stationery (salaries, &c.) 613 (i).
Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9223, 9253; Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9540 (v).
Fisheries (inspectors, &c.) 12261 (vii).
Immigration (general expenses) 5751 (iii).
Justice (Penitentiaries) 12265 (vii).
Labour Dept. ('Gazette') 12261 (vii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5773, 5780 (iii); (pensions) 13324 (vii); (salaries) 4755 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (subsidies) 12263 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries (dredging plant) 4754 (iii); (Hudson Bay patrol) 4131 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1894 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752 (iii); (observatories) 12262 (vii); (patrol boats) 4750 (iii).
Militia (pay and allowance) 12147; (properties) 12148; (Quebec cliffs) 12148; (salaries and wages) 12147; (warlike stores) 12148 (vii).
Miscellaneous (Civil Service Commission) 13168 (vii); (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii); (seed grain) 2780 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 1049 (i), 5764 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2968; (wrecks) 3150 (ii).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5530; (maintenance) 5512 (iii).
Public Works (ass't. dep. min.) 5698 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10891; (experimental farms, repairs, &c.) 10904 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7116; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax, customs) 7166; (Shelburne) 7174; (Yarmouth) 7182 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7465; (Dom. renewals) 7482; (Glencoe) 7487 (iv); (Kingston, militia stores) 10907 (vi); (Renfrew) 7826 (iv); (R.M.C. Barracks) 10907 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives) 5700 (iii); (heating, &c.) 11009 (vi); (mint) 1451; (observatory) 1450 (i); (rents, &c.) 10986 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 7282; (Farnham) 7288; (Knowlton) 7291; (Lachute) 7293; (Lake Megantic) 7294; (Longueuil) 7304 (iv); (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 11689 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Breton Cove) 11224; (Cape St. Mary) 11224; (Caribou Island) 11225; (Digby) 11227; (Glace Bay) 11228; (Hall's breakwater) 11228; (Oyster Pond) 11258; (Port Hood) 11278; (Port Joli West) 11279; (Tancook island) 11230 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Stanley Island wharf) 5720; (Tiffin) 5741 (iii); (Toronto) 12137 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Rustico) 11293 (vi).
Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13322 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (monuments) 11118 (vi).
Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 10391 (vi).
Railways—I.C.R. (double tracking) 12238 (vii); (private car of N.T.R.) 10186; (supplies) 10195 (v); (Truro) 12232 (vii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10389 (vi).
Steamboat Inspection (fog alarms) 12262 (vii).

Timber Limits, Application of Mr. Gentles, &c. (remarks) 7100 (iv).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2664 (ii).

Travelling Expenses, Marine Dept., Minister's, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).

—— *re* Col. Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3996 (ii).

U.S. Training Ships through St. Lawrence Canals, Number, &c. (Ques.) 5788 (iii).

—— (M. for copies) 5800 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6135 (iii).

Wednesday Evening Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., Financial Aid, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2191 (ii).

Willson, T. L., Payments *re* Ottawa Carbide Co. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

TELFORD, Mr. W. P., *Grey, N.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5102 (iii).

I.C.R. Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2459 (ii).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.'s (B. 83) 1°*, 1732 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Registrar of Grey County, 11302 (vi).

Returning Officers in Elections, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).

TELFORD, Mr. W. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12109 (vii).

Tobacco Prohibition, Resolutions from Moral Reform Associations (remarks) 11302 (vi).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W. (Minister of Inland Revenue) *Victoria City, B.C.*

Adulteration of Food, Number of Firms penalized (Ans.) 4402 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3868 (ii).

Assay Office, Vancouver, Results, &c. (remarks) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Barlow, Dr. A. E., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5205 (iii).

——— Survey *re* Temagami District (Ans.) 5473 (iii).

——— Payments *re* Temagami District (Ans.) 5787 (iii).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13569 (vii).

Brock, Mr., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5205 (iii).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6213 (iii).

Chilvers, Francis W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 10515 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10750 (vi).

Cigar Stamps, Use of Black Ones (Ans.) 12390 (vii).

Cirkel, Franz., Remuneration *re* Report of Geological Survey *re* Graphites (Ans.) 7935 (iv).

——— Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7202 (iv). *See* 'Graphite,' &c.

Coal Deposits in P.E.I., Boring for, &c. (Ans.) 515 (i).

Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production (Ans.) 12410 (vii).

Cosgrove, Mr. J. J., Total Cost of Investigation (Ans.) 5797 (iii).

Daley, Mr. R., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5204, 5473 (iii).

Dowling, Dr., Leave of Absence from Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10581 (vi).

——— Emplymt. by German Development Co. (Ans.) 5564 (iii).

——— Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5206 (iii).

Electric and Gas Power Licenses, granted under Statute, c. 16, &c. (Ans.) 360 (i).

Excise Revenue, Amount received from June 1 to 15, 1908 (Ans.) 10792 (vi).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Geological Survey Dept., Total Expenditure from 1896 to 1908 (Ans.) 6402 (iv).

——— Technical Officers (remarks) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Geological Survey Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 11232 (vi).

Gooderham & Worts, Distiller, Deficit in Spirit Production (Ans.) 12411 (vii).

'Graphite,' Cost of Publication, Total Value, &c. (Ans.) 5081 (iii). *See* 'Cirkel,' &c.

Harbottle, N. F., Emplymt. by Excise Dept (Ans.) 7731 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. (B. 143) 1°*, 6142 (iii); in Com., 6466; 3°*, 6517 (iv).

Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 6 (i).

——— Seizures in Cornwall, Toronto, &c. (Ans.) 3847 (ii).

——— Violations, on Inquiry for Ret., 4964 (iii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11238 (vi).

Maple Syrup and Sugar Adulteration, Penalties *re* (Ans.) 6639 (iv).

Marcoun, Mr. Frank, Commission *re* Settlement of Claims (Ans.) 1122 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Accountants, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4109 (ii).

Medicine Patent Bill, *re* Apptmts. to Com. (remarks) 10689 (vi).

Niagara Falls, Rep. of Dr. Spencer, Criticism of, in Press (Ans.) 6056 (iii).

Patent Medicines Inspection (B. 146) Res. prop., 4963 (iii); in Com. on Res., 6215; 1°*, 6218 (iii); 2° m., 10551; (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 10553 (vi); in Com., 12622 (vii).

Patent Medicines Bill, Govtl Legislation *re* (Ans.) 356, 608 (i), 2594 (ii).

——— Committee of Inquiry *re* (Ans.) 3900 (ii).

Peat Deposits in Canada, Development of (Ans.) 515 (i).

——— Emplymt. of Mr. Erik Nystrom, &c. (Ans.) 1122 (i).

Port Hope Inland Rev. Collectorship, Apptmnt. of (Ans.) 895 (i).

Sugar Manufacture, Saccharine Standards, &c. (Ans.) 351 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Excise (inspectors' salaries) 813; Inland Revenue (salaries) 645, 646; Mines (salaries) 646 (i).

Excise (customs duty) 817; (distilleries) 814; (methylated spirits) 820; (provisional allowances) 818; (tobacco stamps) 816; (travelling expenses, rent, &c.) 814 (i).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Survey (maps, &c.) 12260; (oil borings) 13162; (specimens) 12261; (technical officers) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4109 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3189 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10874; (Victoria, immigration) 10874 (vi).

Technical Students, Emplymt. on Govt. Works, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3298 (ii)

Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908 (Ans.) 13064 (vii).

Tobacco Excise Taxes, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 566 (i).

Tobacco, Foreign, Total Amount of Refund, &c. (Ans.) 4402 (iii).

Tobacco Industry, Amts. to Inland Revenue Act (Ans.) 179 (i).

—— Infractions of Inland Revenue Act, on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 9523 (v).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9240 (v).

Tobacco Manufactures, Total Amount of Fines and Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 363 (i).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 920 (i).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6120 (iii).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B. C., Licenses granted, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10277 (v).

Windsor Ferry, Expiration of Franchise (Ans.) 1940 (i).

THOMPSON, Mr. A., *Yukon Territory.*

Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4281 (iii).

Budget, The, 5405 (iii).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 757 (i).

Imperial Treaties, Status of Canada *re* Negotiations, &c. (Ques.) 1939 (i).

Mint, Gold Coins, &c. (Ques.) 2593 (ii).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3954 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3919 (ii).

Treaty-Making Power, Status of Canada, Notice of Discussion, 3172 (ii).

Yukon—Finnie-Perron Case, Information *re* (remarks) 4316 (iii).

—— (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

Yukon, Freight Rates, Rep. of Ry. Commission *re* (Ques.) 894 (i).

—— Mail Service, Complaints *re*, 2022 (ii).

—— Mail Service, Nontransmissable, &c. (remarks) 5136 (iii).

—— Money Transmission, Rates *re* (Ques.) 2979 (ii).

THOMPSON, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Yukon, Morality, Correspondence, &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

TISDALE, Hon. D., *Norfolk.*

Crown Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 180) in Com., 9962 (v).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4577 (iii).

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6658 (iv).

I.C.R., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4444 (iii).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1027 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12792 (vii).

Presbyterian Widows' and Orphans' Funds, B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2789 (ii).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. Blain) in Com., 4580 (iii).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4581 (iii).

TOBIN, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Pulp Wood, Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4821 (iii).

TURCOTTE, Mr. G. A., *Nicolet.*

Nicolet, Govt. Expenditure, for 1878-1896; 1896-1908 (Ques.) 12775 (vii).

TURGEON, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134) 1°*, 5649 (iii).

Blackhall, Mrs. Claims *re* Caraquet Wharf Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11686 (vi).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1730 (i).

Petit Rocher Breakwater (remarks) 7110 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4920 (iii).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9795 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Tracadie Lazaretto) 7187 (iv); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 11686 (vi); (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Petit Rocher spur) 12759 (vii).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G., *Assiniboia, E.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11357 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11170, 11418, 11533, 11947 (vi).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1424 (i); in Com., 4239, 4545, 4577 (iii).

Fog Signal Co., Payments to (Ques.) 11497 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6373 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7046 (iv).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13135 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).

Personal Explanation *re* Land Deals, 1927 (i).

Ry. Act (construction) Amt. (B. 4) 1° m., 91 (i); Discussion *re*, 3404; 2° m., 3406 (ii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3359 (ii).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Timber Leases, Denial of Stmnt. of Mr. Ames, 8697 (v).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4233 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2922 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3765, 3831 (ii); in Com., 12605 (vii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1930 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N. W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10977 (vi); Sask. (Humboldt) 8595 (v).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2290 (ii).

——— Opening of Tenders, Ques. of Priv. *re* Speech of Mr. Foster, 11303 (vi).

——— Papers used in Debate, on Inquiry for, 2386 (ii).

——— Par. in 'Toronto News,' Ques of Priv., 5077 (iii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*

Convict Labour, Control of, Sale of Articles, &c. (Ques.) 238 (i).

Co-operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4562 (iii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3491 (ii).

Fair Wages Schedule on Dredging Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 7200 (iv).

Immigration Agents in Italy, Number, &c. (Ques.) 4584 (iii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6816 (iv).

Immigration Central Board, London, Moneys paid to, &c. (Ques.) 2545 (ii).

Montreal P. O. Building, Settlement of Strike (remarks) 8608 (v).

North Atlantic Trading Co., and Bonuses, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 803 (i).

Post Office Buildings built since 1904, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4761 (iii).

Public Works, Hours of Labour (B. 97) 1° m., 3157 (ii).

WALSH, Mr. J. C., *Montreal, St. Anne's.*

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. (B. 88) 1°*, 2214 (ii); in Com., 5379, 5408, 5785, 5953 (iii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3490 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3537 (ii).

WALSH, Mr. R. N., *Huntingdon.*

Beauharnois Canal, Lease to Robert Co., Emplymt. of Mr. Deschene, &c. (Ques.) 8443 (v).

Brockville Cold Storage Plant, Disposal of (Ques.) 3234 (ii).

Currie, W. D., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 7731 (iv).

Desaulniers, Mr. Gonsalve, Emplymt. as Translator, &c. (Ques.) 1121, 1290 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13272 (vii).

Gaudette, Mr. Victor, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1120 (i).

International Boundary Line, Representations *re* Buildings on (Ques.) 356 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4933 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13381 (vii).

St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe, Waterway from Lake St. Francis, Letters, Plans, Surveys, &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

——— Damages *re* Floods (remarks) 6987 (iv).

——— Rep. of Engineer (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock) 12898 (vii); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dundee) 7286 (iv).

Tuberculin Tests, Results of (Ques.) 9270 (v).

WARD, Mr. H. A., *Durham.*

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copy) 3466 (ii).

WARD, Mr. H. A.—*Con.*

Blunden, Frederick (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 5211 (iii).

Cobourg Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 359 (i).

Gillis, Release from Penitentiary (Ques.) 510 (i).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 960 (i).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1028 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission (remarks) 7387 (iv).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10330 (vi).

Port Hope Inland Revenue Office, Apptmt. of Collector, &c. (Ques.) 895 (i).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8860 (v).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3832 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (damages) 10308 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 9704 (v).

Militia (customs dues) 12156; (pay and allowance) 12147; (provisions) 12151; (R. M. College) 12153 (vii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5524 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon, drill hall) 8518; (Dauphin) 8529 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Hope) 12135 (vii).

Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10330 (vi).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2520, 2652 (ii).

WATSON, Mr. R. J., *Parry Sound.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (amt.) 11890 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal, Plans, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for copies, 1982 (i).

WHITE, Mr. G. V., *Renfrew, N.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (amt.) 11890 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal Survey, Final Report *re* (Ques.) 240 (i), 5465 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. McCool) for copies, 1970 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10314 (vi).

——— Rep. *re* Surveys (remarks) 11827 (vi).

G.T.P., Supplies, Contract *re* District No. 3, &c. (Ques.) 1120 (i).

McInnes, W. B., Inquiry for Ret., 6061 (iii).

Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence (Ques.) 7199 (iv).

Petawawa Camp, Arrangements *re* Training of Troops (Ques.) 5791 (iii).

——— Payment *re* Painting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12147 (vii).

WHITE, Mr. G. V.—*Con.*

Petawawa Dock, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 685 (i).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10716 (vi).

Stevenson, Mr. A. W., Chartered Accountant, Amounts paid to by Marine Dept., &c. (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4205 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5742 (iii); (salaries and wages) 12147 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (masters and mates) 2969 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13154 (vii).

Public Works — Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10901 (vi); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Petawawa) 12134 (vii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1031, &c., on Order for Ret. (amt.) 850 (i).

———Tenders, Original Documents (M for ret.) 2983 (ii).

WILMOT, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's.*

Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagornis, Charges *re* Political Activity (Ques.) 6642 (iv).

Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Wharf (Ques.) 7937 (iv).

G.T.P., Nationality of Messrs. Foley, Welsh & Stewart, Discrimination against Canadians (Ques.) 7936 (iv).

Immigration Agents in N. B., Apptmt. (Ques.) 843 (i).

Live Stock, N. B., Figures *re* Census, Methods of Obtaining, &c. (Ques.) 1506 (i).

Mill Settlement and Newcastle Creek Post Office, Establishment of, Pets., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2982 (ii).

N.B. Inland Waters, Wharfs, Construction Policy, &c. (Ques.) 5465 (iii).

Scotch Town, N.B., Wharf, Application (Ques.) 7202 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. N. F., *Russell.*

Budget, The, 6610 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*

Australian Mission of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2218 (ii).

Australian Representative from Canada in 1901, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2168 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4500 (iii).

British Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3621 (ii).

Budget, The, 6082 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4231 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11353; in Com., 11365, 11661; (amt.) 11930 (vi).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5016 (iii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co. B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13260; in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3625 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5496 (iii).

Governor General's Expenditure since 1892 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3581 (ii).

Haycock, Mr. J. L., Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).

Immigrants deported, Expenditure *re* Transportation, &c. (Ques.) 5080 (iii).

Immigrant Detention Hospitals, Amount expended (Ques.) 5081 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6434 (iv).

Immigration Agent M. C. Dunne, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington County (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Immigration Agent Miller, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Immigration Agents, Names, Addresses (Ques.) 180 (i).

Immigrant Agents in G. B., Names, Salary, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 2169 (ii).

——— Reps. received from (M. for copies*) 557 (i).

Immigration Agents, Names of those paid Commissions to in Europe, &c. (Ques.) 3844 (ii).

——— Agents in Ont., &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 3178 (ii).

——— Special Agents in G. B., Salaries, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2398 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 3300 (ii).

Immigration and Commercial Agents, Rets., Inquiry for, 1108 (i).

Immigration, O.Cs. and Circulars issued *re* (M. for copies*) 2171 (ii).

I.C.R., Dartmouth Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 4244 (iii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11240; in Com., 11247 (vi).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 806 (i).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10709 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13286 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Patent Record) 672 (i).

Canals—Generally (repairs) 10312 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 635; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 984; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5755 (iii).

Post Office (boots for letter carriers) 8880 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10878; (Victoria, immigration) 10878 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, immigration) 8573 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rents) 10983; (Rideau Hall) 11007 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11083 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10379 (vi).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6186 (iii).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N., *Sherbrooke.*

Cavalry Brigade Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 9273 (v).

Church of England Woman's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society, incorp. (B. 75) 1°*, 1584 (i).

Customs Duty on Militia Uniforms, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2584 (ii).

Dom. Arsenal, Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re* Building (Ques.) 7991 (iv).

Dominion Camp Equipment Co., Incorporation, &c. (Ques.) 3238 (ii).

Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c. (Ques.) 177 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

——— Inquiry for, 4834 (iii), 6222 (iv).

Eastman Rifle Match, Accident, Inquiry *re* (Ques.) 1125 (i).

Fortifications, Construction of, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6646 (iv).

Garrison Artillery, 5th Regiment, B.C., Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5792 (iii).

Lee-Enfield Rifles, Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 6644 (iv).

Militia Allowances, Arrears of (Ques.) 8442 9273 (v).

Military Camp in Eastern Townships, Proposed Arrangements, &c. (Ques.) 3842 (ii).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Militia Promotions, Names and Records, &c. (Ques.) 352 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).

Militia Supplies at Halifax, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 6405 (iv).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and U. S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3167 (ii).

Quebec Bridge, Accident, Material on Hand, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 1290 (i).

Quebec Tercentenary, Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance (Ques.) 7992 (iv).

Returns, Inquiry for, 2024 (ii).

Rifles, Purchase of from other Cos. (Ques.) 1123 (i).

Ross Rifle Co., Advances *re* Contracts, Cor. with Bank of Montreal (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Ross Rifle Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt. (Ques.) 5786 (iii).

——— Contracts *re* Bayonets, &c. (Ques.) 6235, 8176 (iv), 8442 (v).

——— (M. for copy*) 5476 (iii).

Ross Rifle, Bonus Loans, Service of Govt. Employees, &c. (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).

——— Consignment to N. W. Mounted Police, Manufacture, &c. (Ques.) 5259 (iii).

——— Contracts *re* Supply of Rifles, &c. (M. for copy*) 557 (i).

——— Contract Price, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 8174 (iv).

——— Disposition of Manufactured Rifles, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3237 (ii).

——— Evidence before Pub. Accounts, Inquiry for Rep., 5914 (iii).

——— Imp. Govt., Cor. with *re* Defects, &c. (M. for cor.*) 5210 (iii).

——— Inefficiency and Extravagance of Dept. of Militia, 8902; (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 8953; Amt. neg. (Y. 18; N. 55) 9090 (v).

——— Inter-changeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3898 (ii).

——— Military Associations, &c., Rep. from, *re* Efficiency (M. for ret.*) 557 (i).

——— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c. (Ques.) 178 (i).

——— Number reported unfit for Use (Ques.) 3841 (ii).

——— Payments for since Jan. 1, 1908 (Ques.) 7209 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9333 (v).

——— Rep. of Col. Gaudet, &c. (Ques.) 9713 (v).

——— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of (Ques.) 3237 (ii).

——— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c. (Ques.) 365 (i).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle, Target Practice, Suspension by N.W.M. Police (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

——— Tests in England, Reps. *re* (remarks) 8170 (iv).

Sherbrooke Militia Corps, Establishment of (Ques.) 9273 (v).

Sutherland Rifle Sight, Contract *re* Additional Number (Ques.) 5257 (iii).

——— Number, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 569 (i).

——— Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 5476 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9567 (v); Marine (ice-breakers) 1897 (i).

Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from by Govt. (Ques.) 356 (i).

WRIGHT, Mr. A. A., *Renfrew, S.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res (Mr. Blain) 5131 (iii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3794 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. McCool) for Plans, &c., 5228 (iii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. J. Hughes) 6270 (iv).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10494 (vi).

——— Rules *re* Hours of Adjournment (prop. Res.) 584 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4646 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5527 (iii); Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11083 (vi).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10695 (vi).

WRIGHT, Mr. W., *Muskoka.*

Address, The, 396 (i).

'Arctic,' Str., Payments *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4175 (ii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5108 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8271 (iv), 11716; in Com., 11869 (vi), 12935 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3613 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 2018 (i).

Gravenhurst Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).

WRIGHT, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Hoppins, Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3842 (ii).

Indian Department, Extravagant Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11057 (vi).

Indians in Man. and Sask., Investigation of Mrs. A. M. Paget and Miss Ferguson, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 6919 (iv).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11991 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10849 (vi).

Ottawa Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 3842 (ii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4232 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Patent Record) 672 (i).

Civil Govt.—Railways (Butler, M. J.) 12756 (vii).

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12753; N.B. (salaries) 12738; Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12735 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4175 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10875; (Victoria, immigration) 10875 (vi); Ont. (Glencoe) 7491 (iv).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2488 (ii).

ZIMMERMAN, Mr. A., *Hamilton, W.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4386 (iii).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6179 (iii).

Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c. (Ques.) 6924 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3612 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4333 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5497 (iii).

—— B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12558 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3745 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7228; on M. for 3°, 7216 (iv).

Militia Uniforms, and Customs Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9569 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5066 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 664 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9569 (v).

Marine (ice-breakers) 1901 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 5745 (iii), 10294 (v).

Ocean and River Service (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10902 (vi); Man. (Dauphin) 8528 (v); Ont. (Owen Sound) 7818 (iv); Ottawa (mint) 1472 (i).

INDEX—SUBJECTS.

Absinthe and Brandy Importations, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).

Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 362 (i).

—— remaining unpaid by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 352 (i).

Accountants, Payments to by Dept. of Justice: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3233 (ii).

Acetylene Gas Works at Prescott, Employmt. of Political Officials: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3292 (ii).

Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6232 (iv).

Adams Lake, Construction of Dam, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5798 (iii).

Address The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech from Throne: moved (Mr. Hall) 9; seconded (Mr. Lanctot) 17.

Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden) 23; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 40; (Mr. Foster) 66; (Mr. Fielding) 94; (Mr. Cookshutt) 123, (amt.) 147; Neg. (Y. 95; N. 56)274; (Mr. Miller) 148; (Mr. Clements) 194; (Mr. Fisher) 213; (Mr. Lewis) 242; (Mr. Clarke) 254; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 263; (Mr. W. Roche) 267; (Mr. Barr) 276; (Mr. Lalor) 292; (Mr. Elson) 304; (Mr. Crawford) 316; (Mr. Armstrong) 335, 366, (amt.) 380; (Neg. Y. 54; N. 103) 505; (Mr.. J. J. Hughes) 380; (Mr. Staples) 383; (Mr. Wm. Wright) 396; (Mr. Geo. Smith) 407; (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 412; (Mr. A. A. McLean) 420; (Mr. Kemp) 434; (Mr. W. McIntyre) 445; (Mr. Perley) 449; (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 455; (Mr. Lake) 459; (Mr. A. Lavergne) 476; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 485; (Mr. Paquet) 505; (Mr. Barker) 519, (amt.) 530; (Neg. Y. 50; N. 96) 552; (Mr. Fielding) 531; (Mr. Monk) 535; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 544; (Mr. Haggart) 548 (i).

—— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to present, 554 (i).

Administrative Buildings, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Admiralty Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 122.'

Adulteration of Food, Number of Firms penalized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 4402 (iii).

Advertisements in Newspapers, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 509 (i).

Advertising in Mar. Prov. Newspapers, Amts. paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 936 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders *re* Govt. Works, Supplies, &c.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4702; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 95) 4735 (iii).

See 'Tenders,' &c.

Agricultural Committee, 2nd Rep.: M. (Mr. Mackenzie) to conc., 12409 (vii).

Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).

AGRICULTURE.

Agriculture, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 7 (i).

—— Dep. Minister O'Halloran's Salary: in Com. of Sup., 12878 (vii).

—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 645, 671 (i), 10569 (vi), 12879 (vii).

Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8611 (v).

—— Goods purchased from T. Lindsay Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8615 (v).

—— Purchase of Goods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).

—— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., Removal of, Action by Govt. since 1896: Ques. Mr. Armstrong) 2167 (ii):

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2795 (ii).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 6223 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).

—— Cable *re* Removal by G. B.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13228 (vii).

Cattle exported to U. S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 2767 (ii).

Cattle Exports and Imports from Canada to G. B.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6460 (iv).

Cattle Registered, Importation from U. S., from 1904-7: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6238 (iv).

Cattle Inspection *re* Ocean Service: in Com. of Sup., 3220 (ii).

Cattle sold from Experimental Farm: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2389 (ii).

Cold Storage, Assistance *re* East Elgin Establishment: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 351 (i).

Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner's Report: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2786 (ii).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*
Dairying and Fruit Industry: in Com. of Sup., 10397 (vi).
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 10569 (vi), 12889 (vii).
—— Amount of Subsidies paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4406 (iii).
Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4584 (iii).
Experimental Farm, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 1018 (i).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12549 (vii).
Experimental Farm (Central) Amounts paid for Seeds, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 556 (i).
—— Sale of Cattle, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2795 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provs.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 7990 (iv).
—— in Quebec District, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2593 (ii).
—— Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 8182 (iv).
Experimental Farms, Number controlled by Dom. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 3897 (ii).
—— Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c: (Mr. Armstrong) 4585 (iii).
Fumigation Stations: in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).
Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 9280 (v).
Hogs slaughtered, Compensation paid, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13085 (vii).
Horses and Cattle, Imports to U. S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6000 (iii).
Imperial Institute: in Com. of Sup., 10623 (vi).
Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, Permission *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5079 (iii).
Live Stock, N.B., Figures *re* Census, Methods of Obtaining, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 1506 (i).
Piggeries at Experimental Farm: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vii).
Seeds Inspection Act: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vii).
Sheep Quarantine by U. S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 13064 (vii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Christie) 13537 (vii).
Tuberculin Tests, Results of: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 9270 (v).
Aids to Navigation, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5040 (iii).
Aids to Navigation, Construction of Lighthouses: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).
See 'Marine.'
Alberta and B. C. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 192'
Alberta Development Co., Control of Coal Lands: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
Alberta Closed Leases, Number granted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3037 (ii).
Alberta Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Alberton Fire Damage Claims: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. A. Lefurgey) 1209 (i).
Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry: prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3853 (ii).
Alexander, Mary, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 177.'
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Subsidies, Reports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 892 (i).
Algoma Steel Co., Orders from Govt. for Steel, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8606 (v).
See 'I. C. R.'
Alien Act: *See* B. No. 130.'
Alien Labour, Protection to Canadians: Pet. (Mr. Boyce) read in Com. of Sup., 12156 (vii).
See 'Immigration,' &c.
Allan, Mr., Interference in Dom. Elections: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).
All-Red Line: prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12414; Agreed to (Y. 109; N. 47) 12501; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Neg. (Y. 108; N. 48) 12499 (vii).
—— Irish Route, Opposition by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10253 (v).
—— Negotiations, Canadian Representative in England, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 353 (i).
—— Omission of, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 28 (i).
—— Route, Letter to Mr. Sifton from Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 948 (i).
—— Mr. Sifton's Address *re* Canada's Attitude: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 947 (i).
All-Red Route, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 87 (i).
—— Remarks *re* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12162 (vii).
—— Statement *re* Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 366 (i).
—— Tenders, Proposals, &c., Cor. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6460 (iv).
—— Mr. White's Duties in England: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 694 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 608 (i).
American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2593 (ii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3484 (ii).

Amherst Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Ancoin *vs.* The King, Cor. *re* Suit in Supreme Court, N. S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McLennan) 558 (i).
Anglo-American Cable between P.E.I. and Mainland, Breaking of: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 8439 (v).
Anglo-American Treaty, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 937 (i), 6985 (iv).
——— Further Information: (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7447, 7834 (iv).
——— Information *re* Presenting (Mr. R. L. 8516 (v).
——— Anglo-American Treaties, Cor. *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9715 (v).
——— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Sproule) 10120 (v).
——— Treaty submitted to Can. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6926 (iv).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank: *See* 'B. No. 141.'
Anglo-Canadian Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 126.'
Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8611 (v).
——— Goods purchased from T. Lindsay Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8615 (v).
——— Purchase of Goods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).
——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).
Anglo-French Treaty, Ratification by Imperial Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11705 (vi).
See 'Franco-Canadian.'
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Cor., Reps., &c.; M. for copies (Mr. Monk) 594 (i).
See 'Japanese,' &c.
Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 12653 (vii).
Annapolis Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11207 (vi).
Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii).
See 'Militia.'
Anuities by Govt. for Old Age: *See* 'B. No. 120.' *See* 'Old Age,' &c.
Anse à la Barbe Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Anse à l'Illot Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Anse St. Jean Bridge, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Anthracite Coal, Qantity imported from U. S. and other Countries: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1510 (i).
Anti-Cigarette Bill: *See* 'Tobacco.'
Antigonish Armoury, Leasing, &c., Letters, Tels., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. Chisholm) 1131 (i).
Antigonish, Increased Accommodation, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Antigonish Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7110 (iv).
Appeal Court, B.C., Salary of Judge: M. to withdraw Res. (Mr. Aylesworth) 7992 (iv).
See 'Justice,' &c.
Apple and Fruit Inspectors, Number of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 353 (i).
Apples, &c., Marking of: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Apples seized by Inspectors at Montreal, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1508 (i).
Architects of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 88.'
Architectural Institute of Canada: M. (Mr. Ethier) to Refund Fees, 11234, 11404 (vi).
Architects on Public Works Payments, &c.: Remarks, in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).
Architectural Branch, Public Works Dept., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11096 (vi).
Archives Dept., Index Cards purchased, Names of Firms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6057 (iii).
Archives Fittings, Furnishings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5700 (iii).
Archives: in Com. of Sup., 671 (i).
'Arctic, Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June, 1904, to June, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 184 (i).
——— History of Cruise in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).
Armouries, Construction of: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Army and Navy Veterans at the Tercentenary: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7448 (iv).
See 'Que. Tercentenary.'
Arnprior Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Emplymt. in Customs, Montreal, Charges against: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1347 (i).
Arthabaskaville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Artz, J. G., Apptmt. of. Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13578 (vii).
Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 58.'
Ashcroft-Dawson Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
Ashouapmouchouan, Peribonka Training Dykes: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Ash Wednesday, Adjournment: Notice of Motion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4221; M. 4314 (iii).
Asiatic Immigration into B.C.: *See* 'Immigration Act.'
Asiatic Labour in B.C., Rep. in Victoria 'Times': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6526 (iv).
See 'Japanese,' &c.
Assaults on Women, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'

Assay Office, Vancouver, Results, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13573 (vii).
Assurance Fund of Saskn. and Alta.: *See* B. No. 168.'
Astronomical Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9737 (v).
Astronomical Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 1450, 1485 (i).
Atlantic, Que. and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 134.'
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction: in Com. on Res., 13306 (viii).
Atlantic Steamers, Mail Service, Cost per Annum: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5656 (iii). *See* 'Post Office,' &c.
Aud. Gen.'s Office: in Com. of Sup., 635 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (Vol. i): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).
——— (Vol. ii): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 766 (i).
——— (Vol. iii): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
Auditor General's Salary: *See* 'B. No. 208.'
Audits and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12658 (vii). *See* 'Banks,' 'Finance,' &c.
Australia, G. B. and Canada Fast Line Steamers, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i). *See* 'Can. and Australia.'
Australian Mission of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2218
Australian Representative from Can. in 1901, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 2168 (ii).
Automobiles injuring Persons: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
Autonomy Act, Validity of: Return, Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 5727 (iii).
Aylmer Customs Collector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 1506 (i).
Aylmer Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Baddeck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11219 (vi).
Badgley Island, Trespass by T. H. Jackman, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1937 (i), 2217 (ii).
Baie St. Paul, Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Bait Freezer and Cold Storage Co., N.B., Lease of Land to, Cost and Terms: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 563 (i).
——— Cor., Agreements, &c., with Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i). *See* 'Cold Storage,' 'New Brunswick,' &c.
Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 3848 (ii).
Balsam Lake Section, Trent Canal, Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
Balsam Lake and Gull River, Ret. Incomplete: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6059 (iii). *See* 'Canals, Trent.
Bank Act, (additional circulation), Amt. *See* 'B. No. 160.'
Banks, Financial Stringency: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
Banks, Govt. Assistance *re* Grain Blockade: *See* 'No. 159.'
Bank of Hamilton, Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 56.'
Banking System: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Pringle) *re* Newspaper Reports, 2306 (ii).
——— Par. in 'Financial Post': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 4770 (iii). *See* 'Can. Bank of Commerce.'
Bank of Vancouver: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Bank of Winnipeg: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure, Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9335 (v).
Barachois de Malbaie Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Barachois Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11223 (vi).
Barlow, Dr. A. E., Emplymt. in Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5205 (iii).
——— Survey *re* Temagami District: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5473 (iii).
——— Payments *re* Survey of Temagami District: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5787 (iii).
Bate & Co., and W. C. Edwards & Co., Amts. paid to *re* Supplies: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 3435 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3234 (ii).
Batiscan River, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Batiscan Wharf, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Battlefields: *See* 'Can. Patriotic,' &c.
Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 and 219.'
Battlefields: *See* 'Quebec.'
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8576 (v).
Bayfield, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 6223 (iv). *See* 'Grand Bend,' &c.
Bay St. Lawrence, Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Bear River Station Dwelling House, Tenders, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2161 (ii).
Beauchemin, A., Emplymt. at Sorel (Mr. Taylor) 5467 (iii).
Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3038 (ii).
——— Lease, Conditions, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1131 (i).
———Inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 1740 (i).

Beauharnois Canal, Lease to Robert Co., Employment of Mr. Deschenes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 8443 (v).

—— Lease of Water Power to McIntyre and Roberts Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).

—— Robert Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 13475 (vii).

—— Water Power, New Lease, Copy of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 946 (i).

Beaver Harbour Wharf: Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).

Beaverton Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090, 13344 (vii).

Becancour, &c., Counties, Dredging at during 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3040 (ii).
See 'Dredging,' &c.

Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2392 (ii).

—— Dredging, Commencement of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7212 (iv).

Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1733 (i).

—— Sir C. H. Tupper's Travelling Expenses: Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 4669 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2883 (ii).

Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).

Belgian Syndicate, Royal Commission, and Chap. 138, R.S.C., Judges as Commissioners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 842 (i).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13569 (vii).

Bellechasse Islet Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4830 (iii).

Belle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).

Belle River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure, *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).

Belleville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).

Belleville Drill Hall, Negotiations for Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1509 (i).

—— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1737 (i).

Belleville Floods, Investigation by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 3319 (ii), 4744 (iii).

Belleville Harbour, Issue of Bonds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6237 (iv).

—— Total Revenue, Expenditure for 1903-7: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2592 (ii).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Porter) 2983 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Porter) 4408 (iii).

Belleville Hospital Lot, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 4830 (iii).

——M. for Ret.* (Mr. Porter) 5211 (iii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 7506 (iv).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G. T. Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Northrup) 2796 (ii).

Belleville Post Office, Excessive Postage: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 7933 (iv).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 20.'

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co. Bill, on Order for 2°: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 681 (i).

Belleville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv).

Bell Memorial Association, Grant by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) on M. for Sup., 11206 (vi).
See 'Brantford.'

Bell Rapids P. O., Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 8883 (v).

Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).

Bernier, Capt., Islands, Customs Ports, &c., Flagged by him: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5208, 5466 (iii).

Berthier Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).

'Bessie Butler,' Str., Dimensions, Use of by R. C. Clergy: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 12411 (vii).

Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).

—— Material supplied, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 9713 (v).

Big Lorraine Harbour, Dredging Entrance Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 142.'

Bills, Royal Assent, Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2974, 2995 (ii), 5135, 6157 (iii), 6526 (iv), 13587 (vii).

BILLS:

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, 3 (i).

Bill (No. 2) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 90 (i); 2°m., 3014; in Com., 3034 (ii).

Bill (No. 3) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 91; 2°, 570; in Com., 583; 3°*, 583 (i).

Bill (No. 4) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°, 91 (i); 2°m., 3406 (ii).

Bill (No. 5) Respecting Co-operation.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 92; 2°m., (i); M. to place on Govt. Orders, 3654 (ii); 2°m., 4547; in Com., 4564; 3°*, 4566 (iii).

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Maclean, South York).
1°, 93; 2°m., 938 (i), 3320, 3363 (ii).

Bill (No. 7) To incorporate the North Empire Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Adamson).
1°*, 231; 2°*, 463 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5077 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 8) Respecting the Tobique Manufacturing Company, and to change its name to 'Fraser Lumber Company, Limited.—(Mr. Carvell).

1°*, 231; 2°*, 463 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 9) Respecting Surveys of Public Lands of the Dominion and the Surveyors entitled to make such surveys (Mr. Oliver).

1° 231; 2° and in Com., 754, 948; 3°*, 953 (i), Sen. Amts., 3755 (ii).

Bill (No. 10) To amend the Irrigation Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 231; 2°, 766; in Com., 767, 953 (i); wthdn., 2974 (ii).

Bill (No. 11) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Maclean, S. York).

1°, 231 (i).

Bill (No. 12) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Maclean, Lunenburg).

1°, 313 (i); 2°, 3414 (ii).

Bill (No. 13) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher).

1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 14) Respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. McColl).

1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*; 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 15) Respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—(Mr. Sloan).

1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 16) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., 1894; 3°, 1929 (i).

Bill (No. 17) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. McCarthy, N. Simcoe).

1°, 349 (i); 2°m., 3414 (ii).

Bill (No. 18) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Kennedy).

1°, 350; 2°, 938 (i).

Bill (No. 19) To incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. Bole).

1°*, 430; 2°*, 680 (i); in Com., 2787; 3°*, 2924 (ii).

Bill (No. 20) Respecting the Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Company.—(Mr. Porter).

1°*, 430; 2°m., 681, 779; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 7669 (iv), 8332, 8552, 8609, 9066 (iv).

Bill (No. 21) Respecting the British Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 430; 2°*, 645 (i); in Com., 3621 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—(Mr. Herron).

1°*, 430; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*, 1894 (i).

Bill (No. 23) Respecting the Ministers' Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.—Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 430; 2°*, 645 (i); in Com., 2788; 3°*, 2924 (ii).

Bill (No. 24) Respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert).

1°*, 430; 2°*, 645; in Com., and 3°*, 1468 (i).

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)

1°*, 430; 2°*, 645 (i); in Com., 3194, 3226; M. to ref. back to Com., 3228; in Com., 3362, 3621, 3692, 3793 (ii), 4224; 3° m., 4357, 4536 (iii).

Bill (No. 26) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash.)

1°*, 430; 2°*, 645; in Com., and 3°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 27) To amend the Government Railways Act.—(Mr. Macdonald.)

1°, 430 (i); 2°, 5211; in Com., 5246; 3°*, 5247 (iii).

Bill (No. 28) To amend the Copyright Act.—(Mr. Macdonell.)

1°, 508; 2°, 939; in Com., 940 (i); 3°*,3014 (ii).

Bill (No. 29) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°, 508 (i); 2°, 5247 (iii).

Bill (No. 30) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Ethier).

1°, 560 (i).

Bill (No. 31) To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Sinclair).

1°*, 562 (i); 2°, and in Com., 5247 (iii).

Bill (No. 32) To incorporate the Bank of Vancouver.—(Mr. Macpherson).

1°*, 606; 2° m., 779; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 4580; 3°*, 4582 (iii).

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher).

1°*, 606; 2°*, 779 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. Hughes, Victoria).

1°*, 606; 2°*, 779; in Com., 1894; 3°*, 1931 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 35) To incorporate the Travellers Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5077 (iii).

Bill (No. 36) Respecting the Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 37) To incorporate the Canada Weather Insurance Company.—(Mr. Schell, Oxford).
1°*, 753; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 5077, 5174; 3°*, 5174 (iii).

Bill (No. 38) Respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*,754; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 39) Respecting the Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 754; 2°*, 1059; in Com., and 3°*, 1895 (i).

Bill (No. 40) Respecting the Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Macpherson).
1°*, 754; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 6182 (iii), 6227; 3°*, 6231 (iv).

Bill (No. 41) To incorporate the Standard Plate Glass Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 754; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 6183; 3°*, 6184 (iii).

Bill (No. 42) Respecting Insurance.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 827; 2°, 1741 (i).

Bill (No. 43) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Barr).
1°, 840 (i); 2° m., 5212 (iii).

Bill (No. 44) To incorporate the Alberta Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Talbot).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 46) Respecting the Cumberland Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Monk).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1109 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 47) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. Stewart).
1°*, 891; 2°, 1059 (i); in Com., 3622, 3794 (ii), 4230; 3°*, 4230 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 48) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 49) To incorporate the Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 5409; 3° m., 5519 (iii).

Bill (No. 50) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Copp).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., 4231; 3°*, 4231; Sen. Amts., 5785 (iii).

Bill (No. 51) Respecting the Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240 (iii).

Bill (No. 52) Respecting a Patent of Eugene Francois Giraud.—(Mr. Gordon).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 53) Respecting the New Brunswick Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Carvell).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5762 (iii).

Bill (No. 54) To incorporate the Northwestern Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 1108; 2°, 1468 (i).

Bill (No. 55) To incorporate the Western Rivers Improvement Company.—(Mr. Sloan).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 56) To incorporate the Bank of Hamilton Pension Fund.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 1207; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5077 (iii).

Bill (No. 57) Respecting a certain Convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 941; in Com. on Res., 1213; 1° m., 1215, 1384 (i); 2°, 2221, 3493; in Com., 3577, 3581, 3636 (ii); 3° m., 4317, 4372 (ii).

Bill (No. 58) Respecting the Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 59) To incorporate the Chartered Bank of British Columbia.—(Mr. Macpherson).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 60) Respecting Patents of the Goodwin Car Company.—(Mr. Osler).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2924 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 61) Respecting Patents of Montague Moore and Thomas James Heskett.—(Mr. Osler).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2924 (ii).

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada—(Mr. Guthrie).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., 5077, 5174; 3°*, 5175 (iii).

Bill (No. 63) Respecting Patents of the Sutherland Rifle Sight Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonald).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 64) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Porter).
1°, 1283 (i); on order for 2°, 5226 (iii).

Bill (No. 65) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1284 (i).

Bill (No. 66) To amend the House of Commons Act.—(Mr. Borden).
1°, 1346 (i); 2° m., 5226 (iii).

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240; Sen. Amts., 5955 (iii).

Bill (No. 68) Respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., 4239, 4545, 4577; 3°*, 4579 (iii).

Bill (No. 69) To incorporate the Ruthenian Catholic Mission of the Order of Saint Basil the Great in Canada.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3194 (ii).

Bill (No. 70) To incorporate the Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., 4231, 4546, 4579; 3°*, 4580 (iii).

Bill (No. 71) Respecting the Standard Mutual Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to 'the Standard Fire Insurance Company.'—(Mr. Maclean, South York).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 72) Respecting Patents of the Windsor Pump and Foundry Company, Limited.—(Mr. Clarke).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 73) Respecting the Quebec Railway, Light and Power Company.—(Mr. Power).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1895 (i); in Com., 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 74) Respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. Grant).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240; Sen. Amts., 6189 (iii).

Bill (No. 75) To incorporate the Woman's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—(Mr. Worthington).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2790 (ii).

Bill (No. 76) Respecting the Interprovincial Railway Bridge Company of New Brunswick.—(Mr. C. Marcil).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1895 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240 (iii).

Bill (No. 77) Respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Dubeau).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1895 (i); in Com., 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 78) To amend the Provisions of the Criminal Code respecting Offensive Weapons.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1668 (i).

Bill (No. 79) To amend the Provisions of the Criminal Code respecting Assaults on Women and Children.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1670 (i).

Bill (No. 80) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Alcorn).
1°, 1671 (i); 2°, 5228 (iii).

Bill (No. 81) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 1732; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., 4231; in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 82) Respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. Adamson).
1°*, 1732; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., 4996, 5049; 3°*, 5077 (iii); Sen. Amts., 10511 (vi).

Bill (No. 83) Respecting the Owen Sound and Meaford Railway Company.—(Mr. Telford).
1°*, 1732 (i); 2°*, 2062 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4240 (iii).

Bill (No. 84) To incorporate the Dominion Transportation and Storage Company.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 1859 (i); 2°*, 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 85) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lavergne, Montmagny).
1°, 2021 (ii); 2° m., 5242 (iii).

Bill (No. 86) To incorporate the Northern Empire Railway Company.—(Mr. Caron).
1°*, 2160; 2°*, 2386 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5387 (iii).

Bill (No. 87) To incorporate the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Sloan).
1°*, 2160; 2°*, 2346 (ii); in Com., 4545; 3°*, 4545; Sen. Amts., 6189 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 88) To incorporate the Institute of Architects of Canada.—(Mr. Walsh, Montreal, Ste. Anne).

1°*, 2214; 2°*, 2386 (ii); in Com., 5379, 5408, 5785, 5953; 3°*, 5955 (iii).

Bill (No. 89) To authorize the Sale to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, of a portion of Major's Hill Park, in the City of Ottawa, as a Hotel Site.—(Mr. Pugsley).

Res. prop., 1584 (i), 2221; in Com. on Res., 2258; 1°*, 2260 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 12061; 3°*, 12084 (vii).

Bill (No. 90) To amend the Passenger Ticket Act.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).

1°,2466 (ii); 2° m., 5244 (iii).

Bill (No. 91) To amend the Act respecting the Supreme Court of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°, 2542 (ii).

Bill (No. 92) To amend the Criminal Code with regard to the Speedy Trial of Indictable Offences.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°, 2543 (ii).

Bill (No. 93) To amend the Criminal Code and punish homicide while hunting.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 2590 (ii).

Bill (No. 94) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending 31st March, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 2780; 1°, 2°, and in Com., 2782; 3°*, 2785 (ii).

Bill (No. 95) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°, 2974 (ii).

Bill (No. 96) To amend the Criminal Code with regard to conspiracy in restraint of trade.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°, 2976 (ii).

Bill (No. 97) Respecting the hours of labour on Public Works.—(Mr. Verville).

1°, 3157 (ii).

Bill (No. 98, from the Senate) Respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Blain).

1°, 3315 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., 4580; 3°*, 4580 (iii).

Bill (No. 99) To amend the Irrigation Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 3315 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 4671; 3°*, 4674 (iii).

Bill (No. 100) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Martin, St. Mary's).

1°*, 3316 (ii).

Bill (No. 101) Respecting the Fort William Terminal Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Macpherson).

1°*, 3477 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., 6180 (iii), 6223; 3°*, 6225 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 102) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 3477; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 3933 (ii).

Bill (No. 103, from the Senate) Respecting the Eastern Trust Company.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 3653 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 6191 (iii).

Bill (No. 104, from the Senate) To amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°*, 3653 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5492; 3°, 5495 (iii).

Bill (No. 105) To regulate the placing and maintaining of Booms in International Streams.—(Mr. Pugsley).

1°, 3654 (ii).

Bill (No. 106) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lavergne, Montmagny).

1°, 3655 (ii).

Bill (No. 107 from the Senate) Respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—(Mr. Girard).

1°*, 3834 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., 5386; 3°*, 5387 (iii).

Bill (No. 108 from the Senate) Respecting the Windsor, Chatham and London Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke).

1°*, 3834 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 5387 (iii).

Bill (No. 109) To authorize a Bounty to Volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa.—(Mr. Oliver).

Res. prop., 3316; in Com. on Res., 3756, 3805; 1°* of B., 3834 (ii); Res. prop., 11938; in Com on Res., 12595; 2°, and in Com., 12595, 13047; 3°, 13207; Sen. Amts., 13524 (vii).

Bill (No. 110, from the Senate) Respecting a certain Patent of Frederick C. Rehm, Elias Frank and Isidore Frank.—(Mr. Béland).

1°*, 3896 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 4996 (iii).

Bill (No. 111) Respecting the Canadian Battlefields at Quebec.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

Res. prop., 3579; in Com. on Res., 3901; 1°, 3902 (ii); 2° m., 4376; in Com., 4393, 4408, 4497; 3° m., 4529 (iii).

Bill (No. 112) To amend the Railway Act as respects the Constitution of the Board of Railway Commissioners.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 3751; in Com. on Res., 3903; 1°*, 3933 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 4964 (iii), 8510; 3°*, 8514 (v).

Bill (No. 113) To amend the Land Titles Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 4221 (iii); 2° m., 6517; in Com., 6518; 3°*, 6520 (iv).

Bill (No. 114) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°, 4312 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 115) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4566 (iii); 2° m., 7835, 7939, 7998; on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8076, 8089, 8138, 8185 (iv), 8296, 8332, 8387, 8619 (v), 11707; Amt. wthdrn., and in Com., 11796; in Com., 11827, 11885 (vi), 12919, 12984; 3° m., 13229; 3°*, 13258; Sen. Amts., 13579 (vii).

Bill (No. 116) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4576 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8501; 3°*, 8510 (v).

Bill (No. 117) To amend the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 4576; 2°, and in Com., 4994; 3°*, 4995 (iii).

Bill (No. 118) To amend the Railway Act with respect to Telegraphs and Telephones, and the Jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 4658 (iii); 2°, 10625; in Com., 10636, 10658; 3° m., 10777, 11124, 11590; ref. back to Com., 11633; 3°*, 11633 (vi).

Bill (No. 119) To encourage the Construction of Dry Docks.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 4314; in Com. on Res., 4675; 1°*, 4689 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6911 (iv); in Com., 10761; 3°*, 10771; Sen. Amts., 11633 (vi).

Bill (No. 120) To authorize the Issue of Government Annuities for Old Age.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Res., 4689; 1°*, 4702 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 10848 (vi), 12053; 3°*, 12054; Sen. Amts., 13316 (vii).

Bill (No. 121) To amend the Supreme Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4826; 2°, and in Com., 5497; 3°*, 5499 (iii).

Bill (No. 122) To make better Provision for the exercise of Admiralty Jurisdiction within Canada, in accordance with the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

Res. prop., 2881 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4835; 1°*, 4867 (iii).

Bill (No. 123, from the Senate) To amend the Gold and Silver Marking Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°*, 5337; 2°*, and in Com., 5495; 3°*, 5497 (iii).

Bill (No. 124, from the Senate) For the relief of Andrew Walker.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 5336; 2°*, 5464 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7142 (iv).

Bill (No. 125, from the Senate) Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464; in Com., 6183; 3°*, 6189 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) To change the name and head office of the Anglo-Canadian Insurance Company.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°*, 5256; 2°*, 5464 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7725 (iv).

Bill (No. 127, from the Senate) Respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.—(Mr. Pringle).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464; in Com., 6183 (iii), 6231; 3°*, 6231 (iv); Sen. Amts., 12773 (vii).

Bill (No. 128, from the Senate) Respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Michaud).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464; in Com., 6181 (iii), 6225; 3°*, 6227 (iv).

Bill (No. 129, from the Senate) To incorporate the London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464 (iii).

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate) To amend the Naturalization Act.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

1°*, 5256 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 11990 (vi); 3°*, 12393 (vii).

Bill (No. 131, from the Senate) Respecting the Occidental Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).

1°*, 5337; 2°*, 5464 (iii); in Com., 7724 (iv); 3°*, 8332 (v).

Bill (No. 132, from the Senate) To incorporate the Standard Accident and Guarantee Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 5337; 2°*, 5464; in Com., and 3°*, 6191 (iii).

Bill (No. 133, from the Senate) To amend the Boards of Trade Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°*, 5337 (iii); 2°, 11987; in Com., 11987 (vi), 12393; 3°*, 12393 (vii).

Bill (No. 134, from the Senate) Respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Marcil).

1°*, 5649; 2°, 5763; in Com., and 3°*, 6191 (iii).

Bill (No. 135) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 5657 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6429; 3°*, 6517 (iv).

Bill (No. 136) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial years ending respectively the 31st March, 1908, and the 31st March, 1909.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 5919, 5955; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5957 (iii).

Bill (No. 137, from the Senate) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment).

1°*, 5913; 2°*, 6191 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 8332 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 138, from the Senate) Respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment).

1°*, 5913; 2°*, 6191 (iii); in Com., 8610, 9069; 3°*, 9070 (v).

Bill (No. 139, from the Senate) For the relief of Edith Maud Rosario Gammell.—(Mr. Galliher).

1°*, 5913; 2°, 6190 (iii); in Com., 7141; 3°*, 7142 (iv).

Bill (No. 140) To amend the Criminal Code respecting injuries to Persons due to Motor Vehicles.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°*, 5993 (iii).

Bill (No. 141, from the Senate) To incorporate the Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 6054; 2°*, 6191 (iii); in Com., 7724; 3°*, 7724 (iv).

Bill (No. 142) To amend the Bills of Exchange Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 6054 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6520; 3°*, 6523 (iv).

Bill (No. 143) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Templeman).

Res. prop., 5161; in Com. on Res., 6118; 1°*, 6142 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6466; 3°*, 6517 (iv).

Bill (No. 144) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 6142 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6523; 3°*, 6525 (iv).

Bill (No. 145) To amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.—(Mr. Brodeur).

Res. prop., 3193; in Com. on Res., 6161, 6191; 1°*, 6215 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6408; 3°*, 6429 (iv).

Bill (No. 146) Respecting Proprietary and Patent Medicines.—(Mr. Templeman).

Res. prop., 4963; in Com. on Res., 6215; 1°*, 6218 (iii); 2°, 10551 (vi); in Com., 12622; 3°*, 12628 (vii).

Bill (No. 147) To repeal the Canned Goods Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°, 6221; 2°, and in Com., 6870; 3°*, 6890 (iv).

Bill (No. 148) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°, 6221; 2°, 6900; in Com., 6900 (iv), 10553; 3°*, 10569 (vi).

Bill (No. 149) To amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°, 6221; 2°, and in Com., 6890; 3° m., 7215; ref. back to Com., 7227; 3°*, 7257 (iv).

Bill (No. 150) To amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 6221 (iv); 2° m., 8481; in Com., 8483 (v), 10518; 3°*, 10526 (vi).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 151, from the Senate) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Crawford).

1°*, 6287; 2°, 6561; in Com., 7141, 7667, 8125 (iv), 8332, 8552, 8609, 8741, 9066, 9377, 9461; 3°*, 9472 (v).

Bill (No. 152) Respecting Signal Dues at Halifax.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 6457 (iv); 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 8510 (v).

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636; in Com., 7675, 7722 (iv), 8560, 8610, 9166; 3° m., 9167 (v).

Bill (No. 154, from the Senate) Respecting the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.—(Mr. Sinclair).

1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636; in Com., 7667; 3°*, 7669 (iv).

Bill (No. 155, from the Senate) Respecting the Pontiac Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8332 (v).

Bill (No. 156, from the Senate) Respecting the Northern Bank and Crown Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636; in Com., and 3°*, 7725 (iv).

Bill (No. 157) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°, 6843 (iv).

Bill (No. 158) Respecting Meaford Harbour.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 7195 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 8510; 3°*, 8510 (v).

Bill (No. 159) Respecting a certain Issue of Dominion Notes.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°, 7307 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10795; 3°*, 10848 (vi).

Bill (No. 160) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°, 7307 (iv); 2°, 10919; in Com., 10933; 3°*, 10952 (vi).

Bill (No. 161) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Beauparlant).

1°, 7307 (iv).

Bill (No. 162) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1°, 7931 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10703; 3°*, 10716 (vi); Sen. Amts., 12393 (vii).

Bill (No. 163) To authorize the exchange of certain School Lands for other Dominion Lands.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 8086 (iv); 2° m., 8467; in Com., 8478; 3°*, 8480 (v).

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) For the relief of Edith May Gilmore.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).

1°*, 8377; 2°*, 8610 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 165) Respecting the Court of Appeal of British Columbia.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

Res. prop., 8185 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8465; 1°, 8466 (v); 2°, and in Com., 10862; 3°*, 10863 (vi).

Bill (No. 166, from the Senate) To amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act in so far as the same affects the Province of Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°*, 8604 (v); 2°, 10690; in Com., 10691; 3°*, 10693 (vi).

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) Respecting the Phœnix Assurance Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonald).

1°*, 8603; 2°*, 9070; in Com., and 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 168) To authorize the payment to the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta of part of the Assurance Fund under the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. Oliver).

Res. prop., 7094 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8480; 1°*, 8481 (v); 2°, 10525; in Com., 10526; 3°*, 10528 (vi).

Bill (No. 169) To amend the Yukon Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 8604 (v); 2°, 10528; in Com., 10529; 3°, 10545; Sen. Amts., 11634 (vi).

Bill (No. 170, from the Senate) Respecting the Nipissing Central Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool).

1°*, 8694; 2°*, 9070; in Com., and 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 171) Respecting the Government Guaranteed Bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°, 8835 (v); 2°, and in Com., 10771; 3°*, 10777 (vi).

Bill (No. 172) To incorporate the Dominion Power Company.—(Mr. Hall).

1°*, 9021; 2°*, 9168 (v).

Bill (No. 173) To restrain the Use of Tobacco by Young Persons.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 9021 (v); 2°, and in Com., 10693; 3°*, 11235 (vi); Sen. Amts., 13044 (vii).

Bill (No. 174, from the Senate) Respecting certain patents of the General Chemical Company.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 175, from the Senate) For the relief of Catherine Ann Cannon.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 176, from the Senate) For the relief of Ada Katurah Stewart Paulding.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 177, from the Senate) For the relief of Mary Alexander.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°* 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 178, from the Senate) Relating to the Water-Carriage of Goods.—(Mr Johnston).

1°*, 9330 (v); M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).

Bill (No. 179, from the Senate) To incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Keewatin.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 9330; 2°*, 10008 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 11460 (vi).

Bill (No. 180, from the Senate) Respecting the Crown Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Tisdale).

1°*, 9330; in Com., 9962; 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 181) To consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 9333 (v); 2°, 11125; in Com., 11158, 11408, 11460, 11502, 11940; 3° m., 11970 (vi), 12394; 3°*,12399; Sen. Amts., 13522 (vii).

Bill (No. 182, from the Senate) For the relief of Hattie Spratte.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°*, 9889; 2°*, 10008 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 183, from the Senate) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°*, 10119 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12851, 13052; 3°*, 13223 (vii).

Bill (No. 184, from the Senate) To amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 10008 (v); 2°, 10545; in Com., 10546, 10743, 11020; 3°*, 11022 (vi).

Bill (No. 185, from the Senate) Respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal.—(Mr. Johnston).

1°*, 10008; M. for 2°, 10122 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 12595 (vii).

Bill (No. 186) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1909.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 10510; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 10510 (vi).

Bill (No. 187, from the Senate) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. Black).

1°*, 10717 (vi); 2° m., 13506; in Com., 13507; 3°*, 13508 (vii).

Bill (No. 188, from the Senate) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 10717 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12559, 13207; 3°*, 13215 (vii).

Bill (No. 189) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 11300; in Com. on Res., 11351; 1°, 10717; 2°, 11315; in Com., 11362, 11535, 11634 (vi), 12163; 3°*, 12189; Sen. Amts., 13520 (vii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 190, from the Senate) Respecting Juvenile Delinquents.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°*, 10915 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12399; 3°* 12406 (vii).

Bill (No. 191) Respecting the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in Lead-bearing Ores Mined in Canada.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 10952; in Com. on Res., 10952; 1°* of B., 10953; 2°, 11235; in Com., 11243; 3°, 12054 (vii).

Bill (No. 192, from the Senate) To incorporate the Alberta and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Herron).

1°*, 11120; 2°*, 11460 (vi); in Com., and 3°*, 12594 (vii).

Bill (No. 193) To amend the Timber Marking Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°, 11120 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12408; 3°*, 12408 (vii).

Bill (No. 194) To amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. Paterson).

Res. prop., 11233; in Com. on Res., 11312; 1°* of B., 11315; in Com., 11980 (vi).

Bill (No. 195, from the Senate) To incorporate the Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—(Mr. Zimmerman).

1°*, 11589; 2°*, 11885 (vi); in Com., and 3°*, 12595 (vii).

Bill (No. 196, from the Senate) For the relief of Arthur James Townsend.—(Mr. Copp).

1°*, 11589; 2°*, 11885 (vi); in Com., and 3°*, 12984 (vii).

Bill (No. 197, from the Senate) Respecting the Sale and Marking of Manufactures of Gold and Silver, and Gold and Silver Plated Ware.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°*, 11990 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12554; 3°*, 12559 (vii).

Bill (No. 198, from the Senate) Respecting a certain Patent of William B. Smith.—(Mr. Galliher).

1°*, 12393; in Com., and 3°*, 12984 (vii).

Bill (No. 199) To provide for the payment of Bounties on Crude Petroleum.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 12162; in Com. on Res., 12406; 1°* of B., 12407; 2°, and in Com., 12644; 3°*, 12644 (vii).

Bill (No. 200) Respecting the Salary of the Superintendent of Insurance.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 12162; in Com. on Res., 12407; 1°* of B., 12407; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 12644 (vii).

Bill (No. 201) To assist in maintaining an Independent and Efficient service of Telegraphic news from Great Britain for Publication in the Canadian Press.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 12052; in Com. on Res., 12407; 1°* of B., 12408; 2°, 12644, 12837; in Com., 12848; 3°*, 12851 (vii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 202) To authorize the Construction of a Branch Line of the Prince Edward Island Railway from Harmony, on the Souris Branch to Elmira.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 12052; in Com. on Res., 12408; 1°* of B., 12409; 2°, 12628; in Com., 12631; 3°*, 12643 (vii).

Bill (No. 203, from the Senate) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act as regards Grain.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 12594; 2°, and in Com., 13048, 13208; 3°*, 13215 (vii).

Bill (No. 204) To amend chapter 38 of the Statutes of 1907, in amendment of the Railway Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 12549; 2°, and in Com., 13046; 3°*, 13047 (vii).

Bill (No. 205) To Prohibit the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Opium for other than Medicinal Purposes.—(Mr. Lemieux).

Res. prop., 12503; in Com. on Res., 12550; 1°* of B., 12551; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 12851; Sen. Amts., 13523 (vii).

Bill (No. 206) To amend the Judges' Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

Res. prop., 12392; in Com. on Res., 12551; 1°* of B., 12554; 2°, and in Com., 13048; 3°*, 13051 (vii).

Bill (No. 207, from the Senate) Respecting certain Patents of the Metal Shingle and Siding Company, Limited.—(Mr. Galliher).

1°*, 12649; 2°, 12649; in Com., and 3°*, 12984 (vii).

Bill (No. 208) Respecting the office of the Auditor General.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 12502; in Com. on Res., 12644; 1°* of B., 12645; 2°, and in Com., 12645; 3°*, 12645 (vii).

Bill (No. 209) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 12392; in Com. on Res., 12645; 1°* of B., 12649; 2°, and in Com., 13053; 3°*, 13207 (vii).

Bill (No. 210) To amend the Northwest Territories Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°*, 12650; 2°, and in Com., 13051; 3°*, 13052 (vii).

Bill (No. 211) To amend the Act of the present session intituled 'An Act respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.'—(Mr. Pringle).

1°*, 2°*, 12773; in Com., and 3°*, 13224 (vii).

Bill (No. 212) To amend the Criminal Code, and to repeal section 415 of the Railway Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 12919; 2°, and in Com., 13316; 3°*, 13320 (vii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 213) Respecting Aid for the extension of the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13066; M. for Com. on Res., 13258; in Com. on Res., 13278; 1°* of B., 13282; 2°, and in Com., 13419; 3°*, 13420 (vii).

Bill (No. 214) Respecting certain Aid for the Extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13069; in Com. on Res., 13282; 1°* of B., 13285; 2°, and in Com., 13420; 3°*, 13420 (vii).

Bill (No. 215) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the Lines of Railway therein mentioned. —(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13071; in Com. on Res., 13285; 1°* of B., 13315; 2°, and in Com., 13478; 3°*, 13490 (vii).

Bill (No. 216) Respecting the Canadian Patriotic Funds Association.—(Sir Frederick Borden).

1°*, 2°, and in Com., 13320; 3°*, 13321 (vii).

Bill (No. 217) Respecting the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13080; in Com. on Res., 13416; 1°* of B., 13417; 2°, and in Com., 13491; 3°*, 13493 (vii).

Bill (No. 218) To authorize the sale or other disposal of certain Ordnance Lands in the Cities of Toronto and Montreal.—(Sir Frederick Borden).

Res. prop., 13226; in Com. on Res., 13417; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 13418; 3°*, 13419 (vii).

Bill (No. 219) Respecting the National Battlefields at Quebec.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

1°, 13495; 2°, and in Com., 13501; 3°*, 13506 (vii).

Bill (No. 220) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial year ending 31st March, 1909.—(Mr. Fielding).

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 13579; in Com. on Ways and Means, 13579; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 13579; 3°*, 13579 (vii).

Binder Twine Bounty, Amounts paid from 1903 to 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4583 (iii).

Binder Twine in Kingston Penitentiary, Sale and Contracts: in Com. of Sup., 5522 (iii).

Binder Twine, Purchasers' Names and P. O. Addresses: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 9715 (v).

——— Seizures, and Payments to Mr. A. Smith: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).

Blackhalls Estate, Claims *re* Caraquet Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 11686 (vi).

Blairmore Townsite: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).

Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amount, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4584 (iii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Clements) 6465 (iv).

Blind River Wharf Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).

Blue Books, Distribution to Members, Changes: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 194 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 241 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 432 (i).

Blunden, Fred. W., Imprisonment of: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 12902

——— Trial and Conviction, Cor. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Ward) 3466 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ward) 5211 (iii).

Boards of Trade Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 133.'

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., Protection *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2992 (ii).

——— Transfer of Power Plant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).

See 'Canals—Trent.'

Boiler Inspection Insurance Co., Payments to Mr. R. Stewart: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).

Boivin, Cote & Co., Amounts paid to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 12650 (vii).

Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1291 (i).

Bonaventure River Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).

Boneless Meat, Frozen, Imported into G.B., Par. in English Newspapers: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3230 (ii).

Bonn Post Office, Application *re* Establishment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).

Bonusing System *re* Immigration: Notice of Motion (Mr. Monk) 6288 (iv).

See 'Immigration,' &c.

Booms in International Streams: *See* 'B. No. 105.'

Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4244, 5083 (iii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 5476 (iii).

Borden, Sir Frederick, and Cold Storage Co.: *See* 'New Brunswick.'

Boundary Delimitations, Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9738 (v).

Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Bounties on Crude Petroleum: *See* 'B. No. 199.'

Bounties on Lead: *See* 'B. No. 191.'

Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c., Amount from 1903 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4583 (iii).

See 'Lead,' &c.

Bounties, Total Amount paid by Govt since 1906: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 895 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1130 (i).
Bounties paid by Govt. for 1908-9: Ques. (Mr. R. L Borden) 13226 (vii)
Boyle Concessions, Memorials from Dawson Legislature: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 509, 562, 681 (i).
Brampton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
Brampton Post Office, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iv).
Brandon Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v), 10953, 10974 (vi).
Brantford Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10891 (vi).
Brantford Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
Brantford Stove Works Strike, Arrests *re* Picketing: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 9027 (v).
——— Cor. with Justie Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 10016 (v).
Brantford Telephone Monument: on Conc., 13567 (vii).
See 'Bell.'
Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagnoris, Charges *re* Political Activity: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 6642 (iv).
Brass, Quantity and Quality, Importation into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6232 (iv).
Braund, Samuel, Apptmt. as Inspector of Port Maitland Pier: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5674 (iii).
Breton Cove Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6404 (iv).
Bridge Strengthening, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
Bridge Subsidies to Rvs.: Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com. on Res., 13310 (vii).
Bridgewater Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7135 (iv).
Brier Island Fog Alarm, Installation of, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9473 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9266 (v).
Brighton Wharf, Repairs *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 5913 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Owen) in Com. of Sup., 12133, 12138 (vii).
B.C., Chartered Bank of: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
B.C., Court of Appeal: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
B.C., Fisheries Commission, Report *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
B.C., Fishing Licenses issued to Packers' Association: Ques. (Mr. Kennedy) 8173 (v).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
B.C., Revenue contributed from 1872-3 to 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. D. Ross) 3435 (ii).
B. C. Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
B. C. Telegraphs, Claims of C. P. Ry. *re* Cape Beale Lines: in Com of Sup., 5732(iii).
British Pensioners, Notice from Imp. Govt. of Deductions: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7501 (iv).
British Yukon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5474 (iii).
Brock, Mr., Emplymt. *re* Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5204 (iii).
Brockville, Cheese Curing Room, Lease, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 3897 (ii).
———Cold Storage Plant, Disposal of: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 3234 (ii).
Brockville and Ottawa, Ry. Connections. Charges against Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1429 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. House, 186 (i).
——— Connection with C.P.R.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 432 (i).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
Brodeur, Hon. L. P., Advances *re* Travelling Expenses for Priv. Sec., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1690 (i).
——— Travelling Expenses since July, 1904: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1689 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1347 (i).
See 'Travelling Expenses.'
Brome County, Number of Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 6241 (iv).
Bronte Harbour, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii).
——— Dues for Wharfage, Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
——— Pier Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).
Bronze Coat-of-Arms, Duty *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).
Bubonic Plague, Prevention of into Canada: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 686 (i).
Buchanan Townsite, Application *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10079, 10083 (v).
——— Homestead Entry by Mr. Ramsland: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10082 (v).
Buctouche Channel, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Budget, The, Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 5137 (iii).
Debate:—(Mr. Foster) 5260; (Mr. Paterson) 5296; (Mr. Cockshutt) 5314; (Mr. Sifton) 5338; (Mr. Bergeron) 5357; (Mr. Pardee) 5364; (Mr. E. L. Smith) 5375, 5388; (Mr. Thompson) 5405; (Mr. M. S. Schell) 5616, 5957; (Mr. W. Jackson) 5959; (Mr. Armstrong) 6046, 6062; (Mr. Guthrie) 6011; (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6097; (Mr. U. Wilson) 6082 (iii); (Mr. Loggie) 6553; (Mr. Mackenzie) 6573; (Mr. Sinclair) 6615; (Mr. Sproule) 6595; (Mr. N. F. Wilson) 6610 (iv).
See 'Financial Review,' &c.

Budget Speech sent out by Deptl. Clerks: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10349 (vi).

Budget Speech: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 519, 559 (i), 4316, 4670 (iii).

Buell, W. S., Emplymt. *re* Telephone Commission: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 10011 (v).

Buffalo imported for Game Preserve, Alberta, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 847 (i).

Buffalo purchased for Park Reserves, Authority for Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 896 (i).

Buffalo Herd, Location at Elk Park, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5208 (iii).

——— Name of Purchaser: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5795 (iii).

——— Purchase of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (ii), 10102 (v).

Buildings B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii).

Buildings, Cost of Construction: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12661 (vii).

———Construction of: Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 12771 (vii).

See 'Public Works.'

Buildings, Generally, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).

Buildings, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 10953 (vi), 13335 (vii).

Buildings, Man. and N. W., Amounts paid by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 698 (i).

Buildings, Man. and N. W. T., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v).

——— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv), 13328 (vii).

——— N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 7110 (iv), 13326 (vii).

——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).

——— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 7183 (iv).

——— Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).

——— Saskatchewan and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).

See 'Public Works.'

Burlington Channel, Lighthouse, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 5467 (iii).

——— Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).

——— Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman, &c.: Ques (Mr. E. D. Smith) 4403 (iii).

Business of the House: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 5135 (iii).

——— Precedence *re* Questions: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 430 (i).

——— Precedence on Tuesday: Remarks: (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2982 (ii).

——— Public Bills and Orders, Priority of Procedure: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2939 (ii).

Business of the House, Public Bills, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) *re* Procedure, 2786 (ii).

——— Remarks on M. for Sup., 10688 (vi).

See 'Govt. Business,' &c.

Butler, Mr. M. J., Dep. Min. of Rys., Salary: in Com. of Sup., 12755 (vii).

Butter and Cheese exported from Prov. of Quebec, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 2162 (ii).

Butter Imports, Quantity and Countries of Origin: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1116 (i).

Cabinet Changes: ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 24; (Mr. Foster) 80; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 44 (i).

Cabinet Ministers and Govt. Contracts, &c.: *See* 'Cold Storage,' &c.

Cable Service in St. Lawrence: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).

Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 33.'

Calgary P.O., and Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8578 (v).

Calgary Town Sites: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) on M. for Sup., 9775 (v).

Cameron, John, Homestead Inspector, Employment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4769 (iii).

Campaign Funds, Charges by Min. of Public Works, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 26 (i).

——— ref. to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 65 (i).

Campaign Literature sent out by Depts.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 10343 (vi).

Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 14.'

Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ontario Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 236 (i).

Campbellton, Harbour, Gas Buoys, Tender *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v)

——— I.C.R. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).

Campbellton Wharf, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi), 13344 (vii).

——— Tenders *re* Piling Supply, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v).

Canada-Australia SS. Service, Yearly Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1289 (i).

——— Discontinuance of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 941 (i).

Canada and Australia SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).

Canada and China, Japan, &c., SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).

Canada Eastern Ry., Cattle killed, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).

Canada and France SS. Communication, Provision *re* Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12391

See 'Franco-Canadian.'

Canada and Germany Trade Relations: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10601 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lalor) 13081 (vii).
Canada Shipping Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 2, 12, 17, 183, 209.'
Canada Shipping Act: *See* 'Masters and Mates.'
Can. Temperance Act Amt.: *See* 'Bill No. 187.'
Canada Temperance Act: M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Order Paper, 13493 (vii).
Canada Weather Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'
Canadian Associated Press: *See* 'B. No. 201.'
Canadian Associated Press, Govt. Subventions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5080 (iii).
Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of Mr. B. E. Walker: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 6005 (iii).
Can. Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. Nos. 111, 219.'
Canadian Battlefields: *See* 'Battlefields,' &c.
Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
Canadian Ensign: *See* 'Red Ensign.'
Canadians entering U. S., Deportation of Macedonians, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 2738; Letter of Messrs. Allen, Cassels & Defries: Read, 2739 (ii).
Canadian Naturalization and British Rights: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 12084 (vii).
Canadians at Niagara, Indignity by U. S. Customs Officers: Remarks (Mr. Bristol) 11121 (vi).
Can. Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Can. Northern Ry. Extension, Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 214.'
Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
Can. Northern Que. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Canadian Northern Ry., Erwood and Pas Mission Branch, Rep. of Engineer: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 13309, 13475 (vii).
C. P. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B No. 45.'
C. P. Ry., Compensation *re* Right of Way: in Com. of Sup., 5561 (iii).
—— Land Taxation, Test Cases, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 5049 (iii).
—— Papineauville and Little Nation River Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).
—— Plaster Rock Branch Line Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
—— Saskatchewan Bridge Subsldy: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vii).
Can. Patriotic Funds Association: *See* 'B. No. 216.'
Canadians repatriated from U. S., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 684 (i).
Canadian Timber used in Govt. Works: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 11208 (vi).
Canadian Towing and Wrecking Co., Payments *re* Contracts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
Canada and U. S., Boundary Treaties: Information *re* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7834 (iv).
—— Trade Treaty Negotiations, Completion of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 937 (i).
See 'Anglo-American.'
CANALS—
Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure, *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3038 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal, Lease, Conditions, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1131 (i).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 1740 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 946 (i).
—— Lease to Robert Co., Emplymt. of Mr. Deschenes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 8443 (v).
—— Lease of Water Power to McIntyre and Roberts Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
—— Robert Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 13475 (vii).
Canals: in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iii).
—— Extra Remuneration: in Com. of Sup., 5697 (iii).
—— Generally, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10325 (vi).
—— Remuneration *re* Sunday Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
—— Staff and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).
—— Statistical Branch: in Com. of Sup., 10317 (vi).
—— list of officers: Read (Mr. Graham) 10317 (vi).
Carillon Dams and Slides: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
Chambly Canal, Towpath: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Cornwall Canal, Accident *re* Banks: Statement (Mr. Graham) 11120 (vi).
—— Further Information *re* Break: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11406 (vi).
—— Opening of: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12660 (vii).
—— Repairs *re* Break in Banks: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Graham) 12161 (vii).
Cornwall Canal, Arrangements with M'f'g. Cos. *re* Water Power: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 13084 (vii).

CANALS—*Con.*
Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).
——— Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
——— Wharf: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Pringle) 12095 (vii).
Galops Canal, Upper Entrance, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5671 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Reps., &c.: Laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 8378 (v).
See main heading.
Lachine Canal, Basin Walls: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
——— Compensation to Richards *re* Horse: in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
——— Lock Repairs: in Com of Sup., 5672 (iii).
——— Slope Walls, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iii).
——— Staff: in Com. of Sup., 5696 (iii).
Murray Canal, Bridgemen's Houses: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Quebec Canals, Steam Road Rollers: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
Rideau Canal, Buoys between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids, Contract *re* Lighting: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8613, 9476 (v).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
St. Lawrence Canal, District Office: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
Soulanges Canal, Claims *re* Accidents, &c.: M. for Reports* (Mr. Boyer) 6239 (iv).
——— Electric Power, Contract with Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10011 (v).
——— Expenditure *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10513 (vi).
——— Floods, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
——— Investigation *re* Charges against Overseer: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6407 (iv).
——— Report of Mr. Boyer: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9890 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12413 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).
——— Manning & Macdonald's Claims: in Com. of Sup., 5668 (iii).
Trent Canal, Balsam Lake Section, Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
——— Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., Protection *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2992 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*
Trent Canal, Bobcaygeon Dam, Transfer of Power Plant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).
——— Bradford Canal, Building of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 13476 (vii).
——— Buckhorn Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
——— Cameron Lake Water Levels, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9772 (v).
——— Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
——— Clearing of Logs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 10310 (vi).
——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
——— Contracts, Deposits, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1734 (i).
——— Damages *re* Floods: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
——— Engineers Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6925 (iv).
———Extension from Balsam Lake to Gull River, Reps., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2991 (ii).
———ret. incomplete: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6059 (iii).
——— Holland River Dredging, Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
——— Holland River Extension: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11939 (vi).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
——— Lindsay Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
——— Newmarket Canal Reps., Surveys, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).
———Newmarket Canal Extension to Devil's Elbow: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi), 12225 (vii).
——— Surveys: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 10338 (vi).
——— Surveys, Reports *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6988 (iv).
——— Tributary Works, Completion of Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1115 (i).
——— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).
——— Wilberforce Dam, Obstructions to Traffic, Cor., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2988 (ii).
Welland Canal, Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
——— Contract Power Co., Amount diverted at De Cew Falls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 897 (i).

CANALS—*Con.*
Welland Canal, Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
——— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
——— Deepening, Estimated Cost: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 10311 (vi).
——— Dredging Deep Cut Slide: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
——— Electric Lighting, Power Plant: in Com. of Sup., 12195 (vii).
——— Feeder, Rep. of Judge Madden *re* Investigation: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lalor) 852 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 174 (i).
——— Piers and Bridges at Queenston Heights: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
——— Port Colborne Elevator and Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).
——— Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4403 (iii).
——— Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
——— Resignation of John R. Scott: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 6058 (iii).
——— Widening: in Com. of Sup., 12210 (vii).
Canned Foods Inspection Act, Enforcement of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3846 (ii).
——— Cor. *re* Regulations, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Clements) 557 (i).
——— Names of Counties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Canned Goods Act: *See* 'B. No. 147.'
Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3847 (ii).
Cannon, Catherine Ann, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Canso Medical Officer, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 6646 (iv).
——— Successor to Dr. Brine: Ques. (Mr Stanfield) 1735 (i).
Cape St. Mary, Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Cap St. Ignace Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
Captains of Govt. Vessels, Examinations *re* Efficiency, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3236 (ii).
Caraquet Wharf, Ice-breakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).
Caribou Island Causeway: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Carillon Dams and Slides: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
'Carlotta G. Fox,' Schr., Seizure of: *See* 'Pelagic Sealing.'
Caron and Thiberge, Messrs., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 10517 (vi).
Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 681 (i).
Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6059 (iii).
——— Statement *re* Conditions of Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 6143 (iii).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464 (iv).
See 'Marine,' &c.
'Castle,' Tug, Removal of Wreck, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6641 (iv).
Cataract Power Co., Welland Canal, Amount diverted at De Cew Falls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 897 (i).
'Catharine C.,' Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5727 (iii).
Catholics and Public Offices, Ref. to Speech in Senate: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sproule) 5047 (iii).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., Removal of, Action by Govt. since 1896: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2167 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2795 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 6223 (iv).
——— Cable, *re* Removal by G. B.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13228 (vii).
——— Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. Armstrong) 13081 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).
Cattle Exports and Imports from Canada to G.B.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6160 (iv).
Cattle exported to U.S. during 1900-7, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1507 (i).
Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 2767 (ii).
Cattle Inspection *re* Ocean Service: in Com. of Sup., 3220 (ii).
Cattle Quarantine Stations: in Com. of Sup., 11008 (vi).
Cattle registered, Importation from U.S. from 1904-7: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6238 (iv).
Cattle sold from Experimental Farm: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2389 (ii).
Cavalry Brigade, Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Cement Testing Laboratory: in Com. of Sup., 11078 (vi).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 11206, 11250 (vi).
Census and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 673 (i), 12879 (vii).
Census Map, Publishing of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4406 (iii).

Census (complete) of the N. W. Provs., Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 3422 (ii).
Central Ry. of Canada, Charter Grant, Deposit *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4767 (iii).
'Challenge,' Dredge, Quantity of Material removed: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 12651 (vii).
Chambly Canal, Towpath: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5653 (iii).
Chambly Common, Area, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5652 (iii).
'Champlain,' Str., Use in Quebec for Political Purposes: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9126, 9280, 9342, 9460 (v).
Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 513 (i).
Chapman, Mr. F. O., Emplymt. in Immigration Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).
Charlan, Mr., Salary as Tobacco Expert: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 11495 (vi).
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 685 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
Charlos Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5202 (iii).
Charlotttown Board of Trade, Pets. *re* Sailing Vessels: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Martin) 6240 (iv).
Charlottetown Pipe Line to Tank, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5655 (iii).
Charlottetown Ry. Station, Contract Price *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 517 (i).
—— Specifications, &c., *re* Construction: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3241 (ii).
Chartered Bank of B. C.: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
Chartered Banks of Canada, Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 8086 (iv).
Charwomen, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Wharf: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7937 (iv).
Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030
Chatham, N.B., Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12757 (vii).
Cheese Adulteration: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Chicoutimi Boom, Payments from Pulp Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8174 (iv).
Chicoutimi, Dredging Contract, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 7203 (iv).
—— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
—— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7279 (iv).
—— Public Works, Expenditures, &c: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Chilvers, Messrs., Emplymt. of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 8894, 9266 (v), 10515 (vi).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Chinese Immigration into B.C., O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 554 (i).
Chinese Immigration, Decision of N. S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 513 (i).
Chinese and Japanese Riots, B.C., Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13155 (vii).
Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 754 (i).
Church of England, Missionary Society, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Church Point Wharf, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Chute a Blondeau Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5087; Amt. (Mr. Macpherson) to adjn. Debate, agreed to (Y. 61; N. 51) 5133 (iii).
—— on M. to resume adjn. debate: Remarks Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5246, 5251 (iii).
Cigarettes, Legislation *re*, Res. of W.C.T.U. of Brampton: Read (Mr. Blain) 7278 (iv).
Cigarettes: *See* 'Tobacco.'
Cigar Stamps, Use of Black Ones: Ques. (Mr. Dubeau) 12390 (vii).
Cimon, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2545 (ii).
—— Payment *re* Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Residence in District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2218 (ii).
Cirkel, Franz, Remuneration *re* Rep. of Geological Survey *re* 'Graphites': Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7935 (iv).
See 'Graphite.'
Civil Servants, General Increases to: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com of Sup., 12913 (vii).
Civil Service Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 189.'
Civil Service Bill, Correction in 'Hansard' *re* Increases: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11494 (vi).
—— and Employees of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13528 (vii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8516 (v).
—— Procedure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11124 (vi).
—— Resolutions *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11016 (vi).

Civil Service Commission, Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13168 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Distribution to Press: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 5723 (iii).
——— Govtl. Action, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7322 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr R. L. Borden) 3317 (ii), 4963, 5408, 5567 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 5491 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 938, 1740 (i), 2787 (ii), 4315, 4495 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Perley) 90 (i).
——— Issue of Commission of Investigation: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6466 (iv).
——— Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassel's Powers: (amt.) to Com. of Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7506, Neg. (Y. 48; N. 99) 7618 (iv).
——— Instructions to Judge Cassels: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7505 (iv).
——— O.C. to Mr. Justice Cassels *re* Investigations: M. to adjn. Hse., 6143 (iii).
See 'Cassels,' &c.
——— Marine, Deptl. Dismissals: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6003 (iii).
——— Number distributed: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 6060 (iii).
——— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5882 (iii).
——— Report: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 5620 (iii).
——— Translation into French: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6222, 6925 (iv), 11312 (vi), 13477 (vii).
Civil Service Employees, 1905-6-7, Dates of Apptmts., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 558 (i).
Civil Service Examiners: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
——— Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 8086 (iv).
Civil Govt.: *See* 'Supply.'
Civil Service List: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 93 (i).
Civil Service System, Reorganization of: Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9132; Neg. (Y. 30; N. 72) 9218 (v).
——— Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) M. to drop, 6242 (iv).
Clarke, Capt. Arthur, Compensation *re* Death, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8179 (iv).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vii).
Clarke City, Seven Islands: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
——— Expenditure *re* Public Works: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
Clarke's Harbour, Dog Fish Works: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vii).
Clearwater Lake, Half-breeds Rights: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 175 (i).
——— Squatters Rights to Lands: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).
Clement, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11300 (vi).
Clement, Mr. W. H. P., Services in Yukon, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
See 'Yukon.'
Clerical and Temporary Clerks, Public Works Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 11099 (vi).
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Office: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Clerk of Works on Public Buildings: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 695 (i).
Clifton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4831 (iii).
Closure Rule: *See* 'Obstruction.'
Cloutier, J. E., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8380 (v).
Coal and Govt. Lands, Acres in possession of Gov.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 843 (i).
Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5469 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5468 (iii).
——— held by F. E. Keniston, Cor., Papers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 5476 (iii).
——— Names and Addresses of Agents *re* Applications: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5789 (iii).
Coal Deposits in P.E.I., Boring for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 515 (i).
Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Zimmerman) 6924 (iv).
Coal Lands in Alberta and Sask., Total Area sold, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 9278 (v).
——— Royalty Fees, Sale or Lease of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11019 (vi).
Coal Lands, Applicants, Names, Price, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 3434 (ii).
Coal Land Leases, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2395 (ii).
Coal Lands, Disposed of by Govt., Original Applicants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3480 (ii).
——— Leased by Govt., Names of Original Grantees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3232 (ii).
——— Leased, Sold or Assigned, since March, 1907: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 698 (i).
Coal Lands in N.W.T., Leases granted, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 5087 (iii).
Coal Lands, O.Cs., Regulations, &c., *re* Disposal: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 4246 (iii).
——— Purchase Price on Sections 16, 20 and 21: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10512 (vi).
——— Purchases on Sections 27, 28, 33 and 34, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 10512 (vi).
——— Sale through J. W. Bettes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6242 (iv).

Coal Lands, sold by P. E. Lessard: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
——— Sale by McGivern & Hayden: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
Coal Lands in Sections 2, 4, 9, 15, 17 and 28, First Applicants, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 3850 (ii).
——— Section 13, First Applicants, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 3851 (ii).
Coal Lands, Timber, &c., Dates of Regulation, O.Cs., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 12656 (vii).
Coal Mining Privileges in Section 11, Applications, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 3850 (ii).
Coal Mine Royalties in Alberta, Sums received: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 12391 (vii).
Coal Mining in Sask. and Alberta, Returns made to Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10257 (v).
Coal Shipments from N.S. and Cape Breton, Res. from Board of Trade, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5470 (iii).
See 'Shipping,' &c.
Coasting Privileges, Prop. Rys. withdrawn, 2795 (ii).
Coasting Trade, O.Cs. *re* Foreign Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4586 (iii).
Coasting Trade *re* Norwegian Ships, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 6237 (iv).
Cobourg Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).
——— Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 359 (i).
Colborne Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).
Colchester Election, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 39 (i).
Colchester Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 680 (i).
Colchester Point, Essex County Pier,, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 12652 (vii).
Cold Storage, Assistance *re* East Elgin Establishment: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 351 (i).
Cold Storage Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8379 (v).
Cold Storage Plants, Construction in Alberta, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1685 (i).
——— Construction of, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 236 (i).
——— Grants to: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1937 (i).
See 'Butter,' 'Cheese,' 'Brockville,' &c.
Cold Storage Ret., Letter of Mr. McKeown, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4223, 4407 (iii).
See 'N.B. Cold Storage,' &c.
Cold Storage Shipments, Number for year ending March, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6403 (iv).
Collingwood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12096 (vii).
Colonial Conference, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 82; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 41 (i).
See 'Intercolonial,' &c.
——— Travelling Expenses, ref. to in Com. of Sup. on Marine Estimates, 3985 (ii).
——— Travelling Expenses of Minister: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 998, 1040 (i).
See 'Travelling Expenses.'
Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, Cor., &c., Govtl. Action: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 174 (i).
Colonization Lands: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 3752 (ii).
Colonization Societies, Quebec, Amounts paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 684 (i).
Commercial Agents, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).
Commercial Travellers, Provincial Tax, Agreement *re* Abolition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Guthrie) 5794 (iii).
Commerical Treaty with Italy: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 10593 (vi).
Commissions appointed between 1896 and 1908, Costs, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Porter) 1295 (i).
Committees, Sel. Standing: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc. in Rep., 90 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Names, 1207 (i), 3315 (ii).
Committee Meeting, Rep. in Toronto 'Globe': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) 2382 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 2383; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2383 (ii).
Committees, Organization of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 507, 560 (i).
——— Sitting concurrently with Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9579 (v).
See 'Pub. Accts.'
Companies Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Conciliation Boards, Applications *re* Industrial Disputes Investigations, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3482 (ii).
Concrete Wharfs, Dissatisfaction in Ont.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).
Congdon, Mr. F. T., Instructions *re* Trust Estates: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12413 (vii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Estates Administration: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10141 (v).
——— Reply from Yukon: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420, 13518 (vii).
Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 565 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 841 (i).
See 'Yukon.'

Contractors' Securities, Amounts retained: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
Convict Labour, Control of, Sale of Articles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 238 (i).
Cookshire Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7281 (iv).
Co-operation: *See* 'B. No. 5.'
Cooper & White, Payments *re* Rental for Govt. Lands, Welland County: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 3841 (iii).
Copper Cliff Postmaster, Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 658 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com., 11913 (vi).
Copyright Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 28.'
'Coquitlam,' Str., Seizure of, Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2389 (ii).
Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Cornwall Canal, Accident to Banks: Statement (Mr. Graham) 11120 (vi).
—— Arrangements with Mfg. Cos. *re* Water Power: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 13084 (vii).
—— Electric Lighting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).
—— Further Information *re* Break: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11406 (vi).
—— Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
—— Opening of: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12660 (vii).
—— Repairs *re* Break in Banks: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
—— Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 12161 (vii).
—— Wharf: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Pringle) 12095 (vii).
Corry Building, Total Rental per Annum, Taxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 11938 (vi).
Cosgrave, Mr. J. J., Total Cost of Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5797 (iii).
Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Cotton, Raw, Imported from U.S. in 1905-7, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Cotton Strikers, Montreal, Commission Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Court of Appeal, B.C.: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Cow Bay (Port Morien) Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Cowie, Mr. F. W., Salary, Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5649 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Cowly, and Highwood, Railway Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Credit by False Pretences: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Criminal Code Amendments, Placing on Govt. Orders: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 9281 (v).
Criminal Code (assault) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
—— (homicide while hunting) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
—— (injuries by motor vehicles) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
—— (libel) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
—— (offensive weapons) Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 65, 78.'
—— (speedy trials) Amt. *See* 'B. No. 92.'
—— (trade restraint) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 96.'
—— (trading stamps, credit) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Criminal Statistics: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lake) 10916 (vi).
Crossings of Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Crown Bank of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Crown Life Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 180.'
Crude Petroleum Bounty: *See* 'B. No. 199.'
Cumberland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi).
Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'
Currie, W. D., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 7731 (iv)
Customs Act Amt: *See* 'B. No. 194.'
CUSTOMS :
Absinthe and Brandy Importations, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3484 (ii).
Anthracite Coal, Quantity imported from U.S. and other Countries: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1510 (i).
Apples seized by Inspectors at Montreal, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1508 (i).
Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Emplymt. in Customs, Montreal, Charges against: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1347 (i).
Aylmer Customs Collector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 1506 (i).
Bernier, Capt., Islands, Customs Ports, &c., Flagged by him: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5203, 5466 (iii).
Brass, Quantity and Quality, Importation into Can.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6232 (iv).
B.C., Revenue contributed from 1872-3 to 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. D. Ross) 3435 (ii).
Bronze Coat-of-Arms, Duty *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).
Butter Imports, Quantity and Countries of Origin: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1116 (i).
Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3847 (ii).
Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Zimmerman) 6924 (iv).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
Cotton, Raw, Imports from U.S. in 1905-7, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Customs Dept., Apptmts. and Civil Service Report: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).
——— Criticism of Civil Service Commission: (Mr. Cockshutt) on M. for Sup., 10428 (vi).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).
——— Estimates, Obstruction in Sup.: Remarks (Mr. Paterson) in Com. of Sup., 10133 (v).
——— Inspectors, Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 9536 (v).
——— Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
——— Outside Service, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 9226, 9430 (v).
——— Printing, Stationery, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9577 (v).
——— Salaries, Payments of, Speech of Hon. Mr. Paterson, *re* Obstruction: Remarks (Mr. Owen) to Com. of Sup., 9894 (v).
Customs and Excise Revenues from June 1st to 15, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 10791 (vi).
Customs Receipts and Expenditures, 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12655 (vii).
Customs Statistics, and Trade and Commerce Rets., Dupliate Printing: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr Foster) on M. for Sup., 9732 (v).
Detroit River Tunnel, Duties on Construction Material, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1116 (i).
——— Customs Collection *re* Construction Materials: M. for O.Cs.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).
——— Ques (Mr. McLaren) 3840 (ii).
——— Material entered free of Customs: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 10254 (v).
——— Material imported for Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4583 (iii).
Detroit River Tunnel and Customs Tariff on Material from U.S.: M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10417 (vi).
——— Explanation (Mr. Paterson) 13524 (vii).
Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. by Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Customs Duties collected: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 13060 (viii).
Foreign Purchases, Customs Collections *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5475 (iii).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Shipments from Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4763 (iii). *See* main heading.
Fraser, Donald, Customs Collector, Investigation *re* Defalcations: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5200 (iii).
——— Dismissal from Customs Service: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5473 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9442 (v).
French Books, Reductions of Customs *re* French Treaty: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2160 (ii).
German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Guarantee Cos.: in Com. of Sup., 9577 (v).
Halifax Customs House: in Com. of Sup., 7144 (iv).
Honey Imports from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8177 (iv).
Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11703 (vi).
Imports and Exports, Values from June to Dec., 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
——— ending Sept. 30th and Oct. 30th, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 350 (i).
Imports from France, Value for Five Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1124 (i).
Imports for Home Consumption, Values for 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13063 (vii).
Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 897 (i). *See* main heading.
Man. Customs Collectors, Brokerage Fees charged, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8441 (v).
Montreal Examining Warehouse, Valuations, Reps., Cor., Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 698 (i).
Montreal Customs Frauds, Penalties, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 9558 (v).
Niagara Falls, Fort Erie, &c., Customs Officers, Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6980 (iv).
Opium, Amount received *re* Customs Duties, Pet. from B.C., *re* Prohibition: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 8614 (v).
Pacaud, Benjamin, Apptmt. to Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5200 (iii).
Pork, Fresh, Quantity imported for Home Consumption: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
Port South Bar, C.B., Vessels entered for Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9271 (v).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
Prince Rupert Customs Collectors, Transfer of Mr. B. R. McDonald: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 6401 (iv).
Pulp Wood, Exported to U.S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Revenue Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils, imported from G.B. in 1904-5-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 1506 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Port, Farm Produce entered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 898 (i).
Seizures for 1905-7, Reasons, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Cockshutt) 4588 (iii).
Sugar Imports for 1908, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 8616 (v).
Venoit, Mr., Collector of Customs at Bathurst, N.B., Political Interference: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 7730 (iv).
Windsor Customs, Pepin, J. A., Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
——Customs Officers, Ages, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 12655 (vii).
—— Wallace, Michael J., Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7500 (iv).
Winnipeg Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5201 (iii).
Cypress Hill Homestead Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Cypress Hills Timber Reserve, Preservation of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3841 (ii).
Cyr, Mr., Letter from *re* Stmnt. of Mr. Foster: Read (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 8460; Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 8460; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 8461 (v).
Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner's Report: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2786 (ii).
Dairying and Fruit Industry: in Com. of Sup., 10397 (vi).
Dairy Products: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Daley, Mr. R., Emplymt. in Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5204, 5473 (iii).
Dauphin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).
—— Valuation of Site: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).
Dawson City Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Debates of the House, Statement *re* Speakers (Mr. Kennedy) 13537 (vii).
Debates, Official Reports of, Analytical Index: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10504 (vi).
—— Average Price per Column: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3479 (ii).
Debates, French Edition, Apptmt. of French Supt. of Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Delay in Printing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Delay in Distribution: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3486 (ii).
Debates Committee, Correction of Clerical Error in Res. of House (Mr. Gervais) 824 (i).
—— 1st Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 2590 (ii).
—— 2nd and 3rd Reports of Committee: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 6979 (iv).
—— 2nd Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 7834 (iv).
—— 2nd Rep., Adoption of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 12504 (vii).
—— 2nd Rep. of Com.: Amt. (Mr. Gervais) on M. to adopt, 13224 (vii).
—— 4th Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 8835 (v).
—— Conc. without Notice: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8896 (v).
—— M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10225; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 94) 10252 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. Monk) *re* conc., 9709, 9889, 10119 (v).
See 'Hansard.'
Debt of Canada, Portions falling due, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 315 (i).
—— Falling Due, 1908: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 315 (i).
See 'Finance.'
Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Deep Waterways Commission, Proceedings *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11205 (vi).
—— St. Lawrence, Damming at Long Sault: Remarks (Mr. Broder) 13142 (vii).
See 'St. Lawrence.'
—— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11101 (vi).
Demurrage on Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Michel des Saints, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9474 (v).
Deptl. Buildings, Mackenzie Avenue: in Com of Sup., 1505 (i).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1736 (i).
Desaulniers, Mr. Gonzalve, Emplymt. as Translator: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 1121, 1290 (i).
Deschambault Wharf, Tenders *re*, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5464 (iii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 5801 (iii).
Detroit Tunnel, Customs Collection *re* Construction Materials: M. for O.Cs.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).

Detroit Tunnel, Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1116 (i), 4583 (iii).

——— M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10417 (vi).

——— Material entered free of Customs: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 10254 (v).

——— explanation (Mr. Paterson) 13524 (vii). *See* 'International.'

Devil's Elbow, Canal Work: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).

'D. H. Thomas,' Tug, Dom. Grant: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 8184 (iv).

Digby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11226 (vi).

Digby to Westport Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7203 (iv).

Dillon, Gerald P., Apptmt. to N.W.M. Police Force: Ques. (Mr. D. Ross) 6001 (iii).

Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. by Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).

Diocese of the Synod of Keewatin: *See* 'B. No. 179.'

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, Establishment of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2562 (ii).

Distilleries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).

Divorce of Mary Alexander: *See* 'B. No. 177.'

Divorce of Catherine Ann Cannon: *See* 'B. No. 175.'

Divorce of Edith Maud Rosario Gammell: *See* 'B. No. 139.'

Divorce of Edith May Gilmore: *See* 'B. No. 164.'

Divorce of Ada Katurah Stewart Paulding: *See* 'B. No. 176.'

Divorce of Hattie Spratte: *See* 'B. No. 182.'

Divorce of Arthur James Townsend: *See* 'B. No. 196.'

Divorce of Andrew Walker: *See* 'B. No. 124.'

Docks, Piers, &c., constructed at Bayfield, Grand Bend, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 2397 (ii).

Dockyards, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).

Documents in Departments, Access to Originals by Members: M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret., 1132; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 86) 1201 (i).

Debate:—(Mr. Oliver) 1133; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1137; (Mr. Foster) 1135; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1140; (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 1143; (Mr. Sproule) 1147; (Mr. Brodeur) 1140; (Mr. Bennett) 1151; (Mr. Lennox) 1155; (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1160; (Mr. Barker) 1162; (Mr. Galliher) 1170; (Mr. D. Ross) 1172; (Mr. Haggart) 1175; (Mr. Devlin) 1177; (Mr. Bergeron) 1180; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1183; (Mr. Northrup) 1190; (Mr. Sproule) 1194; (Mr. Ames) 1195 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of, &c., Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 1617, 1622; Agreed to, 1668 (i).

Debate:—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1623; (Mr. Foster) 1628; (Mr. D. Ross) 1632, 1653; (Mr. Oliver) 1636; (Mr. Barker) 1655; (Mr. Northrup) 1658; (Mr. Bristol) 1663; (Mr. Boyce) 1666 (i).

Documents, Original, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 1766 (i).

Debate:—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1775; (Mr. Haggart) 1778;; (Mr. Sproule) 1782; (Mr. Lennox) 1786; (Mr. Barker) 1793; (Mr. Bristol) 1797; (Mr. Osler) 1800; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1801; (Mr. Fielding) 1805; (Mr. Lancaster) 1814; (Mr. Perley) 1818; (Mr. Broder) 1825; (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1827; (Mr. Northrup) 1830; (amt.) 1839; Neg. (Y. 50· N. 95) 1883; (Mr. Lake) 1839; (Mr. Alcorn) 1843; on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to adjn. debate (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1844; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1847; (Mr. Foster) 1851; (Mr. Crocket) 1861; (Mr. Blain) 1871; (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1875; (Mr. Armstrong) 1878 (i).

Documents, Original, Custody of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 7810 (iv).

——— Detention, &c., Par. in Press. Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Clements) 6010 (iii).

——— Examination of by Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) 3853 (ii).

——— Notice of Motion, on Order being called: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2794 (ii).

——— Production of Originals, Announcement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1425 (i).

——— Production in Committees: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1427 (i).

——— Production of on Order from Hse. Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1617; Agreed to, 1667 (i).

——— Production of to Members: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 1766 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1927 (i).

——— and Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2305, 2308 (ii).

——— Member's remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 2305 (ii).

Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* Immigration Frauds at Halifax: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 5655 (iii).

See 'Halifax.'

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Canso, Operation at: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5651 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii)

——— Total Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8179 (iv).

——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 5790 (iii).

Dog Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1126 (i).

See 'Clarke's,' &c.

Dokis Indian Land Sale, Commission to Mr. P. Ryan: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).

Dokis Indians Reserve, Consent from Chief, *re* Sale of Timber: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8175 (iv).

—— Name of Govt. Agent: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5084 (iii).

—— Notice of Sale, Names of Newspapers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 7500 (iv).

—— Protests *re* Sale: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10918 (vi).

—— Sale of Timber: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 7801 (iv).

—— Surrender of Timber, O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5087 (iii).

—— Surrender of Title, Negotiations *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3849 (ii).

—— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 10512 (vi).

Dom. Arsenal, Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7991 (iv).

Dominion Arsenal, Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 7434 (iv), 12154 (vii).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 50.'

Dominion Camp Equipment Co., Incorporation of: Ques (Mr. Worthington) 3238 (ii).

Dom. Buildings, Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).

—— Ont., Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7467 (iv).

—— Que., Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).

—— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi). *See* 'Public Works—Buildings.'

Dom. Coal Lands: in Com. of Sup., 10066 (v). *See* 'Coal,' &c.

Dom. Elections Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 29, 80, 115.'

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 115) 2° m., 7835.

Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden) 7859; (Mr. Greenway) 7880; (Mr. Alcorn) 7890; (Mr. Bole) 7939; (Mr. Boyce) 7949; (Mr. Conmee) 7982, 7998; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8012; (amt.) 8076; (Mr. Crawford) 8076, 8089; (Mr. Monk) 8116, 8138; (Mr. Devlin) 8143; (Mr. Lake) 8150; (Mr. D. Ross) 8185; (Mr. Schaffner) 8200; (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 8242; (Mr. W. Wright) 8271; (Mr. Dugas) 8282 (iv); (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8296 (v); (Mr. Foster) 8321; (Mr. Burrows) 8357; (Mr. Staples) 8387; (Mr. Carvell) 8401; (Mr. R. L. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8423; (Mr. Galliher) 8619; (Mr. Armstrong) 8645; (Mr. Oliver) 8659; (Mr. Bergeron) 8681 (v); (Mr. Miller) 11707; (Mr. Conmee) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11727; (Mr. Boyce) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11739; (Mr. Alcorn) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11753; (Mr. Aylesworth) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11755 (vi).

In Com., 11796 (vi).

Ballot Papers, Fraudulent Marking (sec. 20) 11890; Amt. (Mr. White) 11890; Amt. (Mr. Porter) 11892 (vi), 13013; Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 13022, 13027; Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 13025; Amt. (Mr. Borden) 13026; (Mr. Crocket) 13028; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 13028; Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 13036; Amt. (Mr. Bennett) 13037; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 13037; Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 13037 (vii).

Boards of Registration (sub.-sec. 4) 12995 (vii).

Canvassing by Aliens (sec. 25), Amt. (Mr. Lake) 11898 (vi).

Contributions for Political Purposes (sec. 28) Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 11927; Amt. (Mr. Wilson) 11930; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 11931 (vi).

Contributions, Statement (sec. 18) 11884; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 11884 (vi).

Conveyances of Voters (sec. 23) 11894; Amt. (Mr. Clarke) 11896; Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 11897 (vi).

Conveyances, paying for (sec. 10) 11829; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 11835 (vi).

Corrupt Practices, Amt. (Mr. Fowler) 13044 (vii).

Enumerators, Posting of Notices (sec. 6) 11824 (vi).

Lists transmitted by Clerk of Crown in Chancery (sec. 1, sub.-sec. 8) 13004 (vii).

Manitoba Lists, Transmission (sec. 1, subsec. 10) 13009 (vii).

—— Polling Divisions (sec. 1, subsec. 2) 13005 (vii).

Nomination Papers, Address of Candidate (sec. 3) 11815; Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 11816; Amt. (Mr. Bristol) 11820; Amt. (Mr. Ames) 11820, 11827 (vi), 13010 (vii).

Ontario, Unorganized Territories (sec. 1) 11796 (vi), 12919 (vii).

Persons on General List, omitted from Special List (sec. 13) 11865 (vi), 13009 (vii); Amt. (Mr. Clarke) 11881 (vi).

Polling Divisions (sec. 6) 13001 (vii).

Posters, Names and Addresses (sec. 26) 11922; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11922 (vi).

P.E.I., Oath (sec. 16) 11882 (vi).

Returning Officers, Instructions to (sec. 11) 11845 (vi); Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13032 (vii).

Voters' Lists Preparation (subsec. 5) 12998 (vii).

Yukon Enumerators (sec. 5) 11823, 11829 (vi), 13013 (vii).

3° m., 13229; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13230; Neg. (Y. 60; N. 99) 13249; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13251; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 13255; Amt. (Mr. Foster) 13257; 3° Agreed to, 13258 (vii).

Dom. Elections, Forms, Writs, Instructions, &c., issued in 1907: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 555 (i).

Dom. Elections Act, and Govt. Measures, Proceeding with: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7721 (iv).

Dom. Elections Bill and Obstruction Tactics: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).

Dom. Guarantee Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. Nos. 127 & 211.'

Dom. Govt. Employees, Interference at Election: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 9 & 181.'

Dom. Lands, Agents, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10038 (v).
—— Area disposed of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3431 (ii).
Dom. Lands and Exchange of School Lands: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Dom. Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage: Ques. (Mr. W. McIntyre) 8182 (iv).
Dom. Lands, Sales of, during 1907: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 3435 (ii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 5727 (iii).
—— Total Area disposed of from 1896 to 1905, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 3852 (ii).
Dom. Lands Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9987, 9996 (v).
Dom. Liabilities due N.B. from 1869 to 1884: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2217 (ii).
See 'Finance.'
Dom. Loan and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 313 (i).
Dom. Notes, Issue of : *See* 'B. Nos. 159 & 160.'
Dom. Notes, Outstanding, Total Amount, 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 691 (i).
—— Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5562 (iii).
Dominion Police Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).
Dom. Post Offices, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).
Dom. Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 172.'
Dominion Power Co.'s Bill: Inquiry for (Mr. Cockshutt) 10919 (vi).
Dom. Revenue from 1873 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1733 (i).
Dom. Transportation and Storage Co.: *See* 'B. No. 84.'
Dorchester Wharf Addition: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Dorval, Dredging at St. Lawrence Yacht Club: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 13060 (vii).
Doukhobors bonused as Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9952 (v).
Doukhobors, Condition of: Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. Foster) 2218 (ii).
—— Destitute Condition at Fort William (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5007 (iii).
—— Homesteads cancelled, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9957 (v).
—— Manner of living, Letter from Yorkton: Read (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5751 (iii).
—— Prisoners at Fort William, Release of by Justice Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 6847 (iv).
—— Religious Fanatics: Par. in 'Press' (Mr. J. D. Reid) 12161 (vii).
—— Tels. *re* Pardon by Justice Dept.: Ques.: (Mr. Lake) 6983 (iv).
Doukhobors, Yorkton, Tel. from Sec. of Bard of Trade: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7620; Remarks (Mr. Lake) on M. for Sup., 7621 (iv).
Dover Wharf on Petitcodiac River: in Com. of Sup., 11692 (vi).
Dowling, Dr. D. B., Emplymt. in Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5206 (iii).
—— Emplymt. by German Development Co.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5564 (iii).
—— Leave of Absence from Geological Survey: Remarks (Mr. Templeman) in Com. of Sup., 10581 (vi).
Doyle, Mr. P., Immigration Agent, Superannuation of: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 6923 (iv).
Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
—— and Mr. Pepper, Candidates for Municipal Office: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 687 (i).
Dredges registered in Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11497 (vi).
Dredging Companies, Contracts, Investigations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5924 (iii).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9710 (v).
—— Midland, &c., Renewals without Tender, O.Cs. *re*: M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 6741 (iv).
—— advertisements *re* tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 7195 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, O.C. *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Bennett) 6853, 6927 (iv), 8696 (v).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10259 (v).
—— Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1736 (i).
—— Quebec Harbour: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7104 (iv).
—— Renewal without Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6633 (iv).
—— Tenders *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9773 (v).
Dredging at Fort William, Amount paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8839 (v).
Dredging Instructions to Inspectors, Circular Letter: Read in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Pugsley) 12043 (vi).
Dredging in Ontario Harbours, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 1129 (i).
Dredging in Ontario and Quebec, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9276, 10008 (v).
Dredging, Ont. and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).

Dredging in Quebec Counties in 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3240 (ii).
Dredging in Quebec Province, Claims Pending, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7200 (iv).
Dredging in St. Lawrence, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 2896 (ii).
Dredging Plant (new) for Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
Dredging Plant for St. Lawrence River (lower): in Com. of Sup., 4754 (iii).
Dredging Works at Nicolet River, &c., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3896 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4247 (iii).
Dredging Work at Rigaud River, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyer) 6240 (iv).
Dredging in Vaudreuil County, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 177 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 556 (i).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 4834 (iii), 6222 (iv).
Drill Shed, Lindsay, Date of Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1111 (i).
See 'Militia.'
Drop Letter, One-Cent Rate: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 3158 (ii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Drug Contracts with Bole Drug Co.: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bole) 5562 (iii).
—— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5513 (iii).
Drury, R. L., O.C. *re* Apptmt. to Japan: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4963 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4769 (iii).
Dry Docks, Construction of: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
Drysdale, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Acceptance of Office: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4768 (iii).
—— Date of Communication *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5084 (iii).
—— O.Cs. &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Taylor) 5086 (iii).
Dundee Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
Dunsmuir, Hon. Mr., Lt. Gov. of B.C., Assent to Natal Act and Dom. Interference: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 1738 (i).
—— Tel. from Sec. of State: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1859 (i).
—— Cor. with Govt. *re* Legislation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1861 (i).
Eagle Lake Coal Lands, Surrender of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 694 (i).
Easter Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464, 6843 (iv).
Eastern Block Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1504 (i).
Eastern Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 103.'
Eastman Rifle Match, Accident, &c., Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1125 (i).
East Templeton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Eclipse Manufacturing Co., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3239 (ii).
—— Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6461 (iv).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 3435 (ii).
Eclipse Manufaturing and Office Specialty Co., Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).
Edmonton, Dunvegan and B.C. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 38.'
Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 68 & 213.'
Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton, Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5257 (iii).
Eight Hour Day for Ry. Employees: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
Elder-Dempster SS. Subsidy to South Africa: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2792 (ii).
Election Bills: *See* 'B. Nos. 29, 80, 115.'
Election in N.B., Interference of Dom. Govt. *re* Patronage: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 3043 (ii).
See 'N. B.' &c.
Election of New Members, Certificates: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Elections, Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Election Writs, Issue of: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
Electoral Districts, Issue of Writs: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
—— Ottawa and Labelle, Certificates of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
Electrical Power exported from Niagara Falls, Cor., &c., *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
Electric and Gas Power Licenses, granted under Statute, c. 16, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 360 (i).
Elmwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).
Emerson Public Building: in Com. of Sup 8534 (v), 13335 (vii).
Empire and Ascension Day Adjnmt.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8894 (v).
Employees of Parlt. and Printing Bureau, Salaries, Religions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5206 (iii).
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 5479 (iii).
Engineering Branch, Public Works Dept., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11093 (vi).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).
Escoumains Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrisons, Equipment, of &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 (i).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Cor., &c., *re* Maintenance: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1128 (i).
——— Maintenance of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1117 (i).
——— Transfer to Canada: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 15.'
Essex County, Junior Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1939 (i).
Estevan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8581 (v), 13336 (vii).
Estevan Quarantine Lands, Disposal of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10093 (v).
Estimates, Basis of Appropriations *re* Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5919 (iii).
——— Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 5661 (iii).
——— Discussions on Resolutions: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).
——— Insufficient Votes *re* Public Works, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5923 (iii).
Estimates of 1908-9: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
——— Suppl. (1908): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2381 (ii), 5134 (iii), 12503 (vii).
Exchange of Schools' Lands: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Exchequer Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 116.'
Exchequer Court, Printing Reports, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5508 (iii).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
Excise Collectors, Payments for Customs Collections: in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Excise, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 813 (i).
——— Inspectors' Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).
——— Provisional Allowance to Inland Revenue Officers: in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 10569 (vi), 12889 (vii).
Exhibitions, Amount of Subsidies paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4406 (iii).
Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4584 (iii). *See* 'Anglo-French.'
Experimental Farm (Central) Amounts paid for Seeds, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 556 (i).
Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
———Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10904 (vi).
Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provs.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 7990 (iv).
——— Number controlled by Dom. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 3897 (ii).
Experimental Farm in Quebec District, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2593 (ii).
——— Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 8182 (iv).
Experimental Farm, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 1018 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12549 (vii).
——— Sale of Cattle, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2795 (ii).
——— Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4585 (iii).
Express Charges in Mar. Provs., Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 518 (i).
Expropriation of Lands by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
Facilities and Increased Accommodations, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Fair Wages Schedule on Dredging Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 7200 (iv).
Falconer, Kenneth, Arrangement *re* Balance of Payments: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10516 (vi).
——— Emplymt. by Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5078 (iii).
——— Payments to *re* Services: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8890 (v).
——— Payments by Ry. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).
Falconer, Mr. K.: *See* 'Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping.'
Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Custom Duties collected: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 13060 (vii).
Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7731 (iv).
Farnham Post Office, Alterations: in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
——— Vote *re* Improvement: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Father Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Favoured Nation Treatment, Conventions *re* Commercial Relations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 846 (i).
Fence Posts Fees, Memorial from Union of Manitoba Municipalities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 10258 (v).

Fernie Public Building, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10866 (vi).
'Fielding,' Dredge, Number of Days Working, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7199 (iv).
Financial Arrangements with Banks: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
Financial Review: Amt. (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 13420 (vii).
—— Reply (Mr. Fielding) 13442 (vii).
See 'Budget.'
FINANCE:
Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 362 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 352 (i).
American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2593 (ii).
Audits and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12658 (vii).
—— Independent Audit, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 11232 (vi).
Bank Act Amendments: Prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4248 (iii).
—— Par. in 'Financial Post': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 4770 (ii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) *re* Newspaper Reports, 2306 (ii).
Banks, Financial Stringency: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9335 (v).
Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c., Amount from 1903 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4583 (iii).
Bounties paid by Govt., for 1908-9: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13226 (vii).
Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of Mr. B. E. Walker: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 6005 (iii).
Chartered Banks of Canada, Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 8086 (iv).
Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, Cor., &c., Govtl. Action: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 174 (i).
Debt. of Canada, Portions falling due, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 315 (i).
See 'Loans.'
Dom. Liabilities due N.B. from 1869 to 1884: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2217 (ii).
Dom. Notes Outstanding, Total Amount, 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 691 (i).
Dom. Revenue from 1873 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1733 (i).
Estimates of 1908-9: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
—— Suppl. (1908): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2381 (ii), 5134 (iii), 12503 (vii).
Financial Arrangements with Banks: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'

FINANCE—*Con.*
Finance, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i), 12914 (vii).
Financial Review: Amt. (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 13420 (vii).
—— Reply (Mr. Fielding) 13442 (vii).
See 'Budget.'
Financial Stringency, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 35 (i).
Govt. Securities in Gold *re* Dom. Notes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 6235 (iv).
Grain Shipments, Financial Aid, Extended Explanation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 607 (i).
See 'Wheat.'
Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 241 (i).
Loan of Aug., 1907, Names of Banks where Discounted: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
Loans to Govt. Outstanding, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 235
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11501 (vi).
Loans negotiated in London, Conditions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 313 (i).
—— Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster) 13582 (vii).
Loans, Temporary, Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 233, 314 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 554 (i).
Loans, Temporary or Advances, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Mint, Amount of Silver and Gold Coins, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8612 (v).
—— Cor. with Imp. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Caron) 5210 (iii).
—— Date of Operation, Values of Coinage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11296 (vi).
—— Issue of Gold Coins: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 2593 (ii).
—— Sums expended, Apptmts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 232 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 557 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Amounts collected and expended, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 1688 (i).
—— Claim of Govt., &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3465 (ii).
—— Indebtedness, Payments, Audit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1931 (i).
—— Bonds, Payment of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2979 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3436; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3442; Agreed to (Y. 108; N. 53) 3464 (ii).

FINANCE—*Con.*
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Toll Gates upon Island of Montreal, Abolition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3299 (ii).
Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Govt. Deposit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3485 (ii).
N.B. Credit, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1937 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present Agreement and Previously: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 315 (i).
—— Dates of last Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237, 564 (i).
—— Increased Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 173 (i).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 79; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 61 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2394 (ii).
—— Investigation *re*: M. for Sel. Com.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2547 (ii).
See main heading.
Receiver General's Office: in Com. of Sup., 12160 (vii).
Treasury Board: in Com. of Sup., 5562 (iii).
Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3480 (ii).
Trust Funds: *See* 'Colonial Securities.'
Wheat Transportation from N.W., Financial Aid by Govt., Cor., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Foster) 2173 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1938 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 173 (i).
See 'Grain.'
Fire caused by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 18.'
Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1510 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 1690 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 4832 (iii).
—— Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7663 (iv).
—— File, Cor., quoted by Minister, custody of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) on M. for Sup., 7763 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Original Papers (Mr. Foster) 8901, 9281 (v).
—— Personal Explanation (Mr. Pugsley) 5658 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) on M. for Sup., 7639 (iv).
Fire Guardians, Number employed in Alberta: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 3433 (ii).
Fisheries Act (jurisdiction of officers) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 31.'
FISHERIES:
Bait Freezer and Cold Storage Plant in St. John, N.B., Cor., Agreements, &c., with Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 563 (i).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 3848 (ii).
Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fimlayson) 1733 (i).
—— Expenses of Sir Charles H. Tupper: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2883 (ii).
—— Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 4669 (iii).
Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Bounties paid to Cape Breton Fishermen, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
B.C. Fisheries Commission, Report *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
B.C., Licenses issued to Packers' Ass'n.: Ques. (Mr. Kennedy) 8173 (iv).
—— Grants to Japanese: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 7445 (iv).
—— Negotiations, Instructions to Mr. Bastedo: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4407 (iii).
—— Reports *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 6849 (iv).
'Carlotta G. Cox,' Seizure of: *See* 'Pelagic Sealing.'
Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Clarke's Harbour, Dog Fish Works: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vii).
Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Operation at Canso: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5651 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii).
—— Total Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8179 (iv).
—— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 5790 (iii).
Dog Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1126 (i).
Fisheries Committee, Sel. Standing, Apptmt. of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1691 (i).
Fisheries Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 12261 (vii).
—— Inspectors in Alberta, Names, &c: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 12390 (vii).
Fisheries Jurisdiction with Provinces, Conference *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3235 (ii).
—— Instructions to Agent: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3429 (ii).
—— Jurisdiction *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 2395 (ii).
Fisheries in Mar. Provs., Violation of Act: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1513 (i).
—— Officers Jurisdiction, Convictions, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4247 (iii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Fisheries Negotiations, &c., Between U.S and Canada: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2023 (ii), 6844 (iv).
——— Boundary between Can. and U.S.: Information *re* (Mr. Sproule) 6632, 6739 (iv).
——— Regulations, Violation of: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 5781 (iii).
Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3427 (ii).
Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to Messrs. Noble and Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 980 (i).
——— Report from Mr. Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5729 (iii).
See 'Noble.'
Lake Winnipeg Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1683 (i).
——— Fisheries, Legislation *re* Closing: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2389 (ii).
Leases granted between Lake Superior and Rocky Mountains, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1683 (i).
Leases, Sessional Papers No. 207: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
Licenses granted in Clearwater, &c., Lakes, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
——— on Lesser Slave Lake, Date of Lease Protest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6398 (iv).
Licenses issued in Saskatchewan Lakes, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. T. Chisholm) 559, 697 (i).
——— Issue of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 351 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2896 (ii).
Lobster Fish Factory, License to E. H. McLennan, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2983 (ii).
Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 10256 (v).
——— Fishing and Packing Licenses, Granting in P.E.I.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Martin) 5475 (iii).
——— Fishing in Lunenburg, &c., Complaints *re* Undersized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2792 (ii).
——— Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10257 (v).
——— Fishing at Pictou: Inquiry for Ret (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12772 (vii).
——— Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland Co.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
——— Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4404 (iii).
——— Overseers in Lunenburg, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2793 (ii).
FISHERIES—*Con.*
Lobster Fishing, Pet. from Fishermen's Union of N.S. *re* Regulations: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 6644 (iv).
——— P.E.I. Pets. *re* Issue of Licenses: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2388 (ii).
Louisburg Bait Freezer, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4406 (iii).
Man., Fish Exportations from, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4240 (iii).
Mar. Provs., Fisheries, Violation of Act: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1513 (i).
Markey Fishing Leases, Copy of Ret. laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 11404 (vi).
Matane River Fishing, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 7446 (iv).
Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5650 (iii).
See 'Georgian Bay.'
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, Seizure of Schr. 'Carlotta G. Cox': on M. for Sup. (Mr. Sloan) 3934 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Sloan) 3156 (ii).
Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10254 (v).
Pound Net Licenses granted in 1905, Cor. with A. E. Dyment, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 2795 (ii).
Protection, Amounts expended since 1885, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1118 (i).
Protection Service: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vii).
Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Contemplated Change: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1940 (i).
River John Licenses, Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10511 (vi).
Salmon Licenses, Leases, &c., in B.C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5652 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5801 (iii).
——— Licenses in Gardner's Inlet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5652 (iii).
——— Number granted in B.C., Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 5998 (iii).
——— Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 5651 (iii).
Salmon Net Fishing in Restigouche River Privileges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13518 (vii).
Seizures of Schooners, B.C., Compensation by Russian Govt.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Selkirk Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Shad Hatchery, Windsor, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 8894 (v).
Townsend Whaling Licenses: *See* 'Whaling.'

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9476 (v).
Trap-Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7204 (iv).
Washington Fisheries Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1732 (i).
Washington Treaty and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2165 (ii).
Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c.: M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10259 (v).
——— Moneys Due, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5996 (iii).
Fish Island Lighthouse, Name of Present Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 6058 (iii).
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, Apptmt. to Hague Tribunal: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 8294 (v).
Floods at Chatham, Damages, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 4742 (iii).
Fog Signal Co., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11497 (vi).
Forbes, Mr Justice, Personal Status, &c., Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Taylor) for Copies*,899 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2390, 3840 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 1860 (i).
Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3427 (ii).
Foreign Purchases, Customs Collections *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5475 (iii).
Foresters, Ancient Order of: *See* 'B. No.62.'
Foresters, Order of, Charges in 'Le Canada': Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bennett) 6005 (iii).
Forest Rangers *re* Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 10049 (v).
Forest Reserves, Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 10049 (v).
Fortier, Mr. Eugene, Payments *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8613 (v).
Fortifications, Construction of, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6646 (iv).
Fort William Terminal Ry. and Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Foss, Mr. C. O., Apptmt. on G.T.P. Engineering Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 358 (i).
Foster, Frederick, Emplymt. of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 12652 (vii).
Franco-Canadian SS. Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty: Prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 941 (i).
——— Preparation of Stmnt. *re* Duty Units (Mr. Foster) 943 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., Stmnt., 1213 (i).
——— Remarks *re* Discussion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3754 (ii).
——— *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Products enjoying Benefits of Minimum Tariff, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 851 (i).
——— Consideration of Proposed Convention: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Monk) 923 (i).
——— Correction *re* Travelling Expenses of Sir Charles Tupper (Mr. Ames) 1424 (i).
——— Delay in Approval, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Talbot) 12655 (vii).
——— Delay due to Canadian Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13534 (vii).
——— Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1206 (i).
——— Distribution to Members: Remarks (Mr. Beland) 605 (i).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12651
——— Favoured Nation Clause, Foreign Powers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 845 (i).
——— Favoured Nation Clause: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 514 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
——— and German Surtax, Effect of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 844 (i).
——— Imports from U.S., Exclusion of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 845 (i).
——— Information in Detail asked for (Mr. Foster) 1585 (i).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 570 (i).
——— Maximum and Minimum Rate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 178 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
——— Papers to be Distributed (Mr. Fielding) 848 (i).
——— Preferential Tariff, Names of Countries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 844 (i).
——— Printing and Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 93 (i).
——— Ratification by French Senate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 13083 (vii).
——— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 28; (Mr. Foster) 82; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 43 (i).
——— Shipments from Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4763 (iii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Tariffs: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8 (i).
——— U.S. Exports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 896 (i).
Fraser, Mr. A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel *re* Sussex St. Property Purchase: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3478 (ii).
——— Payments to for Legal Services: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2979 (ii).
Fraser, Mr. Donald, Dismissal from Customs Service: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5473 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* Defalcations: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5200 (iii).
See 'Customs Defalcations,' &c.

Fredericton Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Fredericton Ry. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12758 (vii).
Free Transportation of Members by SS. Cos.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Freight Rates, Discrimination *re* City of St. John, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 2397 (ii).
French Books, Reduction of Customs Duties *re* French Treaty: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2160 (ii).
French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
French Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
French Language, Legislation *re*, Par. in 'La Presse': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8291 (v).
——— Par. in 'Le Soleil': Ques. of Privilege (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1209 (i).
French Language, Pet. *re*: Read (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8886; Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 8886 (v).
French Language on Ry. Crossings, &c. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2021 (ii).
French Translation of Govt. Statutes and Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for Sup., 3179 (ii).
See 'Debates.'
French Treaty, Taking Effect: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 8614 (v).
French Treaty: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Fritz Cirkel, Mining Engineer, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7202 (iv).
See 'Graphite.'
Frozen Wheat, Shipments from Man., Inspection under Seed Act: M. (Mr. Blain) to adjn. House, 825 (i).
Fruit and Dairy Divisions, Separation of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2166 (ii).
Fruit Inspection in Closed Packages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 2981 (ii).
Fruit Inspection, Complaints *re* Apple Packing: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 2754 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act, Prosecutions *re* Apple Packing: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 4830 (iii).
Fruit and Vegetable Inspectors, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 516 (i).
Fumigation Stations: in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).
Fushimi, Prince, Expenditure *re* Visit: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (iii).
Gaetz Brothers, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10514 (vi).
Galops Canal, Upper Entrance, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5671 (iii).
Game Preserve, Alberta, Payments for Buffalo imported from Montana: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 847 (i).
Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Gananoque and Burnt Island Lights, Buoys, &c., Apptmt. of Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8383 (v).
Gananoque Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Garrison Artillery, B.C., 5th Regiment, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5792 (iii).
Garrison Commons, Toronto, Date of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 353 (i).
Garthby Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3844 (ii).
See 'Lake Aylmer.'
Gatineau Point Bridge, Sums contributed by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 355 (i).
Gaudette, Mr. Victor, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 1120 (i).
——— Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 515 (i).
Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 654, 668 (i).
General Chemical Co., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 174.'
Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Blain) on Conc., 13568 (vii).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Geological Specimens: in Com. of Sup., 12261 (vii).
Geological Survey Department, Total Expenditure from 1896 to 1908: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6402 (iv).
——— Technical Officers, Salaries, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13574 (vii).
——— Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11231 (vi).
Georgetown Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7182 (iv).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Georgian Bay Canal, Plans, Reports, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. McCool) 1941, 1992 (i), 5228 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal Scheme: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10312 (vi).
——— Report *re* Estimated Cost: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 12053 (vii).
——— inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 12836 (vii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Survey, Final Report of Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 240 (i).
——— Final Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. White) 240 (i), 5465 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. White) 11827 (vi).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Haggart) 1739 (i).
——— Reps., &c.: Laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 8378 (v).
Georgian Bay Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12145 (vii).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to Messrs. Noble and Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 980 (i).
—— Report from Mr. Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5729 (iii).
See 'Fisheries.'
German Development Co.: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10579 (vi).
See 'Dowling.'
German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Gillis, Release from Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 510 (i).
Gilmore, Edith May, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 164.'
Girard, Eugene Francois, Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Girouard, J. E., Resignation from Yukon Council: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11938 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11634 (vi).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
—— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7139 (iv).
Glencoe Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3846 (ii).
Glencoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 7486 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Glucose, Quantity imported from G.B.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6980 (iv).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Public Works, Retirement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Goderich Harbour, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
—— Claims of Smeeth & McGillicuddy: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c,: Ques. (Mr Bristol) 9712 (v)
—— Remarks (Mr. Maclaren) 9779 (v).
Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 123 & 197.'
Gold Commissioner's Office, Yukon, Number of Clerks, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).
See 'Yukon.'
'Golspie, Str., Payments *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 1084 (i).
Gooderham & Worts Distillery, Deficit in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12411 (vii).
Goodwin Car Co., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Gore's Landing Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Govt. Business: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7834 (iv), 12049, 12163 (vii).
—— Introduction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10258 (v), 10303, 10403, 10511, 11123, 11826 (vi).
—— M. for Precedence on Mondays (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6287 (iv).
—— Precedence *re* Motion for Want of Confidence: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6917 (iv).
—— Ry. Subsidies: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12504 (vii).
Govt. Business: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 13207 (vii).
—— Suppl. Estimates, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 11016 (vi).
Govt. Employees at Ottawa, Number of Permanent and Temporary, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Northrup) 558 (i).
Govt. Grounds, Condition of: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) 1741 (i).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Sproule) 2890 (ii).
Govt. Officials as Political Partizans in Elections: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on B. 115, 11903 (vi).
Govt. Ownership, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 75; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 51 (i).
Govt. Rys. Act: *See* 'B. No. 27.'
Govt. Railways System: *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Govt. Securities in Gold *re* Dom. Notes, &c.: Ques. (Mr Marshall) 6235 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Amounts paid for Provisions, &c., for Three Years: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1512 (i).
—— Captains' Residences, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 3241 (ii).
—— Ice-breakers, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
—— Maintenance and Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).
—— Number purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10731 (vi).
—— Pay of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10736 (vi).
—— Purchase of Supplies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1099 (i).
—— Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5467 (iii).
Govt. Works, Emplymt. of Technical Students: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3288 (ii).
Governor General's Expenditure since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 555 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. U. Wilson) 3581 (ii).
Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 610 (i).
Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Grain Blockade in the West: *See* 'B. No. 159.'

Grain Commission, Names of Members, Distribution of Evidence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3486 (ii).
Grain Commission's Report: Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 2381 (ii), 4224, 4316 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr .Staples) 180 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Staples) 180, 609 (i).
Grain Inspection in 1906, Total Expenditure, Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4586 (iii).
Grain Shipments, Financial Aid, Extended Explanation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 607
See 'Wheat,' &c.
Grain Standards Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 203.'
Grand Bend, &c., Pier, Delays in Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 4408 (iii).
——— Final Estimate of Chief Engineer Lafleur: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8892 (v).
Grand Bend Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5085 (ii).
See 'Public Works—Wharfs,' &c.
Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Grand Forks Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Grand Manan Telegraph System, Application *re* Leasing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Grand Marais Harbour, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 12140 (vii).
Grand Mechins Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Grand Mere Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 13059 (vii).
Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8382 (v).
Grande Riviere Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
G.T.P. Ry. Co., Guaranteed Bonds: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY:
Accidents to Employees: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 6655, 7447 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr Talbot) 6850 (iv).
——— Investigation by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 10624 (vi).
Application for Portion of Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. D. Ross) 1512 (i).
Apptmt. of District Engineer at Kenora: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 895 (i).
Bond Issue, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8440 (v).
Classification of District 'B' and 'F,' Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 12051 (vii).
See 'Hodgins.'
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Commissioners' Rep., Printing and Distribution: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7 (i).
——— Commission, Total Salaries, Expenses &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13226 (vii).
Commission issued to Inspectors: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9716 (v).
Construction, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 37 (i).
——— Estimated Cost, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 10393 (vi).
——— Inclusive of Terminals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9265 (v).
——— Inquiry for Figures (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10916, 11939 (vi).
——— M. to Lay Statement on Table (Mr. Graham) 12049 (vii).
——— Total Cost, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii), 9265 (v), 11407 (vi).
——— Statement (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 12238 (vii)
——— Reply to Mr. Borden's Statement (Mr. Graham) 12662 (vii).
Construction Tenders, Total Amounts, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. J. T. Schell) 600 (i).
Contracts, Date, Estimated Cost, Mileage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6458, 6636 (iv).
Contracts *re* Eastern and Western Sections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6234 (iv).
Contracts, Safeguard Clauses in Govt. Contracts: M. for Copies* (Mr. Morin) 2398 (ii).
Eastern Division, Estimated Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5563 (iii).
——— Recent Estimate of Cost: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5259 (iii).
Eastern Limit, Mountain Section, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 9265 (v)
Engineers and Assistant Engineers, Names, &c., Date of Apptmt., Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5802 (iii).
Engineering Staff, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 509, 681 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 853 (i).
——— Resignation of Mr. Hodgins: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 516 (i)
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 558 (i).
See 'Hodgins.'
Foss, Mr. C. O., Apptmt. on Engineering Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 358 (i).
Grand Falls and Moncton Section, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9266 (v).
G.T.P., and N.T. Ry., Disputed Questions: Ques (Mr. Barker) 6235 (iv).
Hodgins, Major, Resignation, Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 358 (i).
——— Retirement of, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 366 (i).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Hodgins, Major, Charges *re* Classification, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6844, 6925 (iv).
——Amt. to M. to ref. to Special Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7213, 7320 (iv).
—— Statement from Hon. Mr. Parent: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6985; Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7097 (iv).
—— Investigation *re*, 1st Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Geoffrion) 8515 (v).
—— M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12265; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) Minority Rep., 12291 (vii).
—— Counsel Fees, Payment: M. (Mr. Macdonald) 13578 (vii).
Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 10390 (vi).
La Tuque Branch, Damages by Flooding: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8607 (v).
—— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 8894 (v).
Liquor, Prohibition Zone, Cor., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2024
Location, Conference in Montreal *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7809 (iv).
Lyall, Mr. Peter, Contractor for G.T.P. Terminals at Winnipeg: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 7991 (iv).
Madawaska Right of Way: Remarks (Mr. Michaud) 12661 (vii).
Marier, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. on G.T.P. Commission: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2162 (ii).
Medical Attendance, O.C. regulating Deductions: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1937 (i).
—— Deductions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 9473 (v).
Medical Officer Parent, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8618 (v).
Miles under construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 165 (i).
Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T. P. Ry. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5256 (iii).
Montreal Branch Line Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
Mountain Division, Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
Nationality of Contractors: Discrimination against Canadians: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7936 (iv).
Payments to Mr. A. Brunet: in Com. of Sup., 10378 (vi).
Policy *re* Police Patrol: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7997 (iv).
Port Arthur Branch Line Subsidy: in Com on Res., 13303 (vii).
Prohibition Zone, Reduction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 516 (i).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Protests *re* Land Acquisitions: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 6640 (iv).
Rails purchased, Name of Manufacturers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 10738, 10790 (vi).
—— Importations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 12775 (vii).
—— corrected answer (Mr. Graham) 13065
Rails for Eastern Division, Purchase of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9263 (v).
Return: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6288 (iv).
Route, Financial Reasons for Change of Route: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) 8089 (iv).
Sections B. and F., Amounts paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 5211 (iii).
Securities *re* Construction Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 356 (i).
Supplies to Prince Rupert via American Routes: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 9025 (v), 10375 (vi).
Supply Transportation, Award of Contracts *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2171 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1932 (i).
—— Contractor for District No. 3: Ques. (Mr. White) 1120 (i).
Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12728 (vii).
Ties purchased from U.S.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 1443 (i).
Town and Development Co., Location of Lands, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 5087 (iii).
Winnipeg and Moncton Route, Location of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 2386 (ii).
——Number of Miles completed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6643 (iv).
—— Tenders *re* Contracts, Signatures, &.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 935 (i).
G.T. Ry. and C.P.R. Connection at Wingham: Remarks (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) 191 (i).
G. T. Ry., Connection at Brockville: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
——Connections at Prescott: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 433 (i).
——Entrance into Toronto, O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 556 (i).
G.T.R. Hotel Site at Ottawa: *See* 'B No. 89.'
G.T.Ry. Hotel: *See* 'Major's Hill.'
'Graphite,' Cost of Publication, Total Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5081 (iii).
See 'Fritz Cirkel,' &c.
Gratuities to Marine *re* Accidents to Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vii).
Gratuities to Public Works Officials: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (iii).
Gravenhurst Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).
Graving Docks, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).

Grazing Lands leased to Brown, Bedingfield & Co.: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 13062 (vii).
Grazing Lands Reservations, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 3850 (ii).
Grazing Leases, Application of Messrs. Wood, Fleck and Finnie: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 238 (i).
Grazing Leases, Irrevocable for 21 years, Applications for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1511 (i).
Grazing and Irrigation Lands reserved by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3479 (ii).
Grazing Lease of H. Rivière, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 13060 (vii).
Grazing Ranches, Names and Addresses of Lessees in Townships 12 to 19: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7210 (iv).
G. B. and Canada Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 12728 (vii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
G. B. and U. S. Treaties: Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8694 (v).
See 'Anglo-American.'
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Griffith Island, Georgian Bay, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1508 (i).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Buildings: in Com. of Sup.,7289 (iv).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. A. F. Maclaren) 184 (i).
Gunn, Mr. B. B., Decease of: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 431 (i).
Gunnip, Mr. James, Pet. *re* Claims for Injuries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3844 (ii).
Hackett Dock, Purhase of at Amherstburg: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7730 (iv).
Halifax Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 7144 (iv).
—— Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7211 (iv).
Halifax Dominion Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7140 (iv).
Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10015 (v).
—— Disbandment of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208 (i).
—— Discontent *re* Delay of Pay: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).
—— Occupation by Imp. Troops: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
—— Retraction of Remarks of Minister of Finance: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5784 (iii).
See 'Esquimault.'
Halifax Immigration Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7142-3 (iv).
Halifax Immigration Frauds. Dismissal of Mr. Bernstein: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8605 (v).
—— Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9334 (v).
See 'Immigration.'
Halifax, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii), 12227 (vii).
—— Military Buildings (Wellington Barracks): in Com. of Sup., 7143 (iv).
Halifax Platform *re* Conservative Speeches, ref. to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 47; (Mr. Foster) 66 (i).
Halifax Quarantine Station, Lawlor's Island: in Com. of Sup., 7171 (iv).
Halifax, Signal Dues at: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Halifax Southwestern Ry. (Tusket Wedge) Subsidy: in Com. of Res., 13296 (vii).
Halliday Bros., Supplies to Lighthouses, Rates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6236 (iv).
Hall's Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
Hamilton Bank, Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 56.'
Hamilton, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7692 (iv).
—— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7696 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Hamilton Radial Electric B. 25: in Com., *re* Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to ref. back to Com., 3362 (ii).
Haney, M. J., Claims *re* P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 12762 (vii).
'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 9128 (v).
See 'Debates,' &c.
Harbottle, N. F., Employmt. in Excise Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7730 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11693, 12031 (vi).
—— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii).
—— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
—— N. B., Members' Remarks checked: (Mr. Deputy Speaker) 11290 (vi).
—— N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
—— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— P. E. I., General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).
—— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
—— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
See 'Public Works.'
Harlaka Junction Ry. Connection: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 1436 (i), 3317 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.,' &c.
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Harvey Bank Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).

Hawkeye, Mr., Emplymt. as Returning Officer: Remarks (Mr. Avery) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).
Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Instruction *re* Municipal Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3430 (ii)
——Political Interference, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) on M. for Sup., 6647 (iv).
Haycock, Mr. J. L., Interference in Elections: Remarks (Mr U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).
Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims against Dept. of Agriculture: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5791 (iii).
Hay and Straw Embargo by G. B.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4765 (iii).
Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7210 (iv).
—— Purchase of Cement from A. E. Wallberg, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 4773 (iii).
Higgin's Shore Pier Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 694 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, Increase in Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 10737 (vi).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I. Ry., Claims of M. J. Haney, Arbitration, &c.: Remarks (Mr J. D. Reid) 1739 (i).
—— O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1690 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Barker) 3042, 3690 (ii).
Hillsborough Bridge Construction, Land Purchases, &c., Reps., &s.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lefurgey) 2170 (ii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lefurgey) 6160 (iii).
—— Total Expenditure *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1686 (i).
Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii)
—— Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).
Hindus Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) 5337 (iii).
Hindus in B.C., Protests against Treatment: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr. Foster) 5489 (iii).
—— Tel. *re* Contract Labour: Remarks (Mr Foster) 4407 (iii).
See 'Immigration.'
Hintz, Fred., Location of Homestead: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6238 (iv).
See 'Homesteads,' &c.
Hodgins, Major: *See* 'G.T.P.'
Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 9280 (v).
—— Compensation paid, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13085 (vii).
Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. P. D. McLean) 2081 (ii).
Holland River Dredging, Contract with Lake Simcoe Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2980 (ii).
—— Divisional Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4767 (iii).
—— Name of Inspector, &e.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3037 (ii).
Holliday, Mr. P., Payments of Additional Living Allowance: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5475 (iii).
Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip for Services: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 2161 (ii)
Homestead Application of Mr. John Haddock: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. on B. 181, 11197 (vi).
Homestead Cancellations: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 10090 (v)
Homestead Entries, Declarations, &c., by Mr. R. Cruickshanks: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 698 (i).
Homestead Entries in Man., &c., Total Acreage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6920 (iv).
Homestead Entries granted for Quarter 10-17-17, W. of 4th Meridian: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 9773 (v).
Homesteaders for Sections 15, 16 and 27, &c., Issue of Patents: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 7503 (iv).
Homestead Entry for s.e. ¼ Section 16-28-1, Issue of Patent, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2167 (ii).
Homesteading on Section 18, Extensions *re* Time Allowance: Quese. (Mr. Ames) 8381 (v).
Homestead Entries in Section 27, Cor., Tels., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Staples) 4773 (iii).
—— n.e. ¼ Sec. 28, Permission *re* Grants: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1941 (i).
—— N.W. Quarter Section 35, History of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4762 (iii).
—— Records of Payments of Sale by Peter Luenson to F. Heintz, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr Porter) 1294 (i).
See 'Hintz.'
Homestead Entry by Mr. Tanguay: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).
Homestead Entries: *See* 'Land Patents.'
Homestead Patents, Settlement Conditions: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10095 (v).
—— Sale of in Township 13, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7206 (iv).
Honey Imports from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8177 (iv).
Hoppins, Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3842 (ii).
Horses and Cattle, Imports to U.S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6000 (iii).
Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, Applications, &c., *re* Coal Mining Lands: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 698 (i)

Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, Sales of Lands to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 364, 568 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 3319 (ii).
House of Commons Act (election writ) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
HOUSE OF COMMONS:
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Estimates: in Com of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Colchester Electoral District, Ceretificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 680 (i).
Committees sitting concurrently with Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9579 (v).
Debates of the House, Statement *re* Speakers (Mr. Kennedy) 13537 (vii).
Election Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Electoral Districts, Issue of Writs: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
——— Ottawa and Labelle, Certificates of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
Employees of Parliament, Religion, Nationalities, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 5479 (iii).
House of Commons, Accommodation for Members in New Wing: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 10490 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
——— Additional Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1486 (i).
——— Civil Service Bill, and Employees of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13528 (vii).
——— Clerks, Changes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Owen) 4247 (iii).
——— Employees, Recommendations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 3899 (ii).
——— Increase of Salaries: in Com. of Sup 13562 (vii).
——— Delays in Mails: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 11939 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 570 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
——— Delay, &c.: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) 12044 (vi).
——— Salary Increases to Sessional Clerks: in Sup., Conc., 13578 (vii).
——— Ventilation and Cooling: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 10978, 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
House of Commons and Senate, Cost, &c., Outside of Indemnities: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4760 (iii).
Huron Electoral Division, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
———Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2541 (ii).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Internal Economy Commission, Minutes: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2795 (ii).
Legislation, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10507 (vi).
Library of Parlt. Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
——— Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
——— Montreal Directory: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 4764 (iii).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* Frauds: Read (Mr. Bole) 7942 (iv).
Members, New, Certificates: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Members and Senators appointed to Offices of Emolument, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 555 (i).
Montmagny Electoral District, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 9263 (v).
Nicolet Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1283
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, Bourinot quoted. &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii)
——— Appeal to Speaker from Chairman's Ruling (Mr. Taylor) Agreed to (Y. 84; N. 1) 4188 (ii).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 609 (i).
Peace Union, Parliamentary, Meeting at Ottawa: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13581 (vii).
Printing of Parlt., Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
Private Bills Com., Extension of Time: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 891 (i).
Private Bills Fees, Discrepancy between Senate and H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10122 (v).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen. Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 13580 (vii).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings and Adjournments: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1439 (i).
——— Meetings of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings concurrently with Sittings of Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9504 (v).
——— Production of Original Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1383 (i), 4495 (iii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Joint Meeting of Members and Senators: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 6061 (iii).
Restaurant of H. of C. and Senate: M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Joint Com., 13224 (vii).
——— 1st Rep.: Presented (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 13510 (vii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Returning Officers, Apptmnt. of: Remarks (Mr. Telford) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).
Returns, Questions, &c., ordered by House, Time to complete, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 4242 (iii).
Revised Statutes, French Version, Date of Completion: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 6983 (iv).
Rules of the House, Amendments to: Prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2984 (ii).
Rules *re* Hours of Adjournment: Prop. Res. (Mr. A. A. Wright) 584 (i).
Saturday Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11501 (vi).
Senate, Cost of outside of Indemnities: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 5087 (iii).
——— Days of Sitting, Cost for 1895 and 1906-7, of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1114 (i).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimates: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
South Huron, By-Election, Amounts paid Returning Officer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9270 (v), 11935 (vi).
Speaker's Expenses, Comparison, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
——— Pianos rented, &c., for Speakers' Rooms: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 563 (i).
Speech from the Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i).
——— Reply (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1584 (i).
Stanstead By-Election Papers, Destruction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8087 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 8839 (v).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com. on Priv. and Elections, 8887 (v).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Vacancy in Stanstead, Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Spaker) 569 (i).
Voters' Lists, Manitoba: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 10793 (vi).
——— Manitoba Polling Divisions by Judges: Remarks (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 13139 (vii).
——— Provincial: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Votes and Proceedings, Correction in Names of Clerks (Mr. Burrows) 13066 (vii).
Watson, Mr., K.C., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Election Frauds: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 6848 (iv).
Wednesday Evening Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).
York Electoral District: Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1018 (i).
Howard's Cape Wharf, Pet. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 11702 (vi).
Hudson Bay Co., Original Land Register of Lord Selkirk's Estate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4403 (iii).
Hudson Bay Patrol System: in Com. of Sup., 3985 (ii), 4747 (iii).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction: M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).
——— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5789 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Borden) on Financial Review, 13467 (vii).
——— Surveys, Locations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12764 (vii).
See 'Railways.'
Hudson, Que., Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11703 (vi).
Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11704 (vi).
Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8582 (v).
Hunter, Henry C., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1292 (i), 3236 (ii).
Hunter, J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Hunting, Killing of Persons, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
'Hurona-Mongolian' Collision, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 358 (i).
Huron Electoral Division, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
——— Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2541 (ii).
Hydrographic Surveys, Amounts expended, &c: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1128 (i).
——— River St. Lawrence and Gulf: in Com. of Sup., 13169 (vii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Date of Resignation, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 166 (i).
Ice-breakers for Govt. Service: in Com. of Sup., 2941, 2949 (ii).
Ice-breaker for Northumberland Straits: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).
——— Progress *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1734 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 2944 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Immigration: *See* 'Chinese,' &c.
Immigration Act (concealed weapons) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
Immigration Act Amt: *See* 'B. No. 135.'
IMMIGRATION:
Agents in G. B. and France: in Com. of Sup., 9840 (v).
——— Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2169 (ii).
——— Reps. received from, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 557 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Agents, Special, Salaries, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 2398 (ii).
Agents in East Elgin, Number employed: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 692 (i).
—— Italy. Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 4584 (iii).
—— Kent County, Ont., on M. for Sup. (Mr. Clements) 3172 (ii).
—— payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Agents appointed in Ontario, Names, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1129 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3041 (ii).
Agents, Names, Addresses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 180 (i).
—— Names of those paid Commissions to in Europe, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 3844 (ii).
Agents in N.B., Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 843 (i).
Agents, Special Prizes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3484 (ii).
Agents in U.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).
Asiatic Immigration into B.C.: *See* 'Japanese.'
Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
Bonuses, Abolition of: Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6663, 6945, 6989 (iv).
—— Notice of Motion (Mr. Monk) 4769 (iii), 6288 (iv).
Bonuses, Abolition of: on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1295 (i), 3300 (ii).
—— Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) *re* Discussion of former Speech, 1298; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1299 (i).
—— Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1287 (i).
—— Increase to Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3429 (ii).
Bonuses. Par. in 'Canadian Gazette': Remarks (Mr. Robitaille) 7453 (iv).
B.C., Immigration, O.C. *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 9890 (v).
British Subjects, Regulations *re*, Deportations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9772 (v).
Buildings, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11008 (vi).
Chapman, Mr. F. O., Emplymt. in Immigration Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).
Chinese Immigration into B.C., O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 554 (i).
Chinese Immigration, Decision of N.S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 513 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Colonization Societies, Quebec, Amounts paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 684 (i).
Detention Hospitals, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 5081 (iii).
Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* Immigration Frauds at Halifax: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 5655 (iii).
See 'Halifax.'
Doukhobours bonused as Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9952 (v).
—— Homesteads cancelled, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9957 (v).
—— Ques. of Priv. *re* (Mr. S. Hughes) 7321 (iv).
—— Religious Fanatics: Par. in Press (Mr. J. D. Reid) 12161 (vii).
Doyle, Mr. P., Immigration Agent, Superannuation of: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 6923 (iv).
Dunne, M. C., Agent, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington County: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 555 (i).
Expenditure from March, 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 5080 (iii).
Expenditure *re* Maintenance of Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5084 (iii).
French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
French Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
Gimli Galicians, Relief to (Mr. Oliver) Rep. of Mr. Walker read: in Com. of Sup., 9979 (v).
Halifax Immigration Frauds, Par in Press: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4834 (iii).
—— Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9334 (v).
—— Dismissal of Mr. Bernstein: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8605 (v).
—— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5567 (iii).
—— Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6465 (iv).
—— Rep. of Mr. Robertson: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9127 (v).
—— Restitution *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).
—— Statement *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4963 (iii).
Halifax Immigration Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7142-3 (iv).
Hindus in B.C., Protests against Treatment: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr Foster) 5488 (iii).
—— Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) 5337 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Hindus, Tel. *re* Contract Labour: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4407 (iii).
Immigrants, Amounts paid for Maintenance, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Schaffner) 5476 (iii).
—— Bulgarians, Stranded in Toronto: Tel. read (Mr. Macdonell) 185 (i).
Immigrants at Chatham, Deportation of Five Families: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 6922 (iv).
—— Names and Causes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5796 (iii).
Immigrants deported, Expenditure *re* Transportation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 5080 (iii).
—— Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 177 (i).
Immigrants Destitute, Stranded in Toronto: Remarks *re* Question (Mr. Macdonell) 242 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 429 (i).
Immigrants distributed in West Kent, Certificates of Farmers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1513 (i).
Immigrants from Europe, entering U.S., List furnished to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5082 (iii).
Immigrant Inspection on Ships, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1289 (i).
Immigrants landed in Canada June, 1907, Number deported, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3339 (ii).
Immigrants, Number entering Canada, Bonuses paid on, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5256 (iii).
—— Number settled in Canada in 1905-6-7, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 697 (i).
—— Reported by SS. 'Montreal,' Bonuses paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6921 (iv).
—— Stranded at St. Thomas, Deportation of: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 567 (i).
—— Total Number entering Canada for ten Months, Deportations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 240 (i).
Immigration Act Amt., O.C. *re*: Ques (Mr. Lennox) 7500 (iv).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 8171, 8607, 8696 (v).
Immigration Act, B.C., Natal Act, Disallowance of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 567 (i).
Immigration, Circular issued to Immigrants *re* Fraudulent Powers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 606 (i).
—— Co-operation with N.B. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
—— Deportations: in Com. of Sup., 9882 (v).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Immigration from England, Statements of Mr. O. Smith, &c.: Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. Sproule) 5491 (iii).
Immigration Forms, Number returned by Farmers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3847 (ii).
Immigration from France and Belgium, Premiums paid to Clerical and Lay Agents: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6922 (iv).
Immigration, General Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 5751 (iii).
Immigration Hall, East Selkirk, Furniture, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6402 (iv).
Immigration and Commercial Agencies Rets.: Inquiry for (Mr. U. Wilson) 1108 (i).
Immigration Literature: in Com. of Sup., 9948 (v).
—— Contingencies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9948 (v).
Immigration, O.Cs. and Circulars issued *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 2171 (ii).
—— Regulations, O.C. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11018 (vi).
Immigration from U.S., Total Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5082 (iii).
Japanese Immigration: *See* main heading.
La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Montreal, Pet. *re* Assistance: Ques. (Mr Monk) 4244 (iii).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4773 (iii).
London Immigration, Central Board, Moneys paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2545 (ii).
McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 8617 (v).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Alcorn) 4773 (iii).
Miller, Agent, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 555 (i).
Oriental Immigration, B.C., Legal Expenses *re* Commission: in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Passages to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5468 (iii).
Quebec Immigrant Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
—— Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Relief to Settlers: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 9983 (v).
Salvation Army Immigrants, Letter from Dr. Nadeau: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7094 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
—— Stmnt. of Genl. Booth: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2390 (ii).
Temperance Colonization Society, Land Grants to, Terms of Settlement, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 4774 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Teulon Immigration Sheds, Number cared for: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 892 (i).
U. S. Labourers: in Com. of Sup., 13169 (vii).
U.S., Total Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5082 (iii)
Victoria Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 10874 (vi).
Waugh, James S., Distribution of Immigrants, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gordon) 1690 (i).
—— Refund to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4765 (iii).
Waugh and Perrin, Agents, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Winnipeg Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8573 (vi).
Imperial Conference, 1907, Expenditure by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 511 (i).
—— Travelling Expenses of Ministers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1513 (i).
See 'Colonial.'
Imperial Institute: in Com. of Sup., 10623 (vi).
Imperial Pulp Co., Denial *re* Managing Directorship: Par. in Montreal 'Star': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sifton) 3578 (ii).
Imperial Treaties, Status of Canada *re* Negotiations &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 1939 (i)
Imports and Exports ending Sept. 30th and Oct. 30th, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 350 (i).
—— Values from June to Dec., 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
Imports from France, Value for Five Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1124 (i).
Imports for Home Consumption, Values for 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13063 (vii).
Independence of Parlt. Act, Violation of *re* R. Stewart, M.P. for Ottawa: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).
Independent Bank Audit, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 11232 (vi).
Indiantown and Blackville Branch Ry., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
INDIANS:
Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).
Clearwater Lake, Halfbreeds' Rights: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 175 (i).
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 10916 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
Destitute Indians, Relief, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
Dokis Indian Land Sale, Commission to Mr. P. Ryan: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).
Dokis Indian Reserve, Consent from Chief, *re* Sale of Timber: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8175 (iv).
INDIANS—*Con.*
Dokis Indian Reserve, Name of Govt. Agent: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5084 (iii).
—— Notice of Sale, Names of Newspapers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 7500 (iv).
—— Protests *re* Sale: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10918 (vi).
—— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 10512 (vi).
Dokis Indians, Surrender of Timber, O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5087 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3849 (ii).
—— Sale of Timber: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 7801 (iv).
Indian Affairs: in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 7 (i).
—— Extravagant Management of: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Armstrong) 11022 (vi).
—— Generally, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
Lands in Algoma, Sale of, 13095; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13122; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 101) 13138 (vii).
—— Tel. from Mr. Sifton read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13416 (vii).
—— Ques. of Priv. *re* Mr. Sifton's Telegram, 13528 (vii).
Lands in Algoma, Withdrawal from Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2396 (ii).
Lands in B.C., Provincial Rights: Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) in Com. of Sup., 627 (i).
Lands and Islands owned by Indians, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5078 (iii).
Lands at New Westminster, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3037, 3839 (ii).
Land Sales in N.W. Indian Reserves, Applications, Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii).
Lands, Number of Acres sold since 1896, Total Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4586 (iii).
Land Sales: in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
Man. and Sask. Indians, Investigation of Mrs. Paget and Miss Ferguson, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. Wright) 6919 (iv)
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Legal Opinions of Justice Dept.: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2381 (ii).
Muskoday Reserves, Negotiations *re* Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5082 (iii).
N. B., Agents Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 13170 (viii).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12736 (vii).
—— School Inspector: in Com. of Sup., 13170 (vii).

INDIANS—*Con.*
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 12729, 12737 (vii).
Piegan Indian Reserve, Shipping and Weighing of Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 632 (i).
Rama Indian Fund, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 8610 (v).
St. Mary's Indian Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
St. Peter's Reserve Title, Extinguishment of, Issue of Patents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1932 (i).
—— Instruction to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2217 (ii).
—— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 7990 (iv).
Schools. Dr. Bryce's Report: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
Sioux Indians: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
Six Nation Indians. Negotiations *re*, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 6242 (iv).
—— Refusal of Inspection of Memorials, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6239 (iv).
Swan Lake Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 693 (i).
—— Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
—— Settlement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Yeomans, Agent. Complaints by John Franklin, &c., Letters *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Knowles) 1513 (i).
Ingonish Lightkeeper, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8618 (v).
Inland Revenue Act (excise duties, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
INLAND REVENUE:
Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Excise, Provisional Allowance to Inland Revenue Officers: in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Gooderham & Worts Distillery, Deficit in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12411 (vii).
Inland Revenue Act, Violations: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4964 (iii).
Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 6 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 645 (i).
Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Toronto Inland Revenue Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5797 (iii).
Port Hope Inland Revenue Office, Apptmts. of Collector: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 895 (i).
Seizures, 1906-7, in Cornwall, Toronto, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 3846 (ii).
INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 3851 (ii).
—— Seizures in Cornwall, &c., Names of Officers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 4247 (iii).
Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1903: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Tobacco Manufacturers in Mar. Provs., Amounts of Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 363 (i).
Tobacco Manufacturers in P.E.I., Violation of Inland Revenue Act: Cor. read (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9237 (v).
—— on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9514 (v).
Tobacco. Protection to Canadian Industry, Pets., &c., *re* Amt. to Inland Revenue Act: M. for Copies (Mr. Dubeau) 899 (i).
Tobacco Seizures, at Charlottetown, Penalties, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2982 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act: *See* 'B. No. 64.'
—— (dairy products, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
—— (grain) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 203.'
—— (oat standards) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Inspection of Staples: in Com. of Sup., 12264 (vii).
Inspection of Steamboats: *See* 'Canada Shipping Bills.'
Inspectors of Food Products, Number, Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 352 (i).
Institute of Architects of Can.: See 'B. No. 88.'
See 'Architects.'
Insurance Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*: Personal Explanation *re* Par. in Montreal 'Star' (Mr. Foster) 1860 (i).
—— Introduction of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9272 (v).
—— Discussion *re* (Mr. Foster) 1107 (i).
—— Introduction of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7099 (iv), 8386 (v).
Insurance Commission, Exhibits of Commercial Travellers' Mutual Benefit Society, Originals asked for (Mr. Macdonell) 7988 (iv).
—— Evidence, Sale of for Private Profit: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 6059 (iii).
—— and Political Campaign Literature: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 10792 (vi).
—— Rep.: Ques. of Priv. *re* Stmnt. of Sir Frederick Borden, 9337; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 9352, 9461 (v).
—— Total Expenditure, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 232 (i).
Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 241 (i).
Insurance, Supt. of: in Com. of Sup., 12160 (vii).

Insurance, Supt.'s Salary: *See* 'B. No. 200.'
Intercolonial Conference in London, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 13225 (vii).
—— Expenses of Ministers: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 13511 (vii).
See 'Colonial.'
I.C.R. Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 27.'
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
Accidents, Letter *re*: Read (Mr. S. Hughes) 6985 (iv).
Advertising for Supplies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 10186 (v).
Amherst Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Amqui Station, Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10012 (v).
—— Vote *re* Construction, Amount Expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12774 (vii).
Answer to Questions: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) 13415 (vii).
Antigonish Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Audit System: Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 10214 (v).
Book-Keeping System, Correction of Par. in St. John 'Daily Telegraph': (Mr. Graham) 5260 (iii).
Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
Campbellton Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
Cars sent to U.S., Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).
Cars in Service on Sundays: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
Chatham, N.B., Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12757 (vii).
Circular *re* Delay in Payment of Salaries: Read (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10126 (v).
—— Par. in St. John Press: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Fowler) 10016 (v).
Claims Agent, E. H. Allen, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3480 (ii).
Claims for Damages by A. W. Belyea: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9472 (v).
Claims for Damages to Property or Personal Injury, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 6002 (iii).
Claims for Damages, Settlement of: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5793 (iii), 7196 (iv).
Claims Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 10176 (v).
Cold Storage Cars for Dairy Produce, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1688 (i).
Collection of Revenues: in Com. of Sup., 5693 (iii).
O
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Compensation *re* Horses killed at Truro: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
Concrete Pipes, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6640 (iv).
Dartmouth Branch Line Ry., Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).
Delays to 'Maritime Express': Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8614 (v).
Deterioration of Service: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 10147 (v).
Double Tracking: in Com. of Sup., 12236, 12250 (vii).
Earnings and Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13510 (vii).
Employees, Apptmts. in N.B. during Jan. and Feb., 1908, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5793 (iii).
—— Circular from Genl. Mgr. *re* Municipal Politics: Read (Mr. Sproule) 2304 (ii).
—— Circular *re* Municipal Elections: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2884; on M. for Sup., 2890 (ii).
—— Employees and Municipal Elections: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2309 (ii).
—— Increased Wages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2981 (ii).
—— Provident Fund Act, Names on List: ues. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4582 (iii).
—— and Quebec Provincial Elections: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9777 (v).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10126 (v).
Extension to Great Lakes, Prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2435 (ii).
Extension Policy, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 73 (i).
Fredericton Ry. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12758 (vii).
Freight Rate Discrimination against Fredericton, N.B., Cor., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Crocket) 2558 (ii).
Gross Earnings for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13225 (vii).
Halifax Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii), 12227 (vii).
—— Civic Elections in Halifax, Interference of Employees: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6845 (iv).
Halifax to Sydney Division, Transfer: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12773 (vii).
Hanlon's Crossing Accident, Investigation *re*: M. for Paper* (Mr. Sinclair) 5800 (iii).
Hard Pine Tenders, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3233 (ii).
Harlaka Junction Ry. Connections: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 434, 1436 (i), 3317 (ii).
See 'Que. Central.'

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Ice Supply Contract: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5259 (iii), 7446 (iv).
Increased Accommodations: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry., Change of Name, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6243 (iv).
Lac Saumon Station, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12652 (vii).
Legal Costs to Mr. MacIlreith: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 5553 (iii).
Legal Services: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 10190 (v).
Locomotives: in Com. of Sup., 10149 (v).
Locomotive and Car Shops, Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Moncton, Additional Branch Line: in Com. of Sup., 12760 (vii).
Moncton Car Shops, Contractor, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1509 (i).
——— Car and Locomotive Shops: in Com. of Sup., 12250 (vii).
——— Lease, &c., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1690 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. E. A. Wallberg: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 8892 (v).
——— Tenders *re* Leasing: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5800 (iii).
Motor Cars, Tests *re* Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 565 (i).
Mulgrave Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
N.B. Elections and I.C.R. Employees: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3317 (ii).
Newcastle Station, Inspector of Works: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13514 (vii).
New Glasgow Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
North Sydney Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Notices printed in French and English: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7936 (iv).
Number of Men employed in N.B., for Jan., Feb., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Daniel) 6241 (iv).
'Ocean Limited,' Date of Beginning and Ending of Running, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 6051 (iii).
Officials, A. T. LeBlanc, &c., Accounts, Vouchers, &c., for Travelling Expenses, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 2982 (ii).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
——— Issue of Pass: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
Oxford and Pictou Branch, Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10733 (vii).
Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 10157 (v).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Passes issued to Mr. P. S. Archibald: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2387 (ii).
Petit Rocher Spur Line: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
Pictou Branch, Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 12661 (vii).
Pictou to Copper Crown Co., Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10733 (vi).
Pictou Engine House, Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1683 (i).
——— Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12230 (vii).
——— Station, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10789 (vi).
Piping: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10195 (v).
Private Car for Mr. Schreiber, Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10186 (v).
Quebec Central Ry. Connections: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 189 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 10179 (v).
Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13225 (vii).
Rails, &c., Number of Tons of: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
Rails purchased from Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 9269 (v).
Railway Surveys, Colchester County, Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980 (ii).
——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 5046 (iii).
Rates, Increase in Winter to P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5995 (iii).
Receipts and Expenditures: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 10514 (vi).
Revenue from Terminals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5471 (iii).
Ricard, Mr., Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
Riviere du Loup Station, Improvement *re* Platforms: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 5468 (iii).
——— Station Master, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 7445 (iv).
Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup., 5549 (iii), 12257 (vii).
——— Purchase, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
——— Statement *re* Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Graham) 5697 (iii).
Running of Official Cars on Limited Trains, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 5474 (iii).
St. Cyrille Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12756 (vii).
St. John Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Ste. Monique Gates, Number to be made: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi)

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Ste. Rosalie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12259 (vii).
Sackville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12235 (vii).
Springhill, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Station, Asphalt Platforms, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5466 (iii).
Stationery Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 10181 (v).
Stellarton Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
Stellarton to Pictou, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10734 (vi).
Stewart, Mr. James A., Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9712 (v).
—— Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).
Sunday Cars, Instructions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 10734 (vi).
Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 10188 (v).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation: in Com., of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Sydney to Sydney Mines Branch Ry., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7201 (iv).
Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
—— Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Talbot, Mr. Evariste, Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6400 (iv).
Tatamagouche, Delay of Trains, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1292 (i).
Ties delivered, Changes *re* Inspection: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12052 (vii).
Trains breaking down, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
—— Explanations *re* Delays, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6242 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10159 (v).
Transportation Question, Statement, on M. for Sup., 4420 (iii).
Trois Pistoles Station, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 12652 (vii).
Truro, Buildings, Name of Tenderers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 6233 (iv).
—— Engine House, Contract to Rhodes & Co.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1936 (i).
—— Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12231 (vii).
—— Sewerage Frontage: M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5800 (iii).
—— Station, Unsanitary Condition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7211 (iv).
William, Thos., Emplymt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2388 (iii).

INTERIOR:
Clearwater Lake, Squatters' Rights to Lands: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).
Cypress Hill Homestead Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Interior, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 7 (i).
—— Deptl, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 616 (i), 9693 (v).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications for Homesteads: Letter from Mr. Seaman read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9992 (v).
Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion *re* Interior Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).
Rocky Mountain Park: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Seed Grain purchased, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 8185 (iv).
Squatters' Claims in Alberta: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
Swamp Lands in Man.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 10105 (v).
See 'Immigration,' 'Indians,' &c.
Internal Economy Board of H. of C., Minutes: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2795 (ii).
—— Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
International Boundary Line: Representations *re* Buildings on: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 356 (i).
—— Correction of Answer (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 519 (i).
International Commission, Red River of the North: in Com. of Sup., 11118 (vi).
International Ry., N.B., Directors, Amount of Stocks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4246 (iii).
International Tunnel, Windsor, Customs Duty *re* Construction Material: Ques. (Mr. McLaren) 3840 (ii).
See 'Detroit.'
Interprovincial Bridge Co., N.B., Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).
Interprovl. Ry. Bridge Co. of N.B.: *See* 'B. No. 76.'
Inverness County, Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. McLennan) 12233 (vii).
Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5792 (iii).
Inverness Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7172 (iv).
—— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5997 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid from 1903 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 4244 (iii).

Irrigation Act: *See* 'B. No. 10, 99.'
Irrigation in West, Investigation *re* Measurements: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. of Sup., 9989 (v).
Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, Permission *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5079 (iii).
Japanese Colony in the West, Application from C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 7196 (iv).
Japanese entering B.C., Passports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 4243 (iii).
Japanese Immigration Act, Disallowance of *re* B.C.: Ques. Mr. R. Smith) 6642 (iv).
Japanese Immigration, Announcement of Mr. Lemieux's Mission: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208 (i).
Japanese Immigration and Natal Act, Cor. with Lt.-Gov. of B.C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. Smith) 2170 (ii).
See 'Dunsmuir.'
Japanese Immigration, Cor. *re* Limitations, &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 94 (i).
—— Debate in Japanese Diet, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4737 (iii).
—— from U.S., Deportations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3900 (ii).
—— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 947 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigrants in B.C., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 692 (i).
—— O.Cs., Cor., Papers, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 854 (i).
—— Restriction of: Prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 699; (Mr. Macpherson) 719; (Mr. Sloan) 726; (Mr. D. Ross) 732; (Mr. Kennedy) 748 (i).
—— M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of O.Cs., &c., 854 (i).
—— Parliamentary Control of (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2025; Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2043; Neg. (Y. 45: N. 100) 2158 (ii).
Japanese in B.C., Ques. of Priv. and Political Pamphlets: (Mr. Lemieux) 12659 (vii).
Japanese Immigration, Recent Eentries into B.C.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3751 (ii).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 32; (Mr. Foster) 77; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 58 (i).
—— Rep. of Mr. King laid on Table (Mr. Lemieux) 1550 (i).
—— Restriction, B.C. Legislation: on M. for Sup. (Mr. D. Ross) 1744 (i).
—— Result of Mission: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) 1585 (i).
—— Riots, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (iii).
—— Statement of Postmaster General: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208, 1424 (i).
—— Syndicate *re* Purchasing of Land in Alberta, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2162 (ii).
Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 897 (i).
Japanese Treaty, Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1928 (i).
See 'Anglo-Japanese,'
Jesus River Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 6980 (iv).
Johnston, Mr. W. J., Extra Remuneration, Leave of Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5201 (iii).
Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Joly, Sir Henry, Lt.-Gov. of B.C., Cor., &c., sent to by Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 554 (i).
Judges' Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Judges in Quebec Prov., Insufficient Number, Pets. from Bar, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 842 (i).
Judges' Salaries, Application *re* Payments: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11018 (vi).
Judges of Supreme Court, Quebec, Apptmt. on Commissions: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
Juniper Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
JUSTICE:
Accountants, Payments to by Dept. of Justice: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3233 (ii).
Ancoin vs. The King, Cor. *re* Suit in Supreme Court, N.S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McLennan) 558 (i).
Appeal Court, B.C., Salaries, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Aylesworth) 8185 (iv).
Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, Cor. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Ward) 3466 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ward) 5211 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vii).
Chinese and Japanese Riots, B.C., Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13155 (vii).
Cimon, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Residence in District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2218 (ii).
—— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2545 (ii).
Convict Labour, Control of, Sale of Articles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 238 (i).
Drysdale, Hon. Justice, Date of Acceptance of Office: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4768 (iii).
—— Date of Communication *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5084 (iii).
—— O.Cs., &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Taylor) 5086 (iii).
Essex County Junior Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1939 (i).
Exchequer Court, Printing Reports, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5508 (iii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*
Exchequer Court, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
Forbes, Mr. Justice, Professional Status, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2390, 3840 (ii).
—— Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Taylor) for Copies*, 899 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 1860
Fraser, Mr. A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel *re* Sussex St. Property Purchase: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3478 (ii).
—— Payments to for Legal Services: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2979 (ii).
Gillis, Release from Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 510 (i).
Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. P. D. McLean) 2981 (ii).
Judges in Quebec Prov., Insufficient Number, Pets. from Bar, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 842 (i).
Judges of Supreme Court, Quebec, Apptmt. on Commissions: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
See 'Quebec.'
Judges Salaries, Applications *re* Payments: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11018 (vi).
Justice, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Bureau) 185 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii), 10396 (vi).
Legal Agents in Mar. Provs., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4768 (iii).
—— P.E.I., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4764 (iii).
MacIlreith, Mr. R. T., Payments to for Legal Services, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 695 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 11220 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Delay in delivering Judgments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2594 (ii).
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of, O.C. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Lanctot) 557 (i).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, Releases since 1896, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2822 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 9579 (v).
—— Explanation (Mr. Aylesworth) 13081 (vii).
Penitentiaries: in Com. of Sup., 12265 (vii).
—— B.C., Land Purchases: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
—— Generally, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*
Quebec Judges, Apptmt. to Superior Court: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 11825 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for Sup., 12190 (vii).
—— Apptmt. of Additional Judge: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
St. Louis, Mr. H., Emplymt. by Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1347 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
—— Holidays for Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 2791 (ii).
—— Meat Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Léonard) in Com. of Sup., 5519 (iii).
—— Officers and Municipal Elections: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 2791 (ii).
—— Warden Beauchamp, Interference in Elections, Charges *re* (Mr. Léonard) in Com. of Sup., 5538 (iii).
Sudbury County Court Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 12413 (vii).
Supreme Court Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
Juvenile Delinquents: *See* B. No. 190.'
Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 39.'
Kananaski Falls Water Power, Granting of Rights: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3036 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3850 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5491 (iii), 6464 (iv).
Keewatin, Synod of the Diocese of: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Keewatin Timber and Pulp Lands, Disposal of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13587 (vii).
Kentville Rifle Range, Ref. to in debate on Budget (Sir Frederick Borden) 5290 (iii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).
Kincardine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7698 (iv).
'King Edward' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13063 (vii).
Kingston, Artillery Park: in Com. of Sup., 7701 (iv).
Kingston, Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 7700 (iv).
Kingston, Military Buildings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
—— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv).
—— withdrawal of vote: in Com. of Sup., 7814 (iv).
—— Military Magazine: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Knowlton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7290 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Koenig, Capt., Duties, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 11699 (vi).

Kun, Agnes Ballum, Exercise of Clemency by Justice Dept.: Res. of Town Council Sydney: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9334 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9580, 9710 (v).
Labour, Deptl. Rep: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 841 (i).
—— (Japanese Investigation) Rep.: Presented (Mr. Lemieux) 1583 (i).
——Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12159 (vii).
Labour Disputes Bill, Applications, &c., *re* Settlement: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 605 (i).
'Labour Gazette,' Cost of Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6407 (iv).
'Labour Gazette': in Com. of Sup., 12261 (vii).
Labour, Hours on Public Works: *See* 'B. No. 97.'
Labour Organization *re* Ry. Employees, Par. in Halifax 'Herald': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8289 (v).
Labour, Unemployed, Protection to: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10735 (vi).
Lacas, Mr., Payments to, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 640 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 979 (i).
—— Statement (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).
Lachine Canal, Basin Walls: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
—— Compensation to Richards *re* Horse: in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
—— Lock Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5672 (iii).
—— Slope Walls, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iii).
—— Staff: in Com. of Sup., 5696 (iii).
Lachine Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 12097 (vii).
Lachute, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7293 (iv), 13329 (vii).
La Compagnie de Publication du Canada, Amount paid by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5082 (iii).
Lacoste, Sir Alexandre, Amount of Pension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 1934 (i).
Lac Saumon Station, I.C.R., Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12652 (vii).
'Lady Evelyn,' Date and Place of Wintering, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7936 (iv).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Purchase by Govt., Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3434 (ii).
—— Crew during Winter: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6403 (iv).
Ladysmith Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8176 (iv).
Lafferty, Thos., Payment *re* Removal of Snag in St. John River: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8379 (v).
'La Gazette d'Arthabaska,' Postal Privilege *re*: Ques. (Mr. L. Lavergne) 6058 (iii).
Lake Ainslie Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
Lake Aylmer Wharf at Garthby: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Lake Dauphin, Lowering Lake: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Lakefield Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Lake François Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Lake Megantic Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7294 (iv).
Lake Megantic Public Works, Total Cost to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11299 (vi).
Lake St. Francis Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. John Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. Peter, Piers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4752 (iii).
Lakeville Harbour Opening: Conc., 13568 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* at R.M.C., on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1019 (i).
Lands applied for by Mr. Aylwin, under Irrigation Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 7209 (iv).
Lands, Dom.: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Land Entries of T. J. Oliver and Fred. Hintz, Cancellation of, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3235 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N.W. Ters., Areas reserved on July 1st, 1896: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 13512 (vii).
—— Selection and Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4766 (iii).
Lands in Sections 2, 10, 14, 22 and 24, Disposal of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5083 (iii).
Lands leased by Govt. in Section 11, Twp. 8, Original Grantees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3234 (ii).
Land Patents, Entry of Dates, Applications, Inspections, &c., of Quarter Section 16, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3432 (ii).
Land Patent for E. ½ S. E. ¼ Section 2, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 2169 (ii).
—— S. E. ¼ Sec. 2, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 2171 (ii).
Land Patents, Section 8, Twp. 53, &c., Occupation of Present Owner, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3430 (ii).
—— Sections 10 and 17, Applicants *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 9475 (v).
—— Sections 36, &c., Issue of: Ques (Mr. Lake) 3481 (ii).

Land Sales in N.W. Indian Reserves, Applications, Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii)
Land Sales in N.W., Purchasers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3835 (ii)
Lands set Apart for Settlement since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule), 2796 (ii).
Land Subsidies to Rys., Areas granted from 1892-6: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8613 (v).
See 'Railways,' &c.
Lands, Surveys of: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Land Titles Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 113 and 168.'
Lands withdrawn for Settlement or Colonization Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2393 (ii).
Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Montreal, Pet *re* Assistance: Ques. (Mr. Monk), 4244 (iii).
——— Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4773 (iii).
Lavaltrie, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lead Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 191.'
Lead Production by Lead Producers, Stmnt. *re* Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11407, 11705 (vi).
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7705, 7815 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Leech, Mr. R. A. E., Apptmt. of: Notice of Motion (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3477 (ii).
Lee-Enfield Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes), 10014 (v).
——— Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6644 (iv).
Legal Agents in Mar. Provinces, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sandfield) 4768 (iii).
——— P.E.I., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4764 (iii).
Legislation, House of Commons, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10507 (vi).
Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8444 (v).
Leonardsville Wharf, Contract *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
——— Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Les Eboulements Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
'Le Soleil,' Par. *re* Voting of French Members: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bergeron) 7992 (iv).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7993 (iv).
Lesser Slave Lake Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5719 (iii).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Lethbridge Armoury: in Com. of Sup, 13336 (vii).
Letter Carriers, Boots, Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8872 (v).
——— Hours of Service, Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7728 (iv).
Level Ry. Crossings: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Levis Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Levis Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7294 (iv).
Lewis, N.W.M. Policeman, Murder of, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Herron) 8867 (v).
Liability of Ry. Employees: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Libel Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
Library of Parlt., Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
——— Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Life-Boats in B. C., Purchase of from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Life-Saving Stations and Awards: in Com. of Sup., 2972 (ii).
Life-Saving Stations, Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).
Lighthouses, Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lighting Buoys on Rideau Canal, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 9476 (v).
See 'Canals—Rideau.'
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 4755, 5039, 5773 (iii), 12262, 13323 (vii).
Lighthouse-Keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Lighthouses in Nicolet River, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3837 (ii).
Lighthouses in Quebec, Classifications, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 172 (i).
——— Rep. of Inspectors, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gauvreau) 697 (i).
Lighthouse Service on St. Lawrence, Steamers chartered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11299 (vi).
Light-Keepers Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4755, 5039 (iii), 13323 (vii).
Lightship Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lime Kiln Crossing, Charter of Capt. Hackett's Tug, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7729 (iv).
Lime Kiln Crossing Lightship: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vii).
Lindsay Armoury: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
See 'Militia.'
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 34.'
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).

Literature, &c., distributed through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9095 (v).
Literary Aid Fund, Establishment of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1286 (i).
Lithographing and Printing, Expenditure by Govt. outside of Canada: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1506 (i).
Little Current Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13359 (vii).
Little Sands Wharf, Repairs, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin), 2397 (ii).
Live Stock Industry: in Com. of Sup., 12894 (vii).
Live Stock, N.B., Figures *re* Census, Methods of Obtaining, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot), 1506 (i)
Livingstone, Wm. G., Sale of Sections 22, 28 and 32, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 9475 (v).
Loan og 1874, Commission for Renewal: Ques. (Mr. Foster), 11501 (vi).
Loan of Aug., 1907, Names of Banks where Discounted: Ques. .Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
Loans to Govt. Outstanding, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 235 (i).
Loans negotiated in London, Conditions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, &c.: Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster), 13582 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafs: *See* 'Dom. Loans,' 'Finance.'
Loans, Temporary or Advances, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Loans, Temporary, by Govt., Names of Lenders, Rates of Interest, &c.: M. for Ret.* Mr. Monk) 554 (i).
——— Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 314 (i).
——— since Oct., 1906, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 314 (i).
Lobster Fish Factory, License to E. H. McLennan, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2983 (ii).
Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey), 10256 (v).
Lobster Fishing Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland Co.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
——— Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin), 4404 (iii).
Lobster Fishing in Lunenburg &c., Complaints *re* Undersized, &c.: (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2792 (ii).
——— Overseers, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2793 (ii).
Lobster Fishing and Packing Licenses, Granting in P.E.I.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Martin) 5475 (iii).
Lobster Fisheries, Pet. from Fishermen's Union of N.S. *re* Regulations: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean), 6644 (iv).
Lobster Fishing at Pictou: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12772 (vii).
Lobster Fisheries, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Issue of Licenses: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2388 (ii)
Lobster Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10257 (v).
Lockerby & McCombe, Amounts *re* Extra Harbour Dues: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 11935 (vi).
Locomotive and Car Shops, Moncton: in Com. fo Com of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Loggieville, Dredging, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Co.: *See* 'B. No. 129.'
London Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 10394 (vi).
——— Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).
See 'Militia.'
Londonderry and Bass River Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980 (ii).
Longueuil Public Building: in Com of Sup., 7304 (iv).
Lord's Day Act, Violations at Ottawa *re* Horse Racing: Remarks (Mr. Elson) 3753 (ii).
'Lord Kitchener,' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7198 (iv).
Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Lotbinière Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Louisburg Bait Freezer, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4406 (iii).
Louisburg Harbour, N.S., Amount of Harbour Dues, 1906: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7503 (iv).
——— Harbour Master, Remuneration, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3428 (ii).
Louisburg Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4401 (iii).
Lovell, Mr. H., Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 230 (i).
Lower Newcastle Wharf on Miramichi River: in Com. of Sup., 11095 (vi).
Lumber Combine Investigation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2977 (ii).
Lumber Duties from U. S., on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9504 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 10259 (v).
See 'Pulp.'
Lumber manufactured in N. W. Provs., Royalty Payable, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3835 (ii).
Lunenburg Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vii).
Lyall, Mr. Peter, Contractor for G. T. P. Terminals at Winnipeg: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 7991 (iv).
——— Storage of Refuse of Montreal Harbour Property: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 11936 (vi).

MacIlraith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 12220 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 695 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Toronto Inland Revenue Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5797 (iii).
Mackenzie, Mr. Wm., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Apptmt.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6985 (iv).
Mackinnon Post Office, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).
Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 22.'
Macleod Post Office, Report *re* Accommodation: Remarks (Mr Herron) in Com of Sup, 9110 (v)
McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 8617 (v).
McDonald, Archibald, Dismissal from Whim Road, P. O.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Martin) 5087 (iii).
McDougall, Rev. John, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 688 (i).
McGee, Hon. T. D'Arcy, Monument *re*: Remarks (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6288 (iv).
McGregor's Creek, Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
McGuire, Hon. Thos., Superannuation of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10514 (vi).
McInnes, Hon. W. B., Emplymt. in the Yukon, Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5794 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. White) 6061 (iii).
McKenzie, Mr. K. W., Apptmt. as Dom. Lands Agent at Edmonton: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6981 (iv).
McLeod, Alex., Dismissal from Valleyfield, P.E.I., Post Office: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5087 (iii)
McLeod, Roderick, Date of Homestead Entry: Ques (Mr. Lake) 6401 (iv).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11229, 11292 (vi).
Madawaska River Extension Dyke: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi), 13344 (vii).
Magdalen Islands Breakwater and Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Magee, Hon. Justice, Delay in delivering Judgments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2594 (ii).
Magnetawan River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Magog Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Mails from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12653 (vii).
Mail Matter delayed in Transmission by C. P. R. Accident: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9724 (v).
Mail Matter, Fraudulent Weighing, Inspection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).
——— lost in C. P. R. Accident at Kenora, Rep. *re*: (Mr. Lake) 9281 (v).
——— Mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2214 (ii).
Mail Service to Atlantic Steamers, Cost per Annum: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5656 (iii).
Mail Service in B. C., Improvements *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3754 (ii).
Mail Service beteen Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4828 (iii).
Mail Service, Irregularity of in Argenteuil County: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9119 (v).
Mail Service in N. B. and N. S., Number of Post Offices, Postal Revenue, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 852 (i).
Mail Service, Soulanges County, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Mail Service by Steamers via Coteau Landing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Mail Steamer, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).
Mail Subsidy to France: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5799 (iii).
Major's Hill Park and G. T. R. Hotel Site: *See* 'B. No. 89.'
Major's Hill Park and G. T. R. Hotel: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1425 (i).
Major's Hill Park: in Com. of Sup., 11015 (vi).
Malbay (Gaspé) Boat Shelter: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Manchester, Dr., Misappropriation of Moneys belonging to Mr. Walter Dick: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
Man., Additional Judges: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Man. Boundaries, Bill *re* Extension: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1741 (i).
——— Consent of Legislature, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 936 (i)
——— Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2882 (ii), 11706 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 6222, 7506 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Papers, Memorials, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Schaffner) 852 (i).
——— Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12776 (vii).
Manitoba Election Frauds, Investigation Com., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. W. J. Roche), 495 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Man. Lands owned by Govt., Number of Acres, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1288 (i).

Man. Lands, Section 32, Town Site, Applications *re* Public Buildings: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1348 (i).
Man. and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 26.'
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* Frauds: Read (Mr. Bole) 7942 (iv).
——— Polling Divisions by Judges: Remarks (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 13139 (vii).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 10793 (vi).
Manitoba Voters' Lists: *See* 'Dom. Elections Act.'
Manitoba and North Shore Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 137.'
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).
——— Reps. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 893 (i).
Manning & Macdonald's Claims *re* Soulanges Canals: in Com. of Sup., 5668 (iii).
Maple Creek Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 8600 (v), 13337 (vii).
Maple Syrup and Sugar Adulteration, Penalties *re* Violations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6639 (iv).
Maps, Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12260 (vii).
Marconi Co. and Commercial Press Business, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Interruptions *re* Service: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2161 (ii).
Marconi System: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).
——— Regulation of Rates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 174 (i).
See 'Wireless.'
Marcoun, Mr., Commission *re* Settlement of Claims: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1122 (i).
Marier, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. on G.T.P. Commission: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2162 (ii).
Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).
Margaree Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).
MARINE :
Aids to Navigation, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5040 (iii).
——— Construction of Lighthouses: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).
'Arctic' Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June, 1904 to June, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 184 (i).
——— History of Cruise in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).
Bellechasse Islet Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4830 (iii).
Brier Island Fog Alarm, Installation of, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9473 (v). *See* 'Marine Signals.'
Burlington Channel Lighthouse, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 5467 (iii).
MARINE—*Con.*
Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6059 (iii).
——— Statement *re* Conditions of Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 6143 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* Marine Dept.: Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464 (iv).
——— Absence of Mr. Watson: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 10918 (vi).
——— Apptmnt. of Ass't Judge in Exchequer Court: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11311 (vi).
——— Apptmt. of Counsel: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6845 (iv).
——— Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission : on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7322 (iv).
——— Apptmt. of Mr. Perron as Counsel: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 6926 (iv).
——— Counsel Fees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8837 (v).
——— Delay in Investigation, &c., C. S. Report, &c.: M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8445 (v).
——— Delay *re*, on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9725 (v).
——— Distribution of Evidence : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10789 (vi).
——— Evidence *re*:Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 11203 (vi).
——— remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8516 (v).
——— Evidence presented day by day to House: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8203 (v).
——— Evidence, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11301 (vi).
——— Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13169 (vii).
——— Letter of Instructions to Mr. Watson laid on the Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 7621 (iv).
——— Method of Procedure: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10741 (vi).
——— Officers under Suspension: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6846 (iv).
——— Mr. Perron's Duties: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 10743 (vi).
——— Postponment of by Judge Cassels : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8385 (v).
——— Proceedings in Public, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7321 (iv).
——— Rep. of Judge Cassels: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10915 (vi).
See 'Mar. and Fish.,' &c.
'Champlain,' Str., Use in Quebec for Political Purposes: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9126, 9280, 9342, 9460 (v).

MARINE—*Con.*
Fish Island Lighthouse, Name of Present Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 6058 (iii).
Gananoque and Burnt Island Lights, Buoys, &c., Apptmt. of Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8383 (v).
Govt. Steamers, Amounts paid for Provisions, &c., for Three Years: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1512 (i).
——— Captains' Residences, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 3241 (ii).
——— and Ice-breakers, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
——— Maintenance and Supplies (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).
——— Number of purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10731 (vi).
——— Pay of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10736 (vi).
——— Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5467 (iii).
Gratuities *re* Accidents to Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vii).
Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7210 (iv).
Ingonish Light-keeper, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8618 (v).
Life-boats in B.C., Purchase of from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Lighthouse Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lighthouses, Classification, &c., Rep. of Inspectors, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gauvreau) 697 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 12262, 13323 (vii).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4755 (iii).
Lighthouse-keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Light-keepers Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4755, 5039 (iii), 13323 (vii).
Lighthouses, Maintenance and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lighthouses in Nicolet River, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3837 (ii).
Lighthouses in Quebec, Classifications, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 172 (i).
Lightship Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Louisburg Harbour, N. S., Amount of Harbour Dues, 1906: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7503 (iv).
Louisburg Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4401 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, Reorganization: in Com. of Sup., 3988 (ii).
——— O.Cs., Cor. *re* Change of System: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 852 (i).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 510 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 4223 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 4747 (iii).
——— Acting Deputy Minister: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11939 (vi).
——— Defalcations of Mr. Roy: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10741 (vi).
——— Dep. Min., Ass't.: in Com. of Sup., 12915 (vii).
——— Dep. Minister, Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7938, 7995, 8088: Letter of Dep. Min. Read (Mr. Brodeur) 8088 (iv).
——— Deptl. Investigation by Minister: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6526 (iv).
——— remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6636 (iv).
——— Deptl., Misconduct of Official: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) 6633 (iv).
——— Deptl. Officers under Suspension, Dates of Aptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6982 (iv).
——— Deptl. Officials, Suspension of: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6003 (iii).
——— Minister's Travelling Expenses, Refunds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8889 (v).
——— Purchase of Supplies for 1892-1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Johnston) 6241 (iv).
——— Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2883 (ii).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).
——— contingencies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
——— Steamers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Warehouse, Sussex St.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13062 (vii).
Marine Signalling at Briar Island, Change of System: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9266 (v).
See 'Briar.'
Masters' and Mates' Examination: in Com. of Sup., 2969 (ii).
Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11701 (vi).
'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended *re* Supplies, &c.: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Foster) 1886 (i).
——— Collission with C.P.R. Str., Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8086 (iv).
——— Investigation re: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8171, 9715 (iv), 10121 (v).
——— Purchase Price, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8441 (v).
——— Services as Ice-breaker: Remarks (Mr. Paquet) in Com. of Sup., 2941 (ii).
Negro Point Submarine Signal, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5202 (iii).

MARINE—*Con.*
Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 983 (i).
Red Ensign Flying from Merchant Vessels, Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 12775 (vii).
St. Louis, Mr. H., Payments to by Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
Shipping Statistics *re* Tons Registered: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2790 (ii).
Sorel Property for Marine Dept., Purchase, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4751 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Life-Saving Station, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4586 (iii).
'Viligant,' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 682 (i).
Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Alarms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9274 (v).
Mar. Provs., Harbours and Rivers, Creosoted Timber: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Markey Fishing Leases, Copy of Ret. laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 11404 (vi).
Markham Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7709 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Maskinonge River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8441 (v).
Masters and Mates Examination: in Com. of Sup., 2969 (ii).
Masters' and Mates' Act Amt. B. No. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on order for 2°: Remarks 583 (i). *See* 'B. No. 2.'
Matane Breakwater and Landing Pier: in Com of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Matane River Fishing, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).
Matchedash Bay, Dredging at Fesserton, Amt. expended: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 566 (i).
Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. White) 7179 (iv).
Meaford Harbour: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act: *See* 'B. No. 149.'
Meat and Canned Foods Act Enforcement: in Com. of Sup., 12893 (vii).
——— Inspectors, Number of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 352 (i).
——— Inspectors, Number, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 172 (i).
Meat and Food Inspection Act, Names and Number of Establishments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1505 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 1690 (i).
Meat Inspection Act and Packing Houses, Cor., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 4589 (iii).
Meat Inspection Regulations, Speech of Mr. Fisher at Chatham: ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Clements) 196 (i).
Meat Inspection Act, Violations: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3042 (ii).
Medicine Hat Buildings, Contract *re* Heating System: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 10791 (vi).
Medicine Hat Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).
Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Members appointed to Offices, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 46 (i).
Members introduced 3, 680 (i), 2542 (ii).
Members and Senators appointed to Offices of Emoulment, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 555 (i).
Menzies, Mr. James, Emplymt. in Geodetic Survey, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1349 (i).
Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11701 (vi).
Mess. from His Ex., Franco-Canadian Treaty: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
——— (Suppl. Estimates, 1908): Read (Mr. Speaker) 12503 (vii).
See 'Estimates,' &c.
Mess Pork, Quantity imported from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5650 (iii).
Metal Shingle and Siding Co., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
Methyated Spirits, Supplies to Manufacturers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 820 (i).
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Legal Opinions of Justice Dept.: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2381 (ii).
Michipicoten Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Middle River, Shear Dam Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).
Midland Dredging Co., Statement *re* Mr. McMullen: (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5714 (iii).
Midland Harbour Dredging, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3239 (ii), 8893 (v).
Midland and Tiffin, Dredging, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3428 (ii).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
Midland, Tiffin and Victoria Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8181 (iv).
'Midland Times,' Truro, Amounts paid for Advertisements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3235 (ii).

Midland Towing and Wrecking Co., Contract *re*, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).

Milford, Haven, N.S. Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13060 (vii).

MILITIA :

Allowances, Arrears of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).

Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5662, 5732 (iii); 10286 (v).

Antigonish Armoury, Leasing, &c., Letters, Tel., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. Chisholm) 1131 (i).

Armouries, Construction of: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).

Arsenal, Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 7434 (iv); 12154 (vii).

Belleville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).

——— Negotiations for Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1509 (i).

——— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1737 (i).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amount, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4584 (iii).

——— Return *re*: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 5914 (iii), 6465 (iv).

Boot Contract, Attack *re*: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Frederick Borden) 10739 (vi)

Brampton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).

Brandon Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v), 10953, 10974 (vi).

——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10891 (vi).

British Pensioners, Notice from Imp. Govt. of Deductions: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7501 (iv).

Camp in Eastern Townships, proposed Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3842 (ii).

Camps, Holding of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9779, 9835 (v).

Cavalry Brigade, Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).

Customs Dues: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii), 12155 (vii).

Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 177 (i)

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 556 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 4834 (iii), 6222 (iv).

Eastman Rifle Match, Accident, &c., Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1125 (i).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1117 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Esquimalt Naval Station, Cor., &c. *re* Maintenance: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1128 (i).

——— Transfer to Canada: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 (i).

Esquimalt and Halifax Garrisons, Equipment, of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 *See* 'Naval.'

Fortifications, Construction of, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6646 (iv).

Fredericton Military Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).

Gananoque Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).

Garrison Artillery, B.C., 5th Regiment, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5792 (iii).

Garrison Commons, Toronto, Date of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 353 (i).

Generals, Apptmts. of Names and Qualifications: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5086 (iii).

Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 9712 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. MacLaren) 9779 (v).

Gratuities: in Com. of Sup., 13177 (vii).

Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv), 13331 (vii).

Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10015 (v).

——— Disbandment of, &c: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208 (i).

——— Discontent *re* Delay of Pay: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).

——— Occupation by Imp. Troops: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).

——— Retraction of Remarks of Min. of Fin.: Remarks (Mr .Taylor) 5784 (iii).

Halifax, Military Buildings (Wellington Barracks): in Com. of Sup., 7143 (iv).

Halifax Militia Supplies, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6405 (iv).

Hamilton Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7692 (iv).

Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip for Services: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 2161 (ii).

Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).

Kentville Rifle Range, Ref. to in debate on Budget (Sir Frederick Borden) 5290 (iii).

Kingston, Artillery Park: in Com. of Sup., 7701 (iv).

——— Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 7700 (iv).

——— Military Buildings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).

——— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv).

——— Military Magazine: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).

Lee-Enfield Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Ranges: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10014 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Lee-Enfield Rifles, Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6644 (iv).
Lethbridge Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Lévis Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Lindsay Armoury: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
——— Date of Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1111 (i).
London, Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
——— Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).
Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii).
——— Pay and Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 12147 (vii).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 611 (i), 8871 (v), 12147 (vii).
——— Supplies, Provisions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii).
Militia, Board of Officers, Rep. *re* Pay and Allowance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2165 (ii).
Militia Dept., and Civil Service Commissioner's Report; Stmnt. (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. of Sup., 12505 (vii).
——— Quebec, Hours for Work of Masons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 10790 (vi).
——— Report: Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 4494 (iii).
——— Threats *re* Officials: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13584 (vii).
Militia,—Memorandum of General Lake: M. to lay on Table (Sir Frederick Borden) 12770 (vii).
——— Pay, Arrears, &c., Reasons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 8442 (v).
Militia Promotions, Names and Records, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 352 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 559 (i).
Militia Schools, Garrisons, &c., Amounts paid for Provisions, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1512 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).
Milltown and St. Stephen's Drill Sheds: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 10897 (vi).
Minnedosa Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 10889 (vi).
Moir, Private, Shooting at Wolseley Barracks: Remarks (Mr. Beattie) 7322 (iv)
Moncton Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Montreal Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Naval Defences, Contribution by Canada to Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1118 (i).
Naval Instruction, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1119 (i).
Naval Schools, *re* Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 3222 (ii).
Naval Stations in Canada, Arrangements with G. B., *re* Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1117 (i).
——— List of Places: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 3153 (ii).
Niagara Camp., Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2163 (ii).
———Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) 9779 (v).
Niagara Falls, Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Niagara Land Sale, 13540 (vii).
Oakville Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 10887 (vi).
Pembroke Armoury: Remarks (Mr. White) in Com. of Sup., 10901 (vi).
Permanent Corps, Commission *re* Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1292 (i).
Petawawa Camp, Arrangements *re* Training of Troops: Ques. (Mr. White) 5791 (iii).
Peterborough Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Picton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres leased to Ross Rifle Co.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1348 (i).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com of Sup., 13332 (vii).
——— Properties: in Com. of Sup., 12148 (vii).
——— Provisions and Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 12150 (vii).
Quebec, Citadel Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7431 (iv).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps: Letter read (Mr. Blain) 8694 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10292 (v).
——— Attendance of Veterans: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7448, 7998 (iv), 8695 (v).
——— Food Supply: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
——— Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8851 (v).
——— Number of Troops to be sent, &c.: Rearks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10259 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Quebec Tercentenary, Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7992 (iv).
—— Rep. of Commission: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7449 (iv).
—— Transportation of Troops: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8377, 8384; City Corps, &c.: Remarks, 8386 (v).
Rankin, Col., Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 11405 (vi).
Rations, Cost per Day, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
Rifle and Artillery Association Grants: in Com. of Sup., 12152 (vii).
Rifles purchased from other Companies than Ross Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1123 (i).
Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5654
Rifle Ranges, Charlottetown,, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 6233 (iv).
Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 11494 (vi).
—— Advances to Co. *re* Contracts, Cor. with Bank of Montreal: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 4773 (iii).
—— Arsenal. Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7991 (iv).
—— Bayonets purchased for, &c., Contracts, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
—— Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5786 (iii).
—— Bayonets, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6235, 8176 (iv).
—— Bayonets, Date of Contract, O. C., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paterson) 8442 (v).
—— Bayonets, Provisions *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
—— Bonus, Loans, Services of the Govt., Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 559 (i).
—— Consignment to N. W. Mounted Police, Manufacture, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5259 (iii).
—— Contract Price, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 8174 (iv).
—— Contracts *re* Supply of Rifles, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
—— Correction of Mr. S. Hughes' Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bergeron) 9126 (v).
—— Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* Defects: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5210 (iii).
—— Disposition of Manufactured Rifles, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
—— Evidence before Pub. Accounts Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) 5914 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Ross Rifle, &c., Extension of Cove Field Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4401 (iii).
—— Factory, Pet. *re* Establishment on Plains of Abraham: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3903 (ii).
—— Inefficiency and Extravagance of Militia Dept.: Amt. (Mr. Worthington) on M. for Sup., 8902-8953; Neg. (Y. 18; N. 55) 9090
—— Inter-changeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3898 (ii).
—— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 178 (i).
—— Number reported unfit for Use: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3841 (ii).
—— Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' *re* Accident at Rockliffe Ranges: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10515 (vi).
—— Payments to since Jan. 1, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7209 (iv).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Mr. Bergeron's Denial of Stmnt., 9126, 9330 (v).
—— Rep. of British War Office *re*, Cor., Disappearance from Library of H. of C.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Fred. Borden) 4961 (iii).
—— Rep. of Col. Gaudet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9713 (v).
—— Rep. from Military Associations, &c., *re* Efficiency: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
—— Reports from Public Accounts Com., Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
—— Rifles delivered per Contract, Cost per Rifle: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8180 (iv).
—— Rifles, Number ordered, Payments, Total Number delivered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
—— Ross Rifle Contract: in Com. of Sup., 13542 (vii).
—— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
—— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 365 (i).
—— Number reported unfit for Use: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3841 (ii).
—— Target Practice, Suspensions by N.W. M. Police: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3847 (ii).
—— Tests in England, Reps., &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Frederick Borden) 8167 (iv).
—— Total Number in Use in Canada by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5786 (iii).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. John, Tenders *re* Supplie: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 5788 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Royal Military College: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv), 10907 (vi), 12152, 13177 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* at R.M. C.; on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1019 (i).
St. Hyacinthe, Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 10890 (vi).
——— 84th Regiment, Amount of Pay still Due: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 844 (i).
St. John Fusiliers, 62nd Regiment, Payments *re* Annual Drill, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 847 (i).
St. John, Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Military Stables: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
Sabourin, Maj., Cor. with Lt. Col. Malette and Dept.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
Sherbrooke Militia Corps, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
S. A. Veterans, Land Grants, to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 563 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Herron) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).
——— Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c.: Ques. Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
——— Medals for 3rd Contingent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
Stoney Creek Battlefield Monument: in Com. of Sup., 13177 (vii).
Stores and Arms for Rural Battalions, Care of: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Lalor) 5736 (iii).
Stores, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8181 (iv)
Strathcona Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathroy Armoury: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Sub-Target Company, Number ordered, Dates of Order, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 171 (i).
——— Papers referred to Com. of Last Session: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
——— Ref. to Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 312 (i).
Sussex Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9836 (v).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Number, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 569 (i).
——— Contracts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
——— Contract *re* Additional Number: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5257 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5205 (iii).
Thirteenth Hussars, General Service Medal: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13533 (vii).
Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7203 (iv)
Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3429 (ii).
Uniforms and Customs Refunds: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).
Valleyfield Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv), 10892 (vi).
Valleyfield Regiment, Organization of, Cor., &c., *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 356 (i).
Warlike and other Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 12149 (vii).
Western Rifle Associations, Pet. *re* Govt. Grant: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).
Winnipeg, Military Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
——— Military Building: in Com. of Sup., 10969 (vi).
——— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 10955 (vi).
Woodstock Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Milk Adulteration: *See* 'B. No. 64..
Mill Settlement and Newcastle Creek Post Offices, Establishment of, Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wilmot) 2982 (ii).
Milltown and St. Stephen's Drill Sheds: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 10897 (vi).
Mines, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 646 (i).
Mines and Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 12260 (vii).
Mining Regulations published in 'Yukon World and Official Gazette': M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 5801 (iii).
Mining Rights in Sections 17, 20, 21, &c., Applications, Leases, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Perley) 3851 (ii).
——— Sections 20, 28 and 32, Original Grantees, Transfers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3238 (ii).
Mining, Surface or Timber Rights, on Section 8, Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 3850 (ii).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses from March, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 562 (i).
See 'Travelling,' &c.
Ministers' Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Presbyterian Church: *See* 'B. No. 23.'

Minnedosa Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 10889 (vi).
Mint Building, Imperfect Ventilation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3036 (ii).
——— Date of Operation, Values of Coinage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11296 (vi).
——— Issue of Gold Coins: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 2593 (ii).
——— Sums expended, Apptmnts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 232 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 557 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 933 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table, 941 (i).
Mint: *See* 'Public Buildings, Ottawa.'
Miscou Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T. P. Ry. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5256 (iii).
Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Moberley, Mr. H. J., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3848 (ii).
Moir, Private, Shooting at Wolseley Barracks: Remarks (Mr. Beattie) 7322 (iv).
Moncton Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Moncton Car Shops, Lease, &c., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1690 (i).
Moncton Car and Locomotive Shops: in Com. of Sup., 12250 (vii).
——— Payments to E. A. Wallberg: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 8892 (v).
Moncton-Truro, Additional Line: in Com. of Sup., 12760 (vii).
Moncton Wharf Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi).
Money-Lenders, Operating in Public Buildings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 1738 (i).
'Montague' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 182 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8172 (iv).
Montague Moore, &c., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended *re* Supplies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Foster) 1886 (i).
——— Collision with C.P.R. Str., Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8086 (iv).
——— Investigation *re* Accident: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8171 (iv), 9715 (v).
——— Rep. *re* Accident: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10121 (v).
'Montcalm,' Str., Purchase Price, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8441 (v).
——— Services as Ice-breaker: Remarks (Mr. Paquet) in Com. of Sup., 2941 (ii).
Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
Montmagny Electoral District, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 9263 (v).
Montmagny Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Montmorency Falls, Retaining Walls, Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Montreal Circuit Judges, Increase of Salary: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. on B. 206, 12552 (vii).
Montreal Directory, in Library of House: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 4764 (iii).
Montreal Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 7423 (iv).
——— Valuations, Reps., Cor., Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 698 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3319 (ii).
Montreal Excise Officers, Increase of Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Montreal 'Gazette,' Building, Amount paid for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3900 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Amount of Expenditure *re* Cleaning, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 8888 (v).
——— Cement Contract, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 7199, 7499 (iv).
Montreal Harbour, Expenditure *re* Docks and Elevators: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Schaffner) 2170 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1683 (i).
Montreal Liquor Licenses, Attack of Hon. Mr. Scott: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Gervais) 4064; Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4065; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 4066; Appeal from Dep. Speaker to Speaker, 4071; Ruling, Agreed to (Y. 59; N. 23) 4071 (ii).
Montreal Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Montreal Pneumatic Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (iii).
Montreal Post Office Addition, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6922 (iv).
——— Settlement of Strike: Remarks (Mr. Verville) 8608 (v).
Montreal Post Office, Clerks, Pay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9112 (v).
——— Defalcations, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7197 (iv).
——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 7410 (iv).
Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9274 (v).
Montreal Postal Station B: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
——— Station C: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditure for the last Fifty Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3482 (ii).
Montreal 'Star,' Advertisements in, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7479 (iv).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3436; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3442; Agreed to (Y. 108; N. 53) 3464 (ii)
—— Amounts collected and expended, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 1688 (i).
—— Bonds, Payment of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2979 (ii).
—— Claim of Govt., &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3465 (ii).
—— Indebtedness, Payments, Audit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1931 (i).
—— Rep. of Aud. Gen. J. Fraser: M. for Copy* (Mr. Monk) 2983 (ii).
See 'Toll Gates.'
Monuments to Sir L. H. Lafontaine and Robt. Baldwin: in Com. of Sup., 11118 (vi).
Monuments to McGee and Brown: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13352 (vii).
Moose Jaw Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).
Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch, C.P.R., Extension, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 7654 (iv).
Moose Jaw Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Moose Mountain Buffalo Herd: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10102 (v).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9477; Amt. (Mr. Lake) 9494 (v).
Mortgages as Securities by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
Motions, Unopposed: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8839 (v).
—— Business of the Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8896 (v).
Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Mulgrave Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Murray Canal, Bridgemen's Houses: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry., Improved Service, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 6239 (iv).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. A. Martin) 10123 (v).
Museum: *See* 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Muskoday Indian Reserves, Negotiations *re* Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5082 (iii).
Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Govt. Deposit, &c.: Ques.: (Mr. Gauvreau) 3485 (ii).
National Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 & 219.'
See 'Battlefields.'
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.'
Naturalization Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 130.'
See 'Can. Naturalization.'
Naval Defences, Contribution by Canada to Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1118 (i).
Naval Instructions, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1119 (i).
Naval Schools *re* Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 3222 (ii).
Naval Schools, Establishment of, List of Places: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 3153 (ii).
—— Arrangements with G.B. *re* Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1117 (i).
Neepawa Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8536 (v), 13335 (vii).
Negro Point Submarine Signal, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5202 (iii).
'Neptune,' Cruise in Hudson Bay, on Order for Reps.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 850 (i).
N.B. Coal and Ry. Co.'s Claim against Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9714 (v).
—— Claims *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9270 (v).
N.B. Cold Storage Bait Co., Ministerial Connections *re*: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 9283; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 9415 (v).
See 'Cold Storage.'
N.B. Cold Storage Plants, Bonuses by Govt., Ques. (Mr. Porter) 9272 (v).
N.B. Credit, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1937 (i).
N.B. Elections and Govt. Employees: Telegram read (Mr. Foster) 3229 (ii).
—— I.C.R. Employees: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3317 (ii).
N.B. Elections, Interference of Govt. Officials: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3579 (ii).
—— Mr. Pugsley's Political Connection, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7130 (iv).
N.B. Inland Waters Wharfs, Construction Policy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 5465 (iii).
N.B. Post Offices, Closing of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).
N.B. Post Office Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13153 (vii).
N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt.: M. (Mr. Foster) to Adjn., 3657 (ii).
N.B. Ry. Mail Service, Vacancy, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).
N.B. Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'
New Glasgow Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
New Glasgow Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11257 (vi).
New London Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).
Newmarket Canal, Extension to Devil's Elbow: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi).
—— Reps., Surveys, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).
See 'Canals—Trent.'

New Mills Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
Newspapers in Alberta, Amounts paid to by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 1690 (i).
Newspapers, Amounts paid for Advertising, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 509 (i).
Newspaper Mail Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11298 (vi).
Newspapers, Payments to from 1904 to 1908: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1511 (i).
—— Postal Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6460 (iv).
—— Rates, List of Publications: M. for Copy* (Mr. Cockshutt) 1295 (i).
See 'Public Works—Advertising,' 'Tenders,' &c.
New York Central Ry., Discrimination by Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).
Niagara Falls Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Niagara Falls, Rep. of Dr. Spencer, Cost, Criticism, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6054 (iii).
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Niagara Land Purchase: in Com. of Sup., 13540 (vii).
Niagara Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) 9779 (v).
—— Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2163 (ii).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82.'
Nicolet County, Govt. Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 12775 (vii).
Nicolet Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1283 (i).
Nicolet Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Nicolet Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7428 (iv).
Nicolet Post Office, Completion of, Postmaster's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
—— Contract and Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3838 (ii).
—— Emplymt. of Mr. S. Rivard: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
—— Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3840 (ii), 4588 (iii).
—— Protection Walls, Repairs, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4588 (iii).
—— Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8478 (ii).
Nipigon Ry. (Branch Lines) Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).
Nipissing Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 12390 (vii).
Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5650 (iii).
See 'Georgian Bay.'
Nolan, Wm. Howard, Issue of Land Patents to: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 8182 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid and Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 167 (i).
—— Financial Relations with Govt.: Remarks on M. for Sup., 770 (i).
—— Ref. to Mr. Blair's Letter *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2392 (ii).
North Bay P. O. Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
North Bay Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii).
North East Harbour Wharf, Total Length: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
North Empire Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 7.'
Northern Crown Bank of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Northern Empire Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
North Grove Post Office, Letters, Pets. *re* Establishment: M. for Copies* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4773 (iii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5490 (iii).
North Sydney Improvements, I.C. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Northwest Gold Dredging Co., Leases assigned, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 11702 (vi).
N.W.M. Police, Compensations *re* Injuries: in Com. of Sup., 8870 (v).
—— Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 8870 (v).
—— Salaries and Pay of Force: in Com. of Sup., 8862 (v).
Northwestern Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 54.'
N.W.T. Act (jurisdiction) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 210.'
N.W.T. Govt., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10116 (v).
N.W.T. School Grants: in Com. of Sup., 11117 (v).
Notre Dame de Portage Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
—— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6400 (iv).
N.S. Prisons, &c., Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Oakville Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 10887 (vi).
Oaths of Office: See 'B. No. 1.'
Oats, Standards of: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Observatories: in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Observatory: *See* 'Astronomical.'
Obstructions in Navigable Streams, Removal of: in Com. of Sup., 3156, 3211 (ii).
Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Owen) on M. for Sup., 9894 (v).
—— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10016 (v).
—— Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 10023; (Mr. Speaker) 10024 (v).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Ques. of Order, (Mr. Foster) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ross) 10024: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 10031 (v).
Obstruction Tactics, Discussion of: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 9220 (v).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i), 2941, 2949, 3147, 3195 (ii), 5763 (iii).
Ocean SS. Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Occidental Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 131.'
Official Cars, Number and Maintenance: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 10330 (vi).
Office Specialty Co., and Eclipse Mfg. Co., Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4244 (iii).
Office Specialty Co., Quantity of Goods supplied to Govt.: Ques. (Br. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 3242 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bennett) 3581 (ii), 5785 (iii).
Oil Borings, Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 13162 (vii).
Old Age Pensions: *See* 'B. No. 120.'
Old Age Pensions: M. for Sel. Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2786 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2398 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. Fielding) to wthdrw., 3654 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 7722 (iv).
Old Age Pensions Com., Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12660 (vii).
Old Man's River: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
Olympic Games Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vii).
Ont., Judges of: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Ontario North, Division of Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 8294 (v).
Opium, Amount received *re* Customs Duties, Pet. from B.C. *re* Prohibition: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 8614 (v).
Opium, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. No. 205.'
Orangemen and Quebec Provincial Elections, Speech of Hon. Mr. Brodeur at Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 10123 (v).
Orange Order and Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10355 (vi).
Orangeville Post Office Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).
Order Paper, Differences between English and French Editions: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6740, 6850 (iv).
—— Printing in French: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5407 (iii).
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, 'Bourinot' quoted, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii).
—— Appeal to Speaker from Mr. Chairman's Ruling (Mr. Taylor) Agreed to (Y. 84; N. 1) 4188 (ii).
Ordnance Lands, Sale of: *See* 'B. No. 218.'
Oriental Immigration, B.C., Legal Expenses *re* Commission: in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Original Documents and Returns: *See* 'Documents.'
Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
—— Emplymt. *re* Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
—— Issue of Pass on I.C.R. Express: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
Otonabee Power Co., Amount of Payment *re* Horse Power: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5471, 5656 (iii).
—— Incorrect Answer: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5566 (iii).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
—— Archives Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5700 (iii).
—— Elevator Attendants: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
—— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
—— Improvements, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5707 (iii).
—— Lighting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
—— Renewing Skylights: in Com. of Sup., 7816 (iv).
—— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10983 (vi).
—— Repairs, Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi).
—— Sussex Street: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 13478 (vii).
—— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi). *See* 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Ottawa Grounds, Circular of C. S. Ass'cn: Read (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Amount expended to Jan. 1st, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11499 (vi).
Ottawa Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii).
—— Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3842 (ii).
Ouelle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 516 (i).
—— O.C. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Lanctot) 557 (i).
Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 83.'

Owen Sound to Meaford Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).
Owen Sound Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7817 (iv).
——— Inspector, Apptmt. of Mr. Foster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
——— Contract *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
——— Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
Owen Sound Dredging, Inspector Telford, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3038 (ii).
Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2792 (ii).
Owen Sound Strike, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8606 (v).
Oyster Pond Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Pacaud, Benjamin, Apptmt. to Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5200 (iii).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Pacific Coast Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 40.'
Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 10157 (v).
Pakenham Mail Bags, Throwing off of Train: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1425 (i).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, Releases since 1896, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2822 (ii).
See 'Blunden.'
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 9579 (v).
——— Explanation (Mr. Aylesworth) 13081 (vii).
Parker's Cove Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Park Hill Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Park Reservations: in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 609 (i).
Parliament, Opening: Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Parrsborough Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11259 (vi).
Parrsborough Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Partridge Island Stores, Emplymt. of Ferry Service, Rate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1120 (i).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 12729, 12737 (vii).
Passages of Immigrants to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5468 (iii).
Passenger Ticket Act: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
Passes on Steamers to Members, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Patent Medicines: *See* 'B. No. 146.'
Patent Medicines, Committee of Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3899 (ii).
Patent Medicines, Govt. Intention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 356 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 608 (i), 2594 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) *re* Apptmt. to Special Com., 10689 (vi).
Patent of Eugene Francois Giraud: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Patent of Frederick C. Rehm, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Patents of General Chemical Co.: *See* 'B No. 174.'
Patents of Goodwin Car Co.: *See* 'B. No. 60.
Patents of Metal Shingle and Siding Co.: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
Patents of Montague Moore, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Patents of the Sutherland Rifle Sight Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Patent of Wm. B. Smith: *See* 'B. No. 198.'
Patents of the Windsor Pump and Foundry Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
'Patent Record': in Com. of Sup., 672 (i).
Patterson, J. W., Govt. Lands in B.C., Sale to: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6002 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6241 (iv).
Patronage *re* Civil Service: M. (Mr. Foster, to Drop, 6243 (iv).
See 'Civil Service System.'
Paulding, Ada Katurah Stewart, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 176.'
Peace River Exploratory Surveys, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 3834 (ii).
Peace River Timber Limits, Cor., &c., *re* Granting: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 3851 (ii).
Peace River Valley and Land Co., Cancelling of Grants: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 11018 (vi).
——— Homesteads leased, sold, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 1295 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2769 (ii), 6010 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 10403 (vi).
——— Survey of Lands: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
——— Terms and Regulations *re* Sale, &c., Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1111 (i).
Peace Union, Parliamentary, Meeting at Ottawa: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13581 (vii).
Peat for Fuel Deposits, Development of in Canada: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 515 (i).
Peat Industry, Emplymt. of Mr. Erik Nystrom, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 1122 (i).
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, Seizure of Schr. 'Carlotta G. Cox': on M. for Sup. (Mr. Sloan), 3934 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Sloan) 3156 (ii).

Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1940 (i).
Pembroke Armoury: Remarks (Mr. White) in Com. of Sup., 10901 (vi).
Penitentiaries: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii), 12265 (vii).
Penitentiaries B.C., Land Purchases: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
Pension Fund of I.C.R. & P.E.I. Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
Pepin, J. A., Emplymt. at Windsor Customs: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Perdue, Mr. M. B., Apptmt. as Inspector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 173 (i).
Personal Explanation *re* Land Deals (Mr. Turriff) 1927 (i).
Petawawa Camp, Arrangements *re* Training of Troops: Ques. (Mr. White) 5791 (iii).
Petawawa Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12133 (vii).
—— Ques. (Mr. White) 685 (i).
Peterborough Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Peterborough Steamboat Landing: in Com. of Sup., 12133 (vii).
Petite Decharge, Lac St. Jean, Removal of Rock: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Petition: M. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Present, 1682 (i).
Petit Rocher Breakwater, Contracts, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 1294 (i).
—— Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5723 (iii), 9716 (v).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Taylor) 6464, 7107 (iv).
—— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 10402 (vi).
Petit Rocher Spur Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
'Petrel,' Str., Supplies, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 7937 (iv).
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 7937 (iv).
Petroleum Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 199.'
Phœnix Assurance Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
'Phœnix,' Saskatoon, Number ordered, Payment to: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6920 (iv).
Pianos rented for Speaker's Rooms: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 563 (i).
Piche Point (Lake Temiscaming) Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Picton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Pictou Engine House, I.C.R., Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1683 (i).
Pictou Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12230 (vii).
Pictou Post Office Building, Concrete Sidewalk. Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10518 (vi).
Piegan Indian Reserve, Shipping and Weighing of Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 632 (i).
Piggeries at Experimental Farm: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vii).
Pilotage and Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 5046 (iii), 13324 (vii).
Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9474 (v).
Pisquid Post Office, Removal of, Cor., Tels., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 4588 (iii).
Plains of Abraham, Battle of: *See* 'Nos. 111 & 219.'
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres leased to Ross Rifle Co.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1348 (i).
See 'Militia—Ross Rifle.'
Playgreen Lake, Conditions *re* Lease, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6403 (iv).
Plessissville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Pointe aux Trembles Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8838 (v).
—— Date of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9267 (v).
—— Tenders, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1734 (i), 2394 (ii).
Point Edward Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).
Point Pelee Lightship: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vii).
Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3898 (ii).
Point St. Charles, Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Poirierville Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi).
Pontiac Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
Pork, Fresh, Quantity imported for Home Consumption: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
Portage la Prairie, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8617 (v).
Port Arthur Harbour, Dredging Contracts, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 697 (i).
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
See 'Dredging.'
Port Arthur Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Port Bruce Harbour, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2389 (ii).
Port Burwell Harbour, Contracts, Payments, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Marshall) 556 (i).

Port Burwell Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12135 (vii).
Port Colborne Elevator and Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12146, 12211 (vii).
Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4403 (ii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10513 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4828 (iii).
Porte au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3232 (ii).
Porter's Lake, Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi).
Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11265 (vi).
Port Hillford Breakwater, Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11267 (vi).
Port Hood Harbour, Closing Northern Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 11268 (vi).
—— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10255 (v).
Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10254 (v).
Port Hope, Inland Revenue Office, Apptmts. of Collector: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 895 (i).
Port Hope Pier Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12135 (vii).
Port Joli West, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Maitland Piers, Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 690 (i).
—— Apptmt. of W. W. Krick as Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 6919 (iv).
Port Maitland Entrance Pier, Renewal: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
—— Tenders, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lalor) 1294 (i).
Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11300 (vi).
Port Mulgrave, N.S., Preventing Boats landing Cargoes: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9274 (v).
Port Royal (Madame Island) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).
Port St. Francois Wharf, Construction, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Port South Bar, C.B., Vessels entered for Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9271 (v).
Port Stanley Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 239 (i).
Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Portuguese Cove Breakwater Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Vernon Bridge, P.E.I., Completion of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4404 (iii).
Postage Stamps, Designs for Quebec Tercentenary, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7934 (iv).
See 'Post Office.'
Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., Re-arrangement of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3040 (ii).
—— Statement (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for Sup., 3159 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3885 (ii).
Postal Note Business, Commissions, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9279 (v).
Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8175 (iv).
Postal Rates on N.S. Weekly Newspapers, Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3484 (ii).
Postal Regulations *re* Weekly Newspapers, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5901 (iii).
Postal Revenue *re* One-Cent Rate on Letters Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 8381 (v).
Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 352 (i).
—— Deficiency, &c., Complaints *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 559 (i).
—— Delays, &c., Complaints *re* Ret.: on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. Armstrong) 7257 (iv).
Postal Service, H. of C., Delay in delivering: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 570 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
Postal Service, Improvements in, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
—— Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 4832 (iii).
Postal Stamps, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9111 (v).
—— Special Issue *re* Tuberculosis: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).
Posters, Prohibition of Indecent Bills, Enforcement of Tariff Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 6461 (iv).
Postmasters' Assessment, Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6458 (iv).
Post Office Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 162.'
POST OFFICE:
Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 12653 (vii).
Arnprior Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Atlantic Steamers Mail Service, Cost per Annum: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5656 (iii).
See 'Mail Service,' &c.
Belleville Post Office, Excessive Postage: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 7933 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Bell Rapids P. O., Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 8883 (v).
Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1291 (i).
Bonn Post Office, Application *re* Establishment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).
Brampton Post Office, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iv).
Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagnoris, Charges *re* Political Activity: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 6642 (iv).
Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6404 (iv).
Calgary, P. O. and Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8578 (v).
Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5653 (iii).
Copper Cliff Postmaster, Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 658 (i).
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Michel des Saints, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9474 (v).
Digby to Westport Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7203 (iv).
Drop Letter One-Cent Rate: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 3158 (ii).
Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton, Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5257 (iii).
Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7731 (iv).
Farnham Post Office, Vote *re* Improvement: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Glencoe Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3846 (ii).
Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. A. F. MacLaren) 184 (i).
Hamilton Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7696 (iv).
Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11704 (vi).
'La Gazette d'Arthabaska.' Postal Privileges *re*: Ques. (Mr. L. Lavergne) 6058 (iii).
Letter Carriers, Boots, Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8872 (v).
—— Hours of Service, Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7728 (iv).
Literature, &c., distributed through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9095 (v).
Londonderry and Bass River Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980
Mackinnon Post Office, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).
Macleod Post Office, Report *re* Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
McDonald, Archibald, Dismissal from Whim Road P. O.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Martin) 5087 (iii).
McLeod, Alex., Dismissal from Valleyfield, P.E.I. Post Office: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5087 (iii).
Mails from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12653 (vii).
Mail Matter lost in C.P.R. Accident at Kenora, Rep. *re*: (Mr. Lake) 9281 (v).
—— Mail Matter delayed in Transmission by C.P.R. Accident: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9724 (v).
Mail Matter, Fraudulent Weighing, Inspection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).
Mail Matter mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2214 (ii).
Mail Service in B.C., Improvements *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3754 (ii)
Mail Service between Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4828 (iii).
Mail Service, Irregularity of in Argenteuil County: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9119 (v).
Mail Service in N.B. and N.S., Number of Post Offices, Postal Revenue, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 852 (i).
Mail Service, Soulanges County, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Mail Service by Steamers via Coteau Landing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Mail Steamer, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).
Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5799 (iii).
Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. White) 7199 (iv).
Mill Settlement and Newcastle Creek Post Offices, Establishment of, Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wilmot) 2982 (ii).
Montreal Pneumatic Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (iii).
Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9274 (v).
Montreal Postal Station B: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
—— Station C: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Montreal Post Office, Addition, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6922 (iv).
—— Clerks, Pay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9112 (v).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Montreal Post Office, Defalcations, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7197 (iv).
—— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 7410 (iv).
N.B. Post Offices, Closing of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).
—— Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13153 (vii).
N.B. Ry. Mail Service, Vacancy, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).
—— Postal Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6460 (iv).
Newspaper Rates, List of Publications: M. for Copy* (Mr. Cockshutt) 1295 (i).
—— Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11298 (vi).
See 'Weekly Newspapers.'
Nicolet Post Office, Completion of, Postmaster's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
—— Contract and Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3838 (ii).
—— Emplymt. of Mr. S. Rivard: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
North Bay P. O. Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
North Grove Post Office, Letters, Pets. *re* Establishment: M. for Copies* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4773 (iii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5490 (iii).
Orangeville Post Office Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. *re* Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
Ottawa Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii).
—— Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3842 (ii).
Pakenham Mail Bags, Throwing off of Train: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1425 (i).
Pisquid Post Office, Removal of, Cor., Tels., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 4588 (iii).
Point St. Charles Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11300 (vi).
Porte au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3232 (ii).
Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., Re-arrangement of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3040 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3885 (ii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 4832 (iii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Postal Arrangements between Can. and U.S.: Re-arrangement of: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for Sup., 3159 (ii).
Postal Note Business, Commissions, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9279 (v).
Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8175 (iv).
Postal Revenue *re* One-Cent Rate on Letters: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 8381 (v).
Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 352 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 559 (i).
—— Improvements in, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
Postmasters' Assessment, Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6458 (iv).
Post Office Buildings built since 1904, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 4761 (iii).
Post Office Dept., Clerical Assistance: in Com. of Sup., 8872 (v).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 93 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5561 (iii), 8872 (v).
—— Outside Service: in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v), 13152 (vii).
—— Returns, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6405 (iv).
—— Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. Crocket) 6288 (iv).
Post Office Inspectors, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
—— Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v).
Post Office Irregularities in Western Canada: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).
P.E.I., Post Offices in Queens County, Complaints *re* Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 355 (i).
—— Delays in Distributing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v).
Printing for Postal Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5472 (iii).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., &c., Cost of Mail Service: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1130 (i).
Quebec Terentenary Postage Stamps, French and English Printing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7935 (iv).
—— Designs for, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7934 (iv).
—— New Series, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6397 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8895 (v).
—— Postage Stamps, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. McColl) 12414 (vii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Ry. Mail Clerk at Edmonton, Expenses *re* Trial: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9108 (v).
Regina Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v).
Rimouski Mail Contracts, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8176 (iv).
Rivard, Mr. S., Emplymt. on Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (v).
Riviere du Loup Postmaster, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11297 (vi).
Rural Postmasters, Salary, Increases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 183 (i).
Ryan, Mr. G. M., Apptmt. of Successor as Ry. Mail Supt.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 7504 (iv).
St, Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. of Postmistress, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5797 (iii).
St. Gabriel de Brandon Post Office Savings Bank Opening, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4589 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4828 (iii).
St. Henri Post Office Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
St. Irene des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 5795 (iii).
St. John's Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
St. Mary's Post Office, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12735 (vii).
——— Items *re* Expenditure of $658.03: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11937 (vi).
——— Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11019 (vi).
St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3236 (ii).
St. Peter's Bay, Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1686 (i).
St. Peter's Bay Post Office, Dismissal of Mrs. Mary Finlay, Letters, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 2170 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1687 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 2786 (ii).
Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of Six Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5472 (iii).
Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Sandy Cove, N.S., Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
Savings Banks, Increase of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 691 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Scotch Hill East, Establishment of Post Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2793 (ii).
Southvale, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4829 (iii).
Stamps, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9111 (v).
——— Special Issue *re* Tuberculosis: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).
See 'Quebec,' &c.
Suburban Mail Delivery: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3276 (ii).
Thessalon Post Office, Charges *re* Postmaster: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).
Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2594 (ii).
Trent Bridge Post Office, Re-Opening of: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 609 (i).
Valleyfield, Clock in Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7115 (iv).
Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 11297 (vi).
Victoria Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Weekly Newspapers, Postal Rates in N.S., Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3484 (ii).
Weekly Newspapers, Postal Regulation *re*, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5201 (iii).
Winnipeg Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8575 (v).
Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 3216 (ii).
Woodstock, N.B., Mr. C. L. Smith, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2794 (ii).
——— Interference in Eelctions: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 2886 (ii).
Yukon Mail Service, Complaints *re* (Mr. Thompson) 2022 (ii).
Pound Net Licenses granted in 1905, Cor. with A. E. Dyment, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 2795 (ii).
Prefontaine, Hon. R., Date of Sailing, Acting Minister of Marine: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7732 (iv).
Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 983 (i).
Presbyterian College of Halifax: *See* 'B. No. 154.'
Presbyterian Ministers' Widows and Orphans Fund: *See* 'B. No. 23.'
Preston, W. T. R., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques (Mr. Foster) 360 (i).
Prince Albert Penitentiary Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).

Prince Albert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).
P.E.I. Fisheries Protection Service, Annual Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 359 (i).
P.E.I. Fishing Bounties, Stmnt. of Payments: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 1295 (i).
P.E.I. and G.B. SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 12264 (vii).
P.E.I. Harbours and Rivers, Expenditures: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
P.E.I. Ice-breaker, Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8444 (v).
——— Date of Signing of Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 10254 (v).
——— Progress *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 365 (i).
P.E.I. Life Saving Station, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 681 (i).
——— Lighthouses, Supplies, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 358 (i).
P.E.I. and Nova Scotia SS. Service, Re-establishing of: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8383 (v).
P.E.I., Post Offices in Queens County, Complaints *re* Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 355 (i).
P.E.I. Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1686 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2171 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8696, 9893 (v).
P.E.I. Ry., Alma Station, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 6642 (iv).
——— Bear River Station-master's Dwelling, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1737
P.E.I. Branch Lines: *See* 'B. No. 202.'
P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, Construction, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Martin) 3242 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on B. 215, 13482 (vii).
P.E.I. Ry., Complaints *re* Excessive Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1123 (i).
——— Construction of Freight Sheds, &c., Specifications, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5086 (iii).
——— Dundas and Avondale Extension, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8383 (v).
——— Freight Rates, Delegates from P.E.I., Reps. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 6240 (iv).
——— Harmony-Elmira Branch, Construction: Prop. Res. (Mr. Graham) 12052 (vii).
——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* M. J. Haney's Claims: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) on M. for Sup., 2740 (ii).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Foster) 2882 (ii).
——— remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 7100 (iv).
——— Mail Service, Delays in Distributing &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com of Sup., 9092 (v).
P.E.I. Ry., Montague Branch. Claims of James Maher, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 3834 (ii).
——— Montague Branch Extension: M. to dsch. Bill (Mr. Graham) 11405 (vi).
——— Murray Harbour Branch, Expenditure and Earnings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 848 (i).
——— Stanley Bridge Branch, Surveys, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. A. A. McLean) 850 (i).
——— Stanley Bridge Extension, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4829 (iii).
——— Station Agents, Salaries, Pets., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3236 (ii).
——— Subsidy, Deductions *re* Hillsborough Bridge: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5079 (iii).
——— Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12764 (vii).
——— Tenders *re* News Agency: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8444 (v).
——— Time-Table, Protest *re* Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1123 (i).
——— Train Service between Charlottetown and Murray Harbour: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 568 (i).
P.E.I. Steam Communication with G.B.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 13353 (vii).
P.E.I., Terms of Union with Dom., Nonfufilment of, &c., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5801 (iii).
P.E.I., Telegraphic Communication, Com. from Commercial Cable Co. *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8515 (v).
P.E.I. Tunnel Construction, Reps., &c.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 4589 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 9893 (v).
——— Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 562 (i).
P.E.I., Winter Communication, Contract *re* Construction of Steamer: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2546 (ii).
——— Freight carried, Freight Rates, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 936 (i).
——— Georgetown and Cape George Route, Tests *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 895 (i).
——— Removal of Steamers from Georgetown Route, Discussion of: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1109 (i).
——— Withdrawal of Steamer from Georgetown, Discussion: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1207 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 1513 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Service, Ice-Breaker Str., Rep. *re* Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4583 (iii).
——— Mail Service, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. A. Martin) 1203 (i).

P.E.I., Progress *re* Construction of Ice-breaker: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 5796 (iii).
—— Winter Communication: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 4496 (iii).
P.E.I Winter Service, Str. 'Stanley,' Route, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 172 (i).
—— Total Quantity of Freight, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 843 (i).
Prince Rupert, Customs Collectors, Transfer of Mr. B. R. McDonald: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 6401 (iv).
Printing Bureau, Electric Motor Machines: in Com. of Sup., 7817 (iv).
Printing and Lithographing done outside of Canada, Amounts expended: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1732, 1931 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
See 'Lithographing.'
Printing of Parlt., Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
Printing of Parlt., 5th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Parmelee) 10915 (vi).
Printing for Postal Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5472 (iii).
Printing and Stationary Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
Printing in 'Sun,' &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 5661 (iii).
Printing, Supt., Apptmt. of a Frenchman: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12411 (vii).
Prisons and Reformatories Act *re* N.S.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Prisoner, Released: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'
Private Bills Com., Extension of Time: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 891 (i).
Private Bills Fees, Discrepancy between Senate and H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10122 (v).
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' *re* Attack on French Canadian Ministers: (Mr. Talbot 4221 (iii).
—— Ques. of *re* Registrar of Grey County (Mr. Telford) 11302 (vi).
Privy Council, Promotions: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vii).
—— Office, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 610 (i).
Prohibition Vote in Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen. Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 13580 (vii).
—— Mess. from Senate: Read (Mr. Speaker) 13587 (vii).
—— Speech from Throne, 13590 (vii).
Protection Tariff, ref. to in Debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 74 (i).
Provincial Elections and Federal Ministers' Speeches: Remarks (Mr. Robitaille) 8850 (v).
Provincial Subsidies, Amount paid before and after Adjustment: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8616 (v).
Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present Agreement and Previously: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 315 (i).
—— Dates of last Payments, &c., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237 (i).
—— Dates of Payments, Sums owing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
—— Increased Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 173 (i).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 79; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 61 (i).
Provincial Voters' Lists: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
See 'Man.,' &c.
Public Accounts Com., Evidence *re* Investigation, Freedom of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Bain) 3070; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 103) 3145 (ii).
—— Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3083; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3085 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
—— Meetings and Adjournments: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1439 (i).
—— Meetings concurrently with Sittings of Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9504 (v).
—— Production of Original Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 4495 (iii).
Public Accounts Rep. and Aud. Gen.'s Rep.: M. to ref. to Public Accounts Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 311 (i).
Public Accounts Com.: M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 2159 (ii); M. (Mr. Johnston) to conc., 9890 (v).
—— Production of Original Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1383 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Sittings concurrently with Hse.: M. (Mr. Finlayson) 9579 (v).
Public Accounts Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
Public Bills and Orders, Govt. Business: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 13493 (vii).
—— Precedence of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3405 (ii).
See 'Business of the House.'
Public Buildings constructed since 1897, Amounts expended, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
—— Policy of Erection, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).
—— Works, Initiated since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bovce) 2170 (ii).
Public Lands Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Public Lands of Dom., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 70 (i).
Public Works Expenditure in Mar. Provs., since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 555 (i).
Public Works in Harbours and Rivers., Ont., Tenders, Amounts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 559 (i).
Public Works, Labour Hours: *See* 'B. No. 97.'

PUBLIC WORKS:
Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6232 (iv).
Advertisements for Tenders *re* Govt. Works, Supplies, &c.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4702; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 95) (iii).
Annapolis Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11207 (vi).
Anse a la Barbe Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Anse a l'Ilot Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Antigonish Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7110 (iv).
Architects on Public Works, Payments, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).
Arthabaskaville Public Buildin: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Ashouapmouchouan, Peribonka Training Dykes: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Aylmer Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Baddeck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11219 (vi).
Baie St. Paul Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Barachois Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11223, 12029 (vi).
Batiscan River, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Batiscan Wharf Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8576 (v).
Bay St. Lawrence Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Beaver Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Beaverton Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Becancour, &c., Counties, Dredging at during 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3040 (ii).
Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2392 (ii).
Belle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Belle River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
Belleville Floods, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 4744 (iii).
Belleville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv).
Berthier Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
—— Material supplied, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 9713 (v).
Big Lorraine Harbour, Dredging Entrance Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Blind River Wharf Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).
Bonaventure River Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4244 (iii).
See 'Dredging,' &c.
Brantford Public Building Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
Braund, Samuel, Apptmt. as Inspector of Port Maitland Pier: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5674 (iii).
Breton Cove Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vii).
Bridgewater Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7135 (iv).
Brighton Wharf, Repairs *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 5913 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Owen) in Com. of Sup., 12133, 12138 (vii).
Bronte Harbour, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii).
—— Pier Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).
Buctouche Channel, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Burlington Channel Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
Burlington Channel Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 4403 (iii).
Buildings, Administrative, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).
Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi). 13338 (vii).
Buildings constructed since 1897, Amounts expended, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12661 (vii).
—— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 12771 (vii).
Buildings Generally: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
—— Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).
—— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi).
—— Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Buildings, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 10953 (vi), 13335 (vii).
—— Man. and N.W.T., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v).
Buildings in Man. and N.W., Amounts paid by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 698 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Buildings, N.B.: in Com. of Sup 7186 (iv), 13328 (vii).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7110 (iv), 13326 (vii).
———Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7467 (vi), 13331 (vii).
Buildings, Policy of Erection, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).
Buildings and Public Works, Initiated since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2170 (ii).
Buildings, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 7183 (iv).
——— Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
——— Saskatchewan and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Campbellton Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Campbellton Harbour, Gas Buoys, Tender *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v).
Campbellton Wharf, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).
——— Tender *re* Piling Supply, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v).
Cap St. Ignace Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
Cape St. Mary Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Caraquet Wharf, Ice-breakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).
Caribou Island Causeway: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 681 (i).
Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 513 (i).
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 685 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
Charlos Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5202 (iii).
Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Wharf: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7937 (iv).
Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
Chicoutimi Boom, Payments from Pulp Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8174 (iv).
Chicoutimi Dredging Contract, Tenders *re*: Que. (Mr. Bennett) 7203 (iv).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup. 12030 (vi).
——— Public Works, Expenditures, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Church Point Wharf, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Chute a Blondeau Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
Clarke City, Seven Islands: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
——— Expenditure *re* Public Works: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
Clerks of Works on Public Buildings: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 695 (i).
Clifton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4831 (iii).
Cobourg Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 359 (i).
——— Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).
Colborne Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii)
Colchester Point, Essex County Pier, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 12652 (vii).
Collingwood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12096 (vii).
Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to, &c.: Ques. (Mr Monk) 9277 (v).
Cow Bay (Port Morien) Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Cumberland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi).
Dauphin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).
——— Valuation of Site: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).
Dawson City, Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Deschambault Wharf, Tenders *re*, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5164 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 5801 (iii).
Digby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11226 (vi).
Docks, Piers, &c., Constructed at Bayfield, Grand Bend, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 2397 (ii).
Dorchester Wharf Addition: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Dorval, Dredging at St. Lawrence Yacht Club: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 13060 (vii).
Dover Wharf on Petitcodiac River: in Com. of Sup., 11692 (vi).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9710 (v).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9773, 10259 (v).
——— Midland, &c., Renewals without Tender, O.Cs. *re*: M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 6741 (iv).
——— Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1736 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Dredging Contracts, Quebec Harbour: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7104 (iv).
—— Renewal without Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6633 (iv).
See 'Midland,' &c.
Dredging at Fort William, Amount paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8839 (v).
Dredging at Midland, &c., Advertisements *re* Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 7195 (iv).
Dredging Works at Nicolet River, &c., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3896 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4247 (iii).
Dredging, Ont. and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Dredging in Ontario Harbours, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 1129 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9276, 10008 (v).
Dredging Plant (new) for Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
Dredging Plant for St. Lawrence River (lower): in Com. of Sup., 4754 (iii).
Dredging in Quebec Counties in 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3240 (ii).
Dredging in Quebec Province, Claims Pending, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7200 (iv).
Dredging at Rigaud River, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyer) 6240 (iv).
Dredging in Vaudreuil County, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii)
East Templeton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii).
Elmwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).
Emerson Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8534 (v), 13335 (vii).
Escoumains Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Estevan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8581 (v), 13336 (vii).
Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Father Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Fernie Public Building, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10866 (iv).
'Fielding,' Dredge, Number of Days Working, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7199 (iv).
Garthby Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3844 (ii).
Gatineau Point Bridge, Sums contributed by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 355 (i).
Georgetown Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7182 (iv).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Glace Bay, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7139 (iv).
Glencoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7486 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Public Works, Retirement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Goderich Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Goderich Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
—— Claims of Smeeth & McGillicuddy: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Gore's Landing Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Grand Bend Pier, Final Estimate of Chief Engineer Lafleur: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8892 (v).
—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5085 (iii).
See 'Wharfs.'
Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Grand Forks Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Grand Marais Harbour, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 12140 (vii).
Grand Mechins Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Grand Mere Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 13059 (vii).
Grande Riviere Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8382 (v).
Graving Docks, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 13338 (vii).
Halifax, Dominion Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7140 (v).
Hall's Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
Hamilton, Public Works Employees at, Delay in Payment: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10015, 10119 (v).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11693, 12031 (vi).
—— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii).
—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 133350 (vii).
Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I., General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
——— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Harvey Bank Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Higgin's Shore Pier Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 694 (i).
Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Holland River Dredging, Contract with Lake Simcoe Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2980 (ii).
——— Divisional Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4767 (iii).
——— Name of Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3037 (ii).
Howard's Cape Wharf, Pet. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 11702 (vi).
Hudson, Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8582 (v).
Hunter, J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5792 (iii).
Inverness Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7172 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5997 (iii).
Jesus River Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 6980 (iv).
Juniper Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Kincardine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7698 (iv).
'King Edward' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13063 (vii).
Knowlton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Lachine Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 12097 (vii).
Lachute Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
'Lady of the Lake,' Str., purchased by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3434 (ii).
Ladysmith Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8176 (iv).
Lake Ainslie Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Lake Aylmer, Wharf at Garthby: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering Lake: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Lakefield Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Lake Francois Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Lake Megantic Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Megantic Public Works, Total Cost to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11299 (vi).
Lake St. Francis Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. John Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. Peter Piers: in Com. of Sup., 4752 (iii).
Lakeville Harbour Opening: in Conc., 13568 (vii).
Lavaltrie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7705, 7815 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8444 (v).
Leonardsville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
——— Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Les Eboulements Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lesser Slave Lake, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5719 (iii).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Little Current Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Little Sands Wharf, Repairs, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 2397 (ii).
Loggieville, Dredging, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
Longueuil Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7304 (iv).
Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Lotbinière Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lower Newcastle Wharf on Miramichi River: in Com. of Sup., 11695 (vi).
Lunenburg Public Building Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vii).
McGregor's Creek, Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
McPherson's Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11229, 11292 (vi).
Madawaska River, Extension Dyke: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi), 13344 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Magdalen Islands, Breakwater and Piers : in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).

Magnetawan River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).

Magog Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv), 13329 (vii).

Malbay (Gaspé) Boat Shelter: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

Maple Creek, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8600 (v), 13337 (vii).

Margaree Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).

Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).

Mar. Provs. Harbours and Rivers, Creosoted Timber: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).

Markham Public Building : in Com of Sup., 7709 (iv), 13331 (vii).

Maskinonge River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).

Matane Breakwater and Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

Matchedash Bay, Dredging at Fesserton, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 566 (i).

Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).

Medicine Hat Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).

——Contract *re* Heating System: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 10791 (vi).

Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).

Michipicoton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).

Middle River, Shear Dam Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).

Midland Harbour, Tenders for Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3239 (ii), 8893 (v).

Midland and Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).

—— Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3428 (ii).

Midland, Tiffin and Victoria Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re*:Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8181 (iv).

Milford Haven, N.S. Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13060 (vii).

Miscou Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).

Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).

Moncton Wharf Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi).

'Montague' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 182 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8172 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).

Montmagny Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

Montmorency Falls, Retaining Walls, Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).

Montreal Harbour and St. Lawrence River, Dredging and Elevator Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1683 (i).

Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditure for the last fifty Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3482 (ii).

Moose Jaw Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).

—— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).

Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).

Neepawa Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8536 (v), 13335 (vii).

N.B. Inland Water Wharf, Construction Policy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 5465 (iii).

New Glasgow Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11257 (vi).

New London Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).

New Mills Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).

Nicolet County, Govt. Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 12775 (vii).

Nicolet Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

Nicolet Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7428 (iv).

Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).

—— Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3840 (ii), 4588 (iii).

Nicolet River Protection Walls, Repairs, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4588 (iii).

Nicolet River Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3478 (ii).

North Bay, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii).

North East Harbour Wharf, Total Length: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).

Notre Dame de Portage Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

—— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6400 (iv).

Old Man's River: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).

Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).

Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Ottawa Buildings, Archives Fitting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5700 (iii).
——— Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
——— Corry Building, Total Rental per Annum, Taxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 11938 (vi).
——— Eastern Block Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1504 (i).
——— Elevator Attendants: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
——— Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
——— Improvements, Repairs, &c.: in Com of Sup., 5707 (iii).
——— Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
——— Lighting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
——— Mackenzie Avenue: in Com. of Sup., 1505 (i).
——— Major's Hill Park: in Com. of Sup., 11015 (vi).
——— Mint, in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
——— Mint Building, Imperfect Ventilation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3036 (ii).
——— Renewing Skylights: in Com. of Sup., 7816 (iv).
——— Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10983 (vi).
——— list read (Mr. Pugsley) 10998 (vi).
——— Repairs, Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi).
——— Rideau Hall, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11005 (vi).
——— Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5467 (iii).
——— Sussex Street Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 13478 (vii).
——— Sussex Street Property Purchase, Payments to Jos. Riopelle: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3844 (ii)
——— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi).
——— Victoria Memorial Museum: in Com. of Sup., 1489 (i), 13477 (vii).
——— progress *re* construction: Remarks (Mr. Blain) on conc., 13568 (vii).
——— Western Block Extension, Total Cost, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
Ouelle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Owen Sound Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7817 (iv).
——— Contract *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Owen Sound Public Building, Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
Owen Sound Building Inspector, Apptmt. of Mr. Foster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2792 (ii).
Oyster Pond Breakwater Extension: in Com of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Parker's Cove Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Park Hill Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Parrsborough Harbour Improvements: in Com., of Sup., 11259 (vi).
——— Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1940 (i).
Petawawa Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12133 (vii).
——— Ques. (Mr. White) 685 (i).
Petite Descharge, Lac St. Jean, Removal of Rock: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Petit Rocher Breakwater, Contracts, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 1294 (i).
——— Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5723 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Taylor) 6464 (iv).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 10402 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7107 (iv).
——— Stmnt. as to Missing Letters: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 9716 (v).
Piche Point (Lake Temiscaming) Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Pictou Post Office Building, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10518 (vi).
Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9474 (v).
Plessisville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Point Edward Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).
Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3898 (ii).
Pointe aux Trembles Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
——— Contract of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8838 (v).
——— Date of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9267 (v).
——— Number of Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1734 (i), 2394 (ii).
Poirierville Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Portage la Prairie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Port Arthur and Fort William, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
——— Dredging, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8617 (v).
Port Arthur Harbour, Dredging Contracts, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 697 (i).
Port Arthur Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Port Burwell, Harbour Improvement: in Com of Sup., 12135 (vii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2389 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Marshall) 556 (i).
Port Colborne Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12146 (vii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10513 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4828 (iii).
Porter's Lake Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi).
Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11265 (vi).
Port Hilford Breakwater, Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11267 (vi).
Port Hood Harbour, Closing Northern Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 11268 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10255 (v).
Port Hope Pier, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12135 (vii).
Port Joli West, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Maitland Piers, Tenders, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Lalor) 1294 (i).
——— Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 690 (i).
——— Apptmt. of W. W. Krick as Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 6919 (iv).
——— Entrance Pier, Renewal: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
Port Royal (Madame Island) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).
Port St. François Wharf, Construction, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
——— Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 239 (i).
Portuguese Cove Breakwater Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Vernon Bridge, P.E.I., Completion of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4404 (iii).
Post Offices, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Prince Albert, Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).
——— Penitentiary Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).
P.E.I. Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1686 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 9893 (v).
Public Works Dept., Architectural Branch, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11096 (vi).
——— Clerical and Temporary Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 11099 (vi).
——— Ass't Dep. Minister, Apptmt. of: in Com. of Sup., 5698 (iii).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 7 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 638 (i), 12917 (vii).
——— Engineering Branch, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11093 (vi).
——— Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 5661 (iii).
——— Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5730 (iii).
——— Gratuities to Public Works Officials: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (iii).
——— New Appointments: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 13061 (vii).
——— Ret.: on Inquiry for (Mr. Pugsley) 6223 (iv).
——— Technical Books of Reference: in Com. of Sup., 11100 (vi).
——— Telegraph Branch, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11097 (vi).
——— Unprovided Items: in Com. of Sup., 11119 (vi).
Public Works, Estimated Cost, Extravagant Expenditure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7145 (iv).
Public Works Expenditures: Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4868, 4886; Neg. (Y. 43, N. 99) 4959 (iii).
Public Works Expenditure in Mar. Provs., since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 555 (i).
Public Works in Harbours and Rivers, Ont., Tenders, Amounts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 559 (i).
Pugwash Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Quebec County, Expenditures by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3847 (ii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 3853 (ii).
Quebec Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
——— Specifications, Stmnt. of Expenditure, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 5802 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Quebec Port, Sums expended for Improvements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 697 (i).
Quesnel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10867 (vi).
Rainy River, Long Sault Rapids: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (ii).
——— Correction of Answer (Mr. Pugsley) 5658 (iii).
Red Head Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
Renfrew Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Richelieu River Ice Piers, St. John : in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Richibucto, Extension of Piers: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
——— Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 12412 (vii).
Rimouski County Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10013 (v).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Rivière a la Graisse Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 686 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 3689 (ii).
Rivière du Lievre, Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Rivière du Loup Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 6462 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Post Office, Improvement to Grounds: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Wharf, Total Expenditure *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6462 (iv).
Rivière du Loup (Fraserville) Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Roberval, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Roche's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Rossport Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Round Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11282 (vi) .
Ruscombe River Works, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1122 (i).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11293 (vi).
St. Alphonse (de Bagotville) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 12011 (vi), 12145 (vii).
St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3230 (ii).
——— Expenditure and Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1935 (i).
——— Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3479 (ii).
Ste. Anne de Monts Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Boniface Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
——— Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4246 (iii).
——— Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5999 (iii).
St. Francis River, Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
——— Melbourne Pier, Rock Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6918 (iv).
——— Piers at Richmond, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6641, 6918 (iv).
St. Francois Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Fulgence Pier, Signatures on Paymaster's List: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1115 (i).
——— Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1130 (i).
St. Hyacinthe Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
St. Ignace de Loyola Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Jacques River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. John, Dom. Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
St. John Harbour Improvements, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12011 (vi).
——— Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11700 (vi).
——— Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
St. John River, Removal of Snags, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 3477 (ii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
——— Tidal Waters Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vi).
——— Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
——— Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
St. Joseph's Wharf, Ont., Tenders, &c., *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8890 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. Laurent Wharf: Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 895, 1121 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Louis River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
St. Mary's Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7826 (iv).
St. Mary's River, Kaministiquia, Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contracts, Expenditure *re*, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 853 (i).
St. Maurice, Dam at Grande Piles: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Omer Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Pierre les Becquets Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Rochs Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7133 (iv).
St. Simeon Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Thérèse Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Saguenay River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
——— Purchase of Coal: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8380 (v).
——— 'Storm King,' Tug, Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8381 (v).
Sarnia Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7829 (iv).
Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v), 13337 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Scotch Town Wharf, Application: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7202 (iv).
Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Selkirk Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8547 (v).
Seven Islands, Public Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
Severn River, Improvement of Waterway: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Shawenegan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).
Shellmouth River Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).
Sherbrooke Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Shippegan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12027 (vi).
Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv), 13333 (vii).
'Sir Wilfrid Laurier,' Dredge, Completion, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
Skinner's Cove, Pier Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
——— Boat Channel, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10012 (v).
Slides and Booms Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).
Snag Boat, Red River, Construction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 567 (i).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
Souris Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
——— Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1685 (i).
Souris Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1939 (i).
Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Souris Wharf, Permission to Build, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7728 (iv).
Southampton Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Spanish River Dredging, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4764 (iii).
Spillumcheen River Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2391 (ii).
Stanley Island Wharf and Pier, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5720 (iii).
Strathcona Horse, Barracks, Stables, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10975 (vi).
Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Summerside Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13343 (vii).
Surveys, Slides and Booms: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).
Sydney Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).
Taché, J. C., Apptmt. in Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8180 (iv).
Tancook Island Breakwater :in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).
Tatamagouche Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Tatamagouche Dredging, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11701 (vi).
Temiskaming Wharf, Montreal River: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Thames River Wharf, Damages to: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 7506 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Thompson River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Coal Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
——— Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
——— Dredging, Tenders *re* Owen Sound Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8892 (v).
Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5709 (iii), 13351 (vii).
Tignish Breakwater, P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
——— Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Leurgey) 682 (i).
——— Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3229 (iii)
Tilbury Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).
Tilsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Tobermory Harbour Booms: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Toney River Boat Harbour, Amount of Contract, Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9711 (v).
Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Toronto (eastern gap) Harbour, Amount of Dredging, &.: Ques. (Mr. Madonell) 354 (i).
——— Contract, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 10014 (v).
——— Date of Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1507 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
Toronto (western gap) Harbour, Construction of Entrance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 354, 518, (i), 4587 (iii).
——— Delay in Contract: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 5915 (iii).
Toronto Island Tunnel, Deputation *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5564 (iii).
Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5472 (iii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, Laundry, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
Tracadie Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
Uxbridge Public Building: Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Vancouver, Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10868 (vi).
Varennes Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Vaudreuil County, Dredging, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii).
Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5471 (iii).
Victoria Beach Piers, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237 (i).
Victoria Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Victoria Harbour, Tenders for Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8803 (v).
Walkerville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Welchpool, N.B., Wharf, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7935 (iv).
Welland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Westville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7179 (iv).
——— Total Amount of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9474 (v).
Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Wharfs and Bridges in Quebec, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Wharfs, Piers, Amount of Revenue collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2391 (ii).
Wharfs, Piers and Harbours, Expenditure since 1895: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5078 (iii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 5476 (iii).
——— Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 5800, 5802 (iii).
Wharfs, Piers, &c., and other Public Works, Expenditure since Jan. 1st, 1897, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4867 (iii).
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).
White Head Wharf, Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Wiarton Dredging, Payments to Mr. Bowman: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6407 (iv).
——— Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6236 (iv).
Winfield Basin Dredging, Tender, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6461 (iv).
William's Head Quarantine Station Building: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Winnipegosis Lake Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Winnipeg River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12043 (vi).
Yamaska River Lock: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
Yarmouth, N.S., Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11500 (vi).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11291 (vi).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7180 (iv).
Pugwash Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Pulp Wood Exported to U.S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Pulp Wood Export Duty: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4774 (iii).
See 'Wood.'
Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Contemplated Change: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1940 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., &c., Cost of Mail Service: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1130 (i).
——— Last Deficit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6459 (iv).
Quarantine Lands, Sask., Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3481 (ii).
Quarantine Public Health: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).
Quarantine Stations: in Com. of Sup., 11008 (vi).
Quarter Sections, 35, 31, 6, &c., Public and Private Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 8176 (iv).
Quebec Battlefields: *See* 'B. Nos 111 and 219.'
Que. Bridge and Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 217.'
Quebec Bridge Accident, Apptmt. of Engineer Hoare: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 8173 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Bank Claims, &c.: Corrected Information (Mr. Fielding) 6059 (iii)
——— Change of Plans *re* Height: Ques. (Mr Armstrong) 5202 (iii).
——— Construction Materials, Customs Duties collected: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5793 (iii).
——— Cor., Plans, Specifications, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 605 (i).
——— Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2394 (ii).
——— Govt. Grants, Investigation *re*: M. for Sel. Com.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2547 (ii).
——— G.T.P., Agreement *re* Rentals: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13227 (vii).
——— Horse and Vehicle Traffic: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 10739 (vi).
——— Material, Customs Duties collected &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5200 (iii).
——— Material on Hand, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1290 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Moneys contributed *re* Finances, Estimated Cost of Completion: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5566 (iii).
——— Names of Jurymen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 7991 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Commission : in Com of Sup., 12769 (vii).
Quebec Bridge, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 30; (Mr. Monk) 535 (i).
——— Report, Distribution of Printed Copies: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5914 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 10302 (vi).
——— Evidence, &c.: M. (Mr. Maclean) to ref. to Special Com., 10401 (vi).
——— Inquiry for Report (Mr. R. L. Borden) 946, 1739 (i), 3043 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3043, 4494 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Haggart) 6223 (iv).
——— Report: Presented (Mr. Graham) 4566 (iii), 10915 (vi).
Quebec Bridge, Commission's Report, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6924, 7099, 8171 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 8608 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Barker) 3901 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Special Com.: M. (Mr. Chisholm) to conc., 13353, Amt. (Mr. Monk) 13363, Neg. (Y. 52; N. 103) 13414 (vii).
Quebec Bridge, Salaries to Officials: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13517 (viii).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy, Apptmt. of Committee, 8440 (v).
Quebec Canals, Steam Road Rollers: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
Quebec, Citadel Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv).
——— Cliff Walls, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12148 (vii).
Quebec Conty, Expenditures by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3847 (ii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 3853 (ii).
Quebec, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7431 (iv).
——— Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
——— Specifications, Stmnt. of Expenditure, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 5802 (iii).
Quebec Immigrant Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
——— Immigrant Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Quebec Judges, Apptmt. to Superior Court: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 11825 (vi), 12190 (vii).
——— Additional Apptmts.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. on B. 206, 13048 (vii).
——— Apptmt. of Additional Judge: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).

Que. and N. B. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 128'
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13290 (viii).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry., Branch Lines Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).
Quebec Port Improvements, Expenditure since Confederation, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 697 (i).
Quebec Ry. Light and Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 73.'
Quebec Religious Feuds, Letter of Rev. Mr. Dumesnil to Papal Ablegate, Signed 'P.M. G.': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lemieux) 11501 (vi).
Quebec Port, Sums expended for Improvements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
Quebec Reviews, Expenditure: in Com. of Sup. 13176 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps: Letter Read (Mr. Blain) 8694 (v).
—— Attendance of Veterans: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7998 (iv), 8695 (v).
—— Battlefields: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 and 129.'
—— Food Supply: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
—— Joint Meeting of Members and Senators: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 6061 (iii).
—— Legal Holidays: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7934 (iv).
—— Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8851 (v).
—— Number of Troops to be sent, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10259 (v).
—— Par. in 'Le Canada': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4669 (iii).
—— Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7992 (iv).
—— Rep. of Commission: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7449 (iv).
—— Rural Corps, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10292 (v).
—— Transportation of Troops: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8377, 8384; City Corps, &c. (Mr. S. Hughes) 8386 (v).
Quebec Tercentary Postage Stamps, French and English Printing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7935 (v).
—— Issue of: Ques. (Mr. McColl) 12414 (vii).
—— Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8895 (v).
Quebec Tercentenary, Visit of Prince of Wales, Par. in Halifax 'Chronicle': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5209 (iii).
Quesnel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10867 (vi).
Questions, Answering of, Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) 234; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 234 (i).
—— Precedence of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 350 (i).
Ques. of Privilege, Anti-Catholic Article in 'Leader' (Mr. Bergeron) 8604 (v).
—— *re* Doukhobors: (Mr. S. Hughes) 7321
—— Hunter, Mr., and French Canadians (Mr. Robitaille) 8465 (v).
—— Par. in 'La Presse' *re* Vote on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 2022 (ii).
—— *re* Stmnts of Mr. Conmee (Mr. Boyce) 7995 (iv).
Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13225 (vii).
Ry. Act. Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 85 and 100.'
Ry. Act, B. 3: Ques. of Order, ref. to debate in Senate: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 577 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on Order for 2° (remarks) 938 (i).
—— B. No. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) on Order for 2°: Remarks (Mr. Johnston) 5211 (iii).
Ry. Act (construction) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 4.'
—— (demurrage) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
—— (8-hour day) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
—— (employees' liability) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
—— (expropriation) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
—— (fire damages) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 18.'
—— (level crossings) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
—— (mileage books) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
—— (ry. commission) Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 & 112.'
—— (ry. commission) Amt. B. No. 118 (Mr. Graham) rsmg. adjn. debate on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3° (Mr. Aylesworth) 11590; Amt., Neg. (Y. 36, N. 77) 11600; Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 11602; Amt. (Mr. (Mr. Monk) 11603; Neg. (Y. 36, N. 89) 11608 (vi); Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11614, 11619; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 74) 11631; Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) 11632 (vi).
—— (securities) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
—— (telegraphers, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 118.'
—— (trains on time) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
—— (wires, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 43.'
—— (working hours) Amt. B. No. 157 (Mr. R. Smith): Remarks (Mr. Monk) 10120 (v)
Railway Commission, Applications *re* Crossing of Tracks, by Water Mains, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 1294 (i).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
—— Increase of. *See* 'B. No 112.'
—— Jurisdiction of: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 and 118.'
—— Legal Expenditures: in Com. of Sup., 10362 (vi).
—— Salaries and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 10385 (vi).
—— Total Expenditure in Counsel Fees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10256 (v).
Ry. Mail Clerk at Edmonton, Expenses *re* Trial: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9108 (v).

Ry. Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 215.'
Railway Surveys, Colchester County, Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980 (ii).
——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 5046 (iii).
Railway Tracks, Crossing by Water Mains, Applications to Board, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 1109 (i).
Rails purchased from Govt. by N. B. Coal and Ry. Co., Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9269 (v).
RAILWAYS :
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Subsidies, Reports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 892 (i).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G.T. Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Northrup) 2796 (ii).
Brockville and Ottawa, Ry. Connections. Charges against Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1429 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. Hse., 186 (i).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 432 (i).
See 'G.T.R..' &c.
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ontario Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 236 (i).
Canada Eastern Ry., Cattle killed, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
Canadian Northern Ry., Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood and Pas Missions: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 13475 (vii).
C. P. Ry., Compensation *re* Right of Way: in Com. of Sup., 5561 (iii).
——— Land Taxation, Test Cases, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii).
——— Saskatchewan Bridge Subsidy: in Com of Sup., 13305 (vii).
——— Taxation Cases: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 5049 (iii).
Central Ry. of Canada, Charter Grant, Deposit *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4767 (iii).
Falconer, K., Payments by Ry. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).
Freight Rates, Discrimination *re* City of St. John, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr Crocket) 2397 (ii).
French Language on Ry. Crossings, &c. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2021 (ii).
Govt. Railways System: *See* 'I.C.R., &c.'
G.T. Ry., Connection at Brockville: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
——— Connections at Prescott: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 433 (i).
See 'Brockville,' &c.
G.T. Ry. and C.P.R. Connection at Wingham: Remarks (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) 191 (i).
RAILWAYS—*Con.*
G.T. Ry., Entrance into Toronto, O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 556 (i).
G.T.P. and N.T. Ry., Disputed Questions: (Mr. Barker) 6235 (iv).
Hudson Bay Railway, Construction, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Knowles) 6291 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Borden) on Financial Review, 13467 (ii).
——— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W .J. Roche) 5789 (iii).
——— Railway Building to Fort Churchill, &c., Cor., Documents, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Schaffner) 1689 (i).
——— Surveys, Locations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12764 (vii).
Indiantown and Blackville Branch Ry., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
International Ry., N.B., Directors, Amount of Stocks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4246 (iii).
Inverness County, Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. McLennan) 12233 (vii).
Labour Organizations *re* Ry. Employees, Par. in Halifax 'Herald': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8289 (v).
Land Grants, Amounts and Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4766 (iii), 9271 (v).
Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N. W. Ters., Areas reserved on July 1st, 1896; Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 13512 (vii).
Land Grants in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Total Acreage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6920 (iv).
Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage: Ques. (Mr. W. McIntyre) 8182 (iv).
Land Subsidies to Rys., Areas granted from 1892-06: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8613 (v).
National Transcontinental: *See* 'G.T.P.'
N.B. Coal and Ry. Co., Balance of Subsidy, Claims *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9270 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9714 (v).
New York Central, Discrimination by Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).
Rails purchased from Govt. by N. B. Coal and Ry. Co., Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9269 (v).
Railway Arbitrations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10329 (vi).
Railway Bridge Subsidies: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. on Res., 13309 (vii).
Ry. Charters and Land Grants, Renewals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 9271 (v).
Railway Connections, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) 434 (i).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
——— Extra Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 10342

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Railway Estimates, Obstruction in Sup.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10129 (v)
—— Vote for: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 10007 (v).
Railways Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 10341 (vi).
Railways, Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 10357 (vi).
Railways and Municipalities, Agreements, Penalties *re* Violations: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 6987 (iv).
Railways Statistical Branch: in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).
Railway Statistics Report: Presented (Mr. Graham) 1346 (i).
Ry. Subsidies, Applications for, Memorandum: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).
Ry. Subsidies: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12771 (vii).
Toronto and Schomberg Ry. Blockade: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3901 (ii).
White Pass Ry. Co., Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 10736 (vi).
Rainy River, Long Sault Rapids: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Rama Indian Fund, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 8610 (v).
Ramsland Homestead Entry, Improvements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5209 (iii).
Ranchvale Homestead Entries, Receipts, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5258 (iii).
Ranchvale Sub-land Agency, Closing of: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4829 (iii).
Rankin, Col., Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 11405 (vi).
Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
—— Correction of Answer (Mr. Pugsley) 5658 (iii).
Rattenbury & Co., Purchase of Seed Oats, Assignment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 12392 (vii).
Receiver-General's Office: in Com. of Sup., 12160 (vii).
Red Ensign Flying from Merchant Vessels, Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 12775 (vii).
Red Head Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
Reformatories Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Regina Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v).
Rehm, Frederick C., *et al*, Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Reinhardt, Mr. Paul, Emplymt. by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 10331 (vi).
Reinhardt, Mr., Interference in Quebec Provl. Elections: Cor., &c., read (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10986 (vi).
See 'Caron.'
Renfrew Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Representation from Mar. Provs.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Daniel) 9891 (v).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) 9892 (v).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 9892 (v).
Representation in H. of C. for the Mar. Provinces: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Daniel) 9780 (v).
Restaurant of H. of C. and Senate: M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Joint Com., 13224 (vii).
—— 1st Rep.: Presented (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 13510 (vii).
Restraint of Trade, Conspiracy in: *See* 'B. No. 96.'
Returns delayed: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13082 (vii).
Returning Officers, Apptmnt. of: Remarks (Mr. Telford) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).
Returns, Detention of by Members: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5048 (iii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 2024 (ii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 13081 (vii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2384 (ii), 6847 (iv).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 2384 (ii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 1018 (i), 3318, 2309 (ii), 4223, 4832, 6010 (iii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 4495 (iii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Macdonell) 569 (i), 2885 (ii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. A. Martin) 5491 (iii), 7722 (iv).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8516 (v).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Taylor) 2738 (ii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 2024 (ii).
Returns ordered, Lost, &c., Placed in Record Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2882 (ii).
Returns, Questions, &c., ordered by House, Time to Complete, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 4242 (iii).
——Retention by Members: Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Toronto 'Globe' (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4660 (iii).
See 'Documents,' &c.
Returns unopposed: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5914 (iii).
Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Revised Statutes, Completion of French Edition: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 6983 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6000 (iii), 6232 (iv).
Richard, Mr., Emplymt. on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
Richelieu River Ice Piers, St. John's: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).

Richibucto, Extension of Piers: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
Richibucto Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 12412 (vii).
Rideau Canal, Buoys between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids, Contract *re* Lighting: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8613 (v).
See 'Canals.'
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5467 (iii).
——— Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11005 (vi).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications for Homesteads: Letter from Mr. Seaman read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9992 (v).
——— Timber Reserve, Preservation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) on M. for Sup., 7653 (iv).
——— Squatters' Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 175 (i).
Rifle and Artillery Association Grants: in Com. of Sup., 12152 (vii).
Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5654 (iii).
Rifles purchased from other Companies than Ross Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1123 (i).
See 'Ross Rifle.'
Rifle Ranges, Charlottetown, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 6233 (iv).
Rimouski County Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10013 (v).
Rimouski, Dredging, &c., *re* Landing of 'Lady Evelyn': Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7727 (iv).
See 'Post Office.'
Rimouski Mail Contracts, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8176 (iv).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Rivard, Mr. S., Employmt. on Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
Rivière à la Graisse, Dredging, &c., Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 686 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 3689
Rivière du Lievre, Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Rivière du Loup Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 6462 (iv).
Rivière du Loup (Fraservile) Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Rivière du Loup, Postmaster, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
——— Post Office, Improvement to Grounds: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Station, Improvement *re* Platforms: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 5468 (iii).
Rivière du Loup Wharf, Total Expenditure *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6462 (iv).
River St. John, Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
Robbins Irrigation Co., Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4763 (iii).
——— M. for Papers (Mr. Ames) 5210 (iii).
Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion *re* Interior Dept: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).
Roberval Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Roche's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Rocky Mountain Park: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Rolla L. Crain, Amounts paid to: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 3435 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3239 (ii).
Rolling Stock, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Rossport Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Ranges, Par. in 'Ottawa Citizen' *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10515 (vi).
——— Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 11494 (vi).
——— Advances *re* Contracts, Cor. with Bank of Montreal: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 4773 (iii).
Ross Rifle Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5786 (iii).
——— Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6235, 8176 (iv).
——— Date of Contract, O.C., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paterson) 8442 (v).
——— provisions *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
——— M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Bonus, Loans, Services of Govt. Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 559 (i).
——— Contract: in Com. of Sup., 13542 (ii).
——— Contract Price, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 8174 (iv).
——— Contracts *re* Supply of Rifles, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
——— Consignment to N.W. Mounted Police, Manufacture, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5259 (iii).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* Defects: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5210 (iii).
——— Delivered per Contract, Cost per Rifle: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8180 (iv).

Ross Rifle, Disposition of Manufactured Rifles, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
——— Evidence before Pub. Accounts Com., Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) 5914 (iii).
——— Extension of Cove Field Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4404 (iii).
——— Factory, Pet. *re* Establishment on Plains of Abraham: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3903 (ii).
Ross Rifle, Inefficiency and Extravagance of Militia Dept.: Amt. (Mr. Worthington) on M.for Sup., 8902-8953 (v); Neg. (Y. 18; N. 55) 9090 (v).
——— Correction of Mr. S. Hughes' Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bergeron) 9126 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Mr. Bergeron's denial of Stmnt., 9330 (v).
Ross Rifle, Inter-changeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt.: Ques, (Mr. Worthington) 3898 (ii).
——— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 178 (i).
——— Number ordered, Payments, Total Number, delivered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
——— Number reported unfit for Use: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3841 (ii).
——— Payments to since Jan. 1, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7209 (iv).
——— Rep. of British War Office *re* Cor., Disappearance from Library of H. of C.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Fred. Borden) 4961 (iii).
——— Rep. of Col. Gaudet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9713 (v).
——— Rep. from Military Associations, &c., *re* Efficiency: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
——— Report from Public Accounts, Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
——— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of: Ques (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
——— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 365 (i).
——— Target Practice, Suspension by N.W. M. Police: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3847 (ii).
——— Tests in England, Reps., &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Frederick Borden) 8167 (iv).
——— Total Number in Use in Canada by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5786 (iii).
Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11297 (vi).
Round Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11289 (vi).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. John, Tenders *re* Supplies: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 5788 (iii).
Royal Commission Return: Inquiry for (Mr Porter) 6288, 7447 (iv).
See 'Commissions'.
Royal Military College Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv), 12152, 13177 (vii).
——— Barracks, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
——— Investigation into Conduct of Cadet Lancaster: on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1019 (i).
Royal Mint, Amount of Silver and Gold Coins, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8612 (v).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Caron) 5210 (iii).
Royal Mint, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 1451
See 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
Rules of the House, Amendments to: Prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2984 (ii).
Ruscombe River Works, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1122 (i).
Russian Govt. Payments *re* Compensation to B.C. Sealers: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
——— Seizures of Canadian Vessels, Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2391 (ii).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11293 (vi).
Ruthenian Catholic Mission, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 69.'
Ryan, Mr. G. M., Appt. of Successor as Ry. Mail Supt.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 7504 (iv).
St. Alphonse (de Bagotville) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 12011 (vi), 12145 (vii).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements, Land Grant to Great Falls Power Co.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 238 (i).
St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe Waterway from Lake St. Francis, Letters, Plans, Surveys, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 1690 (i).
St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3230 (ii).
——— Expenditure and Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1935 (i).
——— Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3479 (ii).
Ste. Anne de Monts Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
Ste. Anne de Sorel Lighthouse, Destruction of Trees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7731 (iv).
Ste. Barbe Floods, Rep. of Engineer: Remarks (Mr. R. N. Walsh) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).
——— Damages *re* Floods: Remarks (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 6987 (iv).
St. Boniface Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
St. Boniface Public Building, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4246, 5999 (iii).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
St. Cyrille Ry. Diversion, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12756 (vii).
St. Francis River Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
St. Francis River, Melbourne Pier, Rock Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6918 (iv).
St. Francis River, Richmond Pier, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6641, 6918 (iv).
St. Francois, Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. of Postmistress, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5797 (iii).
St. Fulgence Pier, Paymaster's List, Signatures, &c., Apptmt. of Dr. Savard, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1130 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1115 (i).
St. Gabriel de Brandon Post Office, Savings Bank, Recommendation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4828 (iii).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4589 (iii).
St. Henri Post Office Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
St. Hyacinthe Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 10890 (vi)
St. Hyacinthe, 84th Regiment, Amount of Pay still Due: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 844 (i).
St. Hyacinthe Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv)
St. Ignace de Loyola Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Irenee des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 5795 (iii).
St. Jacques River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. John and Cumberland SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 12263 (vii).
St. John, N.B., Cold Storage Co., Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3580 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 3690 (ii).
——— Names of Stockholders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1938 (i).
See 'N.B.'
St. John, N.B., Dom. Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
St. John Fusiliers, 62nd Regiment, Payments *re* Annual Drill, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 847 (i).
St. John Harbour, Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11700 (vi).
St. John Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12011 (vi).
St John, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
St. John Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Military Stables: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
St. John Port, Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
——— Quarantine Station, Partridge Island: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (iii).
——— Quarantine, Partridge Island Water Service: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Steam Sterilizer: in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
St. John River, Removal of Snags, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 3477 (ii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
——— Tidal Waters Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vi).
——— Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
St. John's, Que., Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
St. Joseph's Wharf, Ont., Tenders, &c., *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8890 (v).
St. Laurent Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 895, 1121 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Lawrence Canals, District Office: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Rapids Dam, Cor., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Gervais) 2996 (ii).
See 'Deep Waterways,' &c.
St. Lawrence River Route, Wrecks and Collisions: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 10739 (vi).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5035 (iii).
St. Louis, H., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1347 (i), 2977 (ii).
——— Payments to by Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
St. Louis River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
St. Mary's Indian Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
St. Mary's Post Office, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12735 (vii).
——— Items *re* Expenditure of $658.03: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11937 (vi).
——— Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11019 (vi).
St. Mary's Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7826 (iv).

St. Mary's River, Kaministiquia, Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contracts, Expenditure *re*, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 853 (i).
St. Maurice, Dam at Grand Piles: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Omer Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3236 (ii).
St. Pierre les Becquets Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Peter's Bay, Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1686 (i).
St. Peter's Bay Post Office, Charges against Mrs. Finlay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1687 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 2170 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 2786 (ii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Instructions to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2217 (ii).
——— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 7990 (iv).
——— Issue of Patents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1932 (i).
St. Rochs Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7438 (iv).
St. Rosalie Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12259 (vii).
St. Simeon Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Therese Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Holidays for Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2791 (ii).
——— Meat Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Leonard) in Com. of Sup., 5519 (iii).
——— Officers and Municipal Elections: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2791 (ii).
——— Warden Beauchamp, Interference in Elections, Charges *re* (Mr. Leonard) in Com. of Sup., 5538 (iii).
Sabourin, Maj., Cor. with Lt. Col. Malette and Dept.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Saccharine Standards, &c., *re* Sugar Manufacture: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 351 (i).
Sackville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12235 (vii).
Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of Six Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5472 (iii).
Saguenay Boom and Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amounts paid Govt. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 183 (i).
See 'Chicoutimi.'
Saguenay River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
——— Purchase of Coal: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8380 (v).
——— 'Storm King, Tug, Employmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8381 (v).
Salaries of Judges: *See* 'Judges.'
Salmon Licenses granted in B.C., Exclusive Privileges, Penalties, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5801 (iii).
——— Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 5651 (iii).
——— in B.C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5652 (iii).
Salmon Fishing Licenses in Gardner's Inlet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5652 (iii).
Salmon Fishing Licenses, Number granted, in B.C., Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 5998 (iii).
Salmon Net Fishing in Restigouche River Privileges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13518 (vii).
Salvation Army Immigrants, Letter from Dr. Nadeau: Ques. of Priv. (Mr .A. Lavergne) 7094 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
——— Stmnt. of Genl. Booth: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2390 (ii).
Samovici, A., and H. Bolacan, Applications for Cancellation of Homestead Rights, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr .Lake) 557 (i).
Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils, imported from G.B. in 1904-5-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 1506 (i).
Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Sandy Cove, N.S., Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7829 (iv).
Saskatchewan and Alta., Assurance Fund: *See* 'B. No. 168.'
Saskatchewan Act, May 23rd, 1906, Constitutionality of, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lake) 3435 (ii).
Saskatchewan Power Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 153.'
Saskatchewan Fishing Licenses, Issue of, &.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 351 (i).
Saskatchewan Legislature Acts, Reports *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6400 (iv).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Conditions of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4761 (iii).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9280 (v).
——— Land Grants, Patents, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5801 (iii).
——— Sale of Homestead Lands: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9127 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Stmnt. Read (Mr. Oliver) 10402 (vi).
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 70.'
Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v), 13337 (vii).
Saturday Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11501 (vi).
'Sault Express,' Amounts paid to for Advertising, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 696 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 853, 1129 (i).
Sault Ste Marie Canal Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Port, Farm Produce entered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 898 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Steel Works, Closing of: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 13470 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Sauve, Alfred, Rep. of Investigation *re* Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9278 (v).
Sawmill Owners, Applications refused *re* Timber Cutting: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 557 (i).
School Lands Exchange: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
School Acts, Saskatchewan, Disallowance of: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6644 (iv).
——— Notice of Discussion (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6647 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to adjn., 6854 (iv).
School, Timber and Coal Lands in Man., &c., Average Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3430 (ii).
Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Scotch Hill East, Post Office, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2793 (ii).
Scotch Town Wharf, Application: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7202 (iv).
Scrip received on Account of Lands, Mines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3431 (ii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 3852 (ii).
Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Sec. of State, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 611 (i).
Section 14, Southeast Quarter, Applications for: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Herron) 5476 (iii).
Section 32, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 8383 (v).
Securities of Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
Seed Control Act, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5500 (iii).
Seed Grain in N.W., Distribution to Settlers, Apptmt. of Mr. R. E. A. Leech: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3040 (ii).
Seed Grain, Distribution, Duties of Mr. Leech: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3158 (ii).
Seed Grain, Buying and Distribution. Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420 vii).
——— Charges by Mr. Macdonell, M.P.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 1438 (i).
——— Delegation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 1840 (i).
Seed Grain for N.W. Settlers, Extension of Time for Payment: Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2896; Neg. (Y. 58; N. 98) 2937 (ii).
Seed Grain Distribution, Extension to Unorganized Territories: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 5408 (iii).
——— Distribution to Settlers in N.W.: In Com. of Sup., 2771 (ii).
See 'B. No. 96.'
Seed Grain to N.W. Settlers: M. to Adjn. (Mr. Sifton) 1349 (i).
——— O.C. *re* Advances: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6634 (iv).
——— O.C. amending Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6981 (iv).
——— Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 8185 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 692 (i).
——— Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10121 (v).
Seed Grain Purchases, Apptmt. of Agent in P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 3690 (ii).
——— Purchases from P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 3752 (ii).
——— Purchases from P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 3157 (ii).
Seeds Inspection Act: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vii).
Seed Inspectors, Number of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 352 (i).
Seed Oats purchased in P.E.I., Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 12391 (vii).
——— Incomplete Answer (Mr. Blain) 12551 (vii).
——— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 12661 (vii).
——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Oliver) 13066 (vii).
Seizures of Schooners, B.C., Compensation by Russian Govt.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Selkirk Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Selkirk, Lord, Land Registers and State Papers, Register 'B' *re* Hudson Bay Co., Custody of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1684 (i).
Selkirk Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8547 (v).
Semaphores at Interlocking Plant, London, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 9714 (v).

Semaphores on Railways, Standard Ladder and Posts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 239 (i).
Senate, Cost of outside of Indemnities: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 5087 (iii).
—— Days of Sitting, Cost for 1895 and 1906-7, of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1114 (i).
Senate Reform: Prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1513 (i).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 70 (i).
Senate Salaries and Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 10489 (vi).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimates: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Sessional Paper No. 167b, brought down April 26th: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
Sessional Papers and Returns, Number ordered, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Johnston) 2796 (ii).
—— Number presented, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Johnston) 2592 (ii).
See 'Documents,' &c.
Seven Islands, Public Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
See 'Clarke City.'
Severn River, Improvement of Waterway: in Com .of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Shad Hatchery, Windsor, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 8894 (v).
Sharbot Lake to Carleton Place, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).
Shawenegan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Sheep Quarantine by U.S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 13064 (vii).
—— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Christie) 13537 (vii).
Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).
Shellmouth River Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).
Shepley, Mr. G. F., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1295 (i)
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
—— Militia Corps, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Sherbrooke Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Shipbuilding in Canada: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 2947 (ii).
Shippegan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12027 (vi).
Shipping Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 2, 12, 17, 183, 209.'
Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) on M. for Com. of Sup., 7732 (iv).
Shipping Companies on Pacific Coast, Amounts of Subsidies: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 6919 (iv).
Shipping Master at Quebec, Apptmnt. of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 11699 (vi).
Shipping Rings, Combination *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 5915; Cor. read (Mr. Sproule) 5916 (iii).
Shipping Statistics *re* Tons registered: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2790 (ii) .
Shortt, Prof., Amounts paid *re* Industrial Disputes: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 4765 (iii).
Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Co.: *See* 'B. No. 49.'
Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Co.'s incorp. B. No. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5409; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5445; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5460.
Signal Dues at Halifax: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Signal Service: in Com. of Sup., 5045 (iii).
Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv), 13333 (vii).
Sioux Indians: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
'Sir Wilfrid Laurier' Dredge, Completion, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
Six Nations Indians, Negotiations *re*, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 6242 (iv).
—— Refusal of Inspection of Memorials, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6239 (iv).
Skinner's Cove Boat Channel, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10012 (v).
Skinner's Cove Pier Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Sleeping Car Cos.: *See* 'B. No. 11.'
Slides and Booms Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).
Smith, O., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4765 (iii).
Smith, Wm. B., Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 198.'
Smith, Mr. W. Maxwell, Dom .Fruit Inspector, Salary ,&c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2393 (ii).
—— Cor. *re* Salary: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sproule) 2398 (ii).
—— Occupation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5085 (iii).
Snag Boats on Red River, Construction and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 567. 891 (i).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
Sorel Irregularities, Allegations against Mr Roy: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 8295 (v).
—— Investigation by Mr. Gaudet *re* Irregularities, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6988, 7099 (iv).
—— Irregularities, Final Rep.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10794 (vi).
Sorel Shipyard Pay Lists, Irregularities: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5408 (iii)

Sorel Shipyard Pay Lists, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 5477 (iii).
—— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet *re* Padding: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7938 (iv).
—— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet: laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 8170 (iv).
Sorel Property for Marine Dept., Purchase, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4751 (iii).
Sorel Public Works, Investigations *re* Pay Rolls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4767 (iii).
Soulanges Canal, Claims *re* Accidents, &c.: M. for Reports* (Mr. Boyer) 6239 (iv).
—— Charges against Overseer, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6407 (iv).
—— Comnr. Boyer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12413 (vii).
—— Electric Power, Contract with Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10011 (v).
—— Expenditure *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10513 (vi).
—— Floods, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
—— Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Boyer: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9890 (v).
—— Rep. of Mr. Boyer: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).
Soulanges Canal, Manning & Macdonald's Claims: in Com. of Sup., 5668 (iii).
Souris Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1685 (i).
Souris Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1939 (i).
Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Souris Ry. Wharf, P.E.I., Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2386 (ii).
—— Permission to Build, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7728 (iv).
S.A. Volunteers' Lands Grants Bill: Prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3316 (ii), 11938 (vi).
—— Land Grants to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M S. McCarthy) 563 (i).
—— Land Grants: Remarks (Mr. Herron) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).
—— Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
—— Medals for 3rd Contingent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
—— School Teachers, Recognition of Services by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2791 (ii).
South African Volunteers, Bounty to: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Southampton Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Southern Alberta Land Co., Application *re* Change of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 7729 (iv).
South Huron By-Election, Amounts paid Returning Officer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9270 (v), 11935 (vi).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 16.'
Southvale, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4829 (iii).
Spain, Commander, Expenditure re Wrecks Investigations: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 3150 (ii).
—— Travelling Expenses, Cor. with Aud. Gen.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4405 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 4670
—— Papers *re* Travelling Expenses: Laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 4825 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
—— Statement (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).
Spanish River Dredging, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4764 (iii).
Speakers' Expenses, House of Commons, Comparison, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
Speech from the Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i).
—— Reply (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1584 (i).
'Speedy,' Str., Purchase, Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 565 (i).
—— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3844 (ii).
Spillumcheen River Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Spratte, Hattie, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Springhill Increased Accommodation: in Com of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2391 (ii).
Squatters Claims in Alberta: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
Squatters on Turtle Mountain Forest Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 4739 (iii).
Standard Accident and Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. No. 132.'
Standard Mutual Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 71.'
Standard Plate Glass Ins. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 41.'
Stanley Island Wharf and Pier, &c.: in Com of Sup., 5720 (iii).
'Stanley,' Passenger Accommodation *re* Staterooms: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 687 (i).
Stanstead By-election Papers, Destruction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8087 (iv)
—— Disappearance of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 8839 (v).
—— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com. on Priv. and Elections, 8887 (v).

Statistical Branch, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 10317 (vi)
—— List of Officers: Read (Mr. Graham) 10317 (vi)
Steamboat Inspection Act: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
—— Rep. presented (Mr. Brodeur) 3896 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Steamboat Inspection: *See* 'Canada Shipping Bills.'
Steamship Subsidies and Subventions, Total Amount paid for Five Years, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 853 (i).
Steel Concrete Co., Payments to by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 3850 (ii).
Stellarton Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
Stevenson, Mr. A. W., Chartered Accountant, Amounts paid to by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. White) 3233 (ii).
Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor I.C.R., Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).
Stoney Creek Battleford Monument: in Com of Sup., 13177 (vii).
Stoney Lake Damage Claims: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5565 (iii).
Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5564, 5649, 5786 (iii).
Strathcona Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathcona Horse, Barracks, Stables, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10975 (vi).
Strathcona Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathroy Armoury: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Students of Technology: *See* 'Govt. Works.'
Subsidiary High Court of A. O. F.: *See* 'B. No. 62.'
Subsidies to Rys.: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies.'
Subsidies to Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 215.'
Sub-Target Company, Number ordered, Dates of Order, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 171 (i).
—— Papers referred to Com. of Last Session: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
—— Ref. to Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 312 (i).
See 'Sutherland Rifle Sight,' &c.
Suburban Mail Delivery: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3276 (ii).
Sudbury County Court Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 12413 (vii).
Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Sugar Imports for 1908, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Sugar Manufacture, Regulations *re* Saccharine Standards: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 351 (i).
Summerside Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13343 (vii).
Summerside Harbour and Str. 'Stanley': Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 6160 (iii).
Superannuation and Retirement Acts, Payments under: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7989 (iv).
Supplies for Govt., Apptmt. of Purchasing Commission: Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5802; Neg. (Y. 44; N. 99) 5880; Amt. (Mr. Fielding) 5826, Agreed to (Y. 93; N. 43) 5879; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Blain) 5847, Neg. (Y. 46; N. 90) 5877 (iii).
Supply Bills: *See* 'B. Nos. 94, 136, 186.'
Supply—Changes in Procedure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1884 (i).
—— Conc.: M. (Mr. Fielding) 5499, 5915 (iii).
—— M. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
—— Obstruction *re*, Charges by Govt: on M. for Sup., 9894 (v).
See 'Obstruction.'
SUPPLY:
Committee:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Archives, 671 (i).
Census and Statistics, 673 (i), 12879 (vii).
Exhibitions, 10569 (vi), 12889 (vii).
Experimental Farms, 12549 (vii).
Fruit and Dairying Industry, 10397 (vi).
Fumigation Stations, 12879 (vii).
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibits, 10623
Live Stock Industry, 12894 (vii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act, 12893 (vii).
Patent Record, 672 (i).
Seed Control, &c., 5500 (iii), 12891 (vii).
Year Book, 677 (i).
Charges of Management:
Dom .Notes, 5562 (iii).
Offices of Assistant Receivers General, 12160 (vii).
Civil Government:
Agriculture, 645 (i), 12878 (vii).
Auditor General's Office, 635 (i).
Board of Civil Service Examiners, 12917 (vii).
Customs, 637 (i).
Finance, 637 (i), 5562 (iii), 12914 (vii).
Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 610 (i).
Inland Revenue, 645 (i).
Interior, 616 (i), 9693 (v).
Justice, 5505 (iii), 10396 (vi)
Labour, 12156 (vii).
Marine, 976 (i), 12915 (vii).
Militia and Defence, 611 (i), 8871 (v).
Mines, 646 (i).
Northwest Mounted Police, 8862 (v).
Post Office, 8872 (v).
Printing Bureau, 612 (i).
Privy Council, 610 (i), 12902 (vii).
Public Works, 638, 645 (i), 5698 (iii), 12916 (vii).
Railways and Canals, 10325 (vi), 12755 (vii).
Secretary of State, 611 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 648 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Customs:
Printing, &c., 9577 (v).
Revenue Cruisers, &c., 9578 (v).
Salaries, &c., 9223, 9439 (v).
Salaries, Inspectors of Ports, &c., 9536 (v).
Departments Generally:
Charwomen, 10508 (vi).
Dominion Lands:
Salaries, &c., 10038 (v).
Surveys, &c., 9987 (v).
Dominion Police, 5509 (iii).
Excise:
Methylated Spirits, 820 (i).
Distillery Duty, 814 (i).
Duty collected, Expenses *re*, 817 (i).
Provisional Allowances, 817 (i).
Salaries, &c., 813 (i).
Stamps for Tobacco, 816 (i).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 814 (i).
Fisheries:
Dog Fish, Reduction Works, 13325 (vii).
Protection Service, 13326 (vii).
Salaries to Overseers, &c., 5777 (iii), 12261 (vii).
Geological Survey:
Boring for Oil, &c., 13162 (vii).
Maps, &c., 12260 (vii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Specimens, 12261 (vii).
Govt. of the Northwest Territories:
General Vote, 10116 (v).
Govt. of the Yukon:
General Vote, 10107 (v).
Immigration:
Agents' Salaries, &c., 9769, 9840 (v).
Contingencies, &c., 9948, 9964 (v).
Deporting Immigrants, 9882 (v).
General Expenses, 5751 (iii), 13169 (vii).
Winnipeg Hospital, &c., 9982 (v).
Indians:
British Columbia:
Salaries, 12752 (vii).
Generally:
Destitute Indians, Relief, 5762 (iii).
Printing and Stationery, 5762 (iii).
New Brunswick:
Salaries, 12736, 13170 (vii).
Sioux, 5762 (iii).
Ontario and Quebec:
General Vote, 12729 (vii).
Inspection of Staples:
Salaries, 12264 (vii).
Justice:
Exchequer Court, 5505 (iii).
Printing and Binding, 5508 (iii).
Supreme Court:
Contingencies, 12917 (vii).
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Contingencies, 10502 (vi).
Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, 10508 (vi).
General Vote, 10490 (vi).
Printing and Binding, 10507 (vi).
Salaries, 10501 (vi).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimate, 10503 (vi).
Voters' Lists, 10508 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Legislation—*Con.*
Library of Parliament:
General Vote, 10503 (vi).
Senate:
General Vote, 10489 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 5039 (iii).
Aids to Navigation, 5039, 5773 (iii), 12263 (vii).
Dockyards, Maintenance, 5039 (iii).
Lightship at Point Pelee, 13325 (vii).
Limekiln Crossing, 13323 (vii).
Maintenance and Repairs, 5039 (iii).
Pilotage, Str. 'Eureka,' 5046 (iii).
Pensions to Pilots, 13324 (vii).
Repairs to Lightships, 5039 (iii).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 4755, 5039 (iii), 13323 (vii).
Signal Service, 5045 (iii).
Thunder Bay, Ice Breaking, 5041 (iii).
Wireless Stations, 5045 (iii).
Mail Subsidies:
Can. and Australia, 13152 (vii).
Can. and G. B., 12728 (vii).
Can., Japan and China, 13152 (vii).
General Vote, 12262 (vii).
Marine Hospitals:
Further Amount, 5782 (iii).
Militia:
Annual Drill, 5662, 5732 (iii), 10286 (v), 13176, 13540 (vii).
Battlefields, Monuments, 13177 (vii).
Customs Dues, 5662 (iii), 12155 (vii).
Dominion Arsenal, 12154 (vii).
Gratuity to Caretaker J. Donovan, 13177 (vii).
Gratuity to Mrs. C. D. Murray, 13177 (vii).
Military Properties, Construction, &c., 12148 (vii).
Quebec Cliff Repairs, 12148 (vii).
Ordnance, &c., 12505 (vii).
Pay and Allowances, 12147 (vii).
Provisions, 5662 (iii), 12150 (vii).
Rifle Associations, Grants, 12152 (vii).
Royal Military College, 12152, 13177 (vii).
Salaries and Wages, 12147 (vii).
Warlike Stores, 12149 (vii).
Miscellaneous:
Can. Bank of Commerce, Yukon Services, 13167 (vii).
Chinese Riots, Vancouver, 13155 (vii).
Royal Commission, 13156 (vii).
Civil Service Commission, 13168 (vii).
Cotton Industry, Quebec, Commission, 13156 (vii).
Grant to National Gymnastic Society, 13167 (vii).
Jamaica Earthquake, 5784 iii).
Japanese Riots, B.C., 5783 (iii).
Labour Dept., 12261 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries, Investigation, 13169 (vii).
Mounted Police, Compensation, 8870 (v).
Olympic Games, Can. Representatives, 13167 (vii).
Oriental Labour Question, 13156 (vii).
Park Reservations, 5755 (iii).
Prince Fushimi's Visit, 5783 (iii).
Seed Grain Relief, 2770 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Mounted Police:
General Vote, 8863 (v).
Ocean and River Service:
Ice-breaker for Northumberland Strait, 1885, 1895 (i), 2941 (ii).
Maintenance and Repairs, Ice-breakers, &c., 1033, 1060 (i), 5763 (iii).
Patrolling Northern Waters, 3985 (ii), 4747 (iii).
Wreck Investigations, 3147, 3184, 3195 (ii).
Penitentiaries:
British Columbia, 12918 (vii).
General Vote, 5509, 5522 (iii), 12265 (vii).
St. Vincent de Paul, 12918 (vii).
Pensions:
Rebellion of 1885, *re*, 8870 (v).
Post Office:
Durston, Robt., Apptmt., 5561 (iii).
Mail Service, 5561 (iii).
Miscellaneous, 5562 (iii).
North Bay Office, 13152 (vii).
Salaries and Allowances, 9092 (v).
Public Works—Capital:
Buildings:
Archives, 5700 (iii).
Astronomical Observatory, 1450, 1485 (i).
Eastern Building, 1504 (i).
New Buildings, 1504 (i), 5701 (iii).
Parlt. Buildings, Additions, &c., 1486 (i).
Royal Mint, 1451, 1470 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 1489 (i), 13477 (vii).
Harbours and Rivers:
Manitoba:
St. Andrew's Rapids, 5701 (iii).
Ontario:
Port Arthur, &c., Harbour Improvements, 12144 (vii).
Quebec:
Lake St. Peter Piers, 4752 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Improvements, 12144 (vii).
Sorel Property, 4751 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 5035 (iii).
Dredging Plant, 4754 (iii).
Transportation Facilities:
Georgian Bay to Montreal, Surveys, 12145, 13326 (vii).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, 12146 (vii).
St. Andrew's Rapids, 12145 (vii).
Marine Dept.:
Gratuity to mother of late J. Carbonneau, 13321 (vii).
Public Works—Collection of Revenue:
Graving Docks, Maintenance, 5731 (iii).
Land and Cable Lines, Lower St. Lawrence, 5721 (iii).
Telegraph Lines:
Ashcroft-Dawson, 5731 (iii).
Cape Beale Lines, 5731 (iii).
Operating Expenses, 13178 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia:
Chilliwack, Public Building, 13338 (vii).
Cranbrook, Public Building, 10864 (vi).
Cumberland, Public Buiing, 10864 (vi).
Fernie, Public Building, 5706 (iii), 10866 (vi).
Grand Forks, Public Building, 13338 (vii).
Greenwood, Public Building, 13338 (vii).
Ladysmith, Public Building, 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Quesnel, Public Building, 10867 (vi).
Revelstoke, Public Building, 13339 (vii).
Vancouver, Examining Warehouse, 13339 (vii).
—— Public Building, 10868 (vi).
Vernon, Public Building, 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii).
Victoria, Immigration Building, 10874 (vi).
—— Post Office, 10883 (vi).
Williams Head, Quarantine Station, 10883 (vi).
Generally:
Construction of Armouries, 10886 (vi).
Experimental Farms, 10904 (vi), 13339 (vii).
General Vote, 10886 (vi).
Manitoba:
Brandon, Drill Hall, 8517 (v), 10953, 10974 (vi).
Dauphin Public Building, 8519 (v).
Elmwood, Public Building, 13335 (vii).
Emerson, Public Building, 8534 (v), 13335 (vii).
Neepawa, Public Building, 8536 (v), 13335 (vii).
Portage la Prairie, Public Building, 13336 (vii).
Selkirk, Public Building, 8547 (v).
St. Boniface, Public Building, 8566 (v).
Souris, Public Building, 13336 (vii).
Winnipeg, Examining Warehouse, 8566 (v).
—— Immigration Building, 8573 (v).
Winnipeg, Military Buildings, Hospital, 10955 (vi).
—— Fort Osborne Barracks, 10969 (vi), 13336 (vii).
Winnipeg, Post Office, Land and Building, 8575 (v).
Winnipeg, Postal Station 'B,' 8576 (v).
New Brunswick:
Fairville, Public Building, 13328 (vii).
Fredericton, Military Buildings, 13328 (vii).
Grand Falls, Public Building, 13328 (vii).
Hillsborough, Public Building, 13328 (vii).
Moncton, Armoury, 13328 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
New Brunswick—*Con.*
St. John, 5703 (iii), 7186 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 7187 (iv).
Nova Scotia:
Antigonish, Public Building, 7110 (iv).
Bridgewater, Public Building, 7135 (iv).
Glace Bay, Public Building, 7139 (iv).
Halifax, Dom. Buildings, Repairs, 7140 (iv).
——— Immigrant Building, 7142 (iv).
——— Immigrant Detention Building, 7143 (iv).
——— Military Quarters, 7143 (iv).
——— New Building, 7144 (iv).
——— Quarantine Station, 7171 (iv).
Inverness, Public Building, 7172 (iv).
Lunenburg, Public Building, 13326 (vii).
Parrsborough, Public Building, 13327 (vii).
Shelburne, Public Building, 7173 (iv).
Westville, Public Building, 7179 (iv).
Wolfville, Public Building, 13327 (vii).
Yarmouth, Public Building, 7180 (iv).
Ontario:
Arnprior, Public Building, 7454 (iv).
Belleville Armoury, 7454, 7678 (iv).
Brantford, Public Buildings, 7455 (iv).
Dominion Public Buildings, 7467 (iv).
Glencoe, Public Building, 7473 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Guelph Armoury, 7678 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Hamilton Drill Hall, 7692 (iv).
——— Post Office, 7696 (iv).
Harriston, Public Building, 13331 (vii).
Kincardine, Public Building, 7698 (iv).
Kingston, Military Buildings, 10907 (vi).
——— New Gun Shed, 7700, 7814 (iv).
——— New Guard-house, 7701, 7814 (iv).
——— New Hospital, 7702, 7814 (iv).
——— Royal Military College, 7702 7819 (iv).
——— Royal Military College, Stables, 10907 (vi).
——— New Magazine, 10907 (vi).
Leamington, Public Building, 7701, 7815 (v), 13331 (vii).
Listowel, Public Building, 13331 (vii).
London, Military Buildings, 7705 (iv).
Markham, Public Building, 7709 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Mount Forest, Public Building, 13331 (vii).
Mitchell, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
Niagara Falls, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
North Bay, Public Building, 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii).
Ottawa, Departmental Buildings, Sky-lights, 7816 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Ottawa Post Office, 5705 (iii).
——— Printing Bureau, 7817 (iv).
Owen Sound, Public Building, 7817 (iv).
Parkhill, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
Peterborough, Armoury, 13332 (vii).
Port Arthur, Public Building, 7825 (iv).
Renfrew, Public Building, 7825 (iv).
St. Mary's, Public Building, 7826 (iv).
Sarnia, 7829 (iv), 13332 (vii).
Seaforth, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
Simcoe, Public Building, 7830 (iv), 13333 (vii).
Sudbury, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Tilsonburg, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Uxbridge, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Waterloo, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Walkerville, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Welland, Public Building, 7830 (iv).
Whitby, Public Building, 7833 (iv).
Prince Edward Island:
Georgetown, 7182 (iv).
Quebec:
Arthabaskaville, Public Building, 13329 (vii).
Chicoutimi, Post Office, 7279 (iv).
Cookshire, Post Office, 7281 (iv).
Dominion Public Buildings, 7286 (iv).
Dundee, Custom House, 7286 (iv).
Farnham, Post Office, 7287 (iv).
Grand Mere, Public Building, 13329 (vii).
Grosse Isle, Improvements, 7289 (iv).
Grosse Isle, Disinfecting Apparatus, 7290 (iv).
Joliette, Armoury, 13329 (vii).
Knowlton, Public Building, 7290 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Lachute, Public Building, 7293 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Lake Megantic, Public Building, 7294 (iv).
Lévis, Public Building, 7294 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Longueuil, Public Buiding, 7304 (iv).
Magog, Public Building, 7306 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Marieville, Public Building, 7306 (iv).
Megantic, Public Building, 13329 (vii).
Montreal, Barracks, 7407 (iv).
——— General Post Office, 7410 (iv).
——— Military Buildings, 7418 (iv).
——— New Postal Station, 'B,' 7418 (iv).
——— New Postal Station, Point St. Charles, 5703 (iii), 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii).
——— Eastern Postal Station, 7419 (iv).
——— New Examining Warehouse, 7423 (iv).
Nicolet, Public Building, 7428 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Plessisville, Public Building, 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Quebec Citadel, Drill Shed, 7430 (iv).
——— Governor General's Quarters, 7431 (iv).
——— Drill Hall, 7431 (iv).
——— Examining Warehouse, 7432 (iv).
——— Immigrant Building, 7432 (iv).
——— Immigrant Hospital, 7433 (iv).
——— Military Building, 7434 (iv).
Quebec East, Public Building, 7438 (iv).
Roberval, Public Building, 13330 (vii). (vii).
St. Henri, Post Office, 7439 (iv).
St. Hyacinthe, Public Building, 7440 (iv).
St. Johns, Military Buildings, 7440 (iv).
——— Public Buildings, 7444 (iv).
St. Therese, Public Building, 13330 (vii).
Shawenegan, Public Building, 13330 (vii).
Sherbrooke, Drill Hall, 7439 (iv).
Sherbrooke, Public Building, 13330 (vii).
Three Rivers, New Building, 13330 (vii).
Westmount, Public Buildings, 13330 (vii).
Rents, Repairs, &c.:
Dom. Public Buildings, Rents, 10981 (vi).
Electric Light, &c., 11011 (vi).
Elevator Attendants, 11011 (vi).
Furniture, 11007 (vi).
Grounds, 11012 (vi).
Heating, &c., 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
Immigration Buildings, 11008 (vi).
Major's Hill Park, 11015 (vi).
Post Office, 11007 (vi).
Quarantine Stations, 11008 (vi).
Rideau Hall, 11005 (vi).
Telephones, 5706 (iii), 11012 (vi).
Ventilation, Lighting, &c., 5707 (iii), 10981 (vi).
Yukon Buildings, 11005 (vi).
Saskatchewan and Alberta:
Barracks for Permanent Corps (Strathcona Horse), 10975 (vi).
Battleford, Public Building, 8576 (v).
Calgary, Public Building, 8578 (v).
Edmonton, Public Building, 5705 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii).
Estevan, Land Office, 8581 (v), 13336 (vii).
Humboldt, Public Building, 8582 (v).
Lethbridge, Armoury, 13336 (vii).
Maple Creek, Public Building, 8600 (v), 13337 (vii).
Medicine Hat, Public Building, 8601 (v).
Moose Jaw, Armoury, 13337 (vii)
——— Public Building, 13336 (vii).
Prince Albert, 8601 (v), 13337 (vii).
Regina, Post Office, 8602 (v).
Saskatoon, Public Building, 8602 (v), 13337 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Saskatchewan and Alberta—*Con.*
Strathcona, Buildings, 13338 (vii).
Wetaskiwin, Public Buildings, 13338 (vii).
Yorkton, Public Building, 8603 (v).
Yukon Territory:
Commissioner's Residence, 10883 (vi).
P. O. Building, 13339 (vii).
Dredging:
Mar. Provs., New Plant, 12142 (vii).
Ont. and Quebec, 13351 (vii).
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia:
Spillumcheen River, 13351 (vii).
Thompson River, 13351 (vii).
Manitoba:
Grand Marais Harbour, 12140 (vii).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering Lake, 12141 (vii).
Mar. Provs.:
General Vote, Creosoted Timber, 12028 (vi).
New Brunswick:
Beaver Harbour, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Buctouche, Channel, 11679 (vi).
Campbellton, Wharf, 11685 (vi), 13344 (vii).
Caraquet, Wharf, &c., 11685 (vi).
Dorchester Wharf, Addition, 13344 (vii).
Dover, Wharf, 11692 (vi).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 11693 (vi).
Harvey Bank, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Leonardsville, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Lorneville, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Lower Newcastle, Wharf, 11695 (vii).
Madawaska River, Extension of Dyke, 11696 (vi), 13344 (vii).
Miscou, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Moncton, Wharf, 11696 (vi).
New Mills, Wharf, 13345 (vii).
Richibucto, Extension of Piers, &c., 11698 (vi).
River St. John, including tributaries, 11698 (vi).
River St. John, Wharfs in Tide Water, 12090 (vi), 13345 (vii).
St. Andrews, Harbour Improvements, 12011 (vi).
St. John Harbour, Improvements, 5708 (iii), 12011 (vi).
Shippegan, Harbour, 12027 (vi).
Tracadie, Protection Works, 13349 (vii)
Nova Scotia:
Annapolis Harbour Improvements, 11207 (vi).
Baddeck Wharf, 11219 (vi).
Barachois, Training Pier, 11223 (vi).
Bay St. Lawrence, Harbour, 12224 (vi).
Big Lorraine Harbour, 11224 (vi).
Breton Cove, 11224 (vi).
Cape St. Mary, Breakwater, 11224
Cariboo Island, Causeway, 11224 (vi).
Charlo's Cove, Breakwater, 11225 (vi).
Church Point, 11225 (vi).
Cow Bay (Port Morien) 11225 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Digby, Harbour, 11226 (vi).
Fort Lawrence Wharf—Extension of head block, additional trestle approach, &c., General Vote, 13341 (vii).
Glace Bay, 11223 (vi).
Hall's Harbour, 11228 (vi).
Lake Ainslie, Boat Channel, 11228 (vi).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf, 11229 (vi).
Margaree River, Shear Dams, &c., 11229 (vi).
Middle River (Lower) 11229 (vi).
New Glasgow, Extension of Wharf, 11257 (vi).
Oyster Pond, 11258 (vi).
Parker's Cove, Improvements, 11258 (vi).
Parrsboro', Harbour Improvements, 11259 (vi).
Poirierville, Landing Pier, 11260 (vi).
Porter's Lake, Boat Channel, 11260 (vi).
Port Hastings, Wharf, 11265 (vi).
Port Hilford Breakwater, 11267 (vi).
Port Hood Harbour, 11268 (vi).
Port Joli West, Herring Rocks. Breakwater, 11279 (vi).
Port Royal, Madame Island, Wharf 11278 (vi).
Portuguese Cove, Breakwater, 11279 (vi).
Pugwash, Wharf, 11279 (vi).
Round Hill, Wharf, 11282 (vi).
Scotch Cove Breakwater. 11290 (vi).
Skinner's Cove, Dredging Channel, &c., 11290 (vi).
Sydney Harbour, Wharf, 11230 (vi).
Tancook Island, 11230 (vi).
Tatamagouche Bay,Wharf, 11290 (vi).
Yarmouth Harbour, Improvements, 11291 (vi).
Ontario :
Beaverton, Harbour Improvements, 12090 (vii).
Belle River, Dredging, 12090 (vii).
Blanche River, Improvement, 12090 vii).
Blind River, Dredging, &c., 12091 (vii).
Bronte Dredging, 5708 (iii).
Bronte Harbour, Repairs, 12091 (vii).
Burlington Channel Piers, 12092 (vi).
Chûte à Blondeau,Wharf, 12092 (vii).
Cobourg, Dredging, &c., 12095 (vii).
Colborne, Wharf, 12095 (vi).
Collingwood Harbour, Improvements, 12096 (vii).
Goderich Harbour, Improvements, 12101, 13350 (vii).
Gore's Landing, Wharf, 12101 (vii).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 12101 (vii).
Juniper Island, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Lakefield, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Little Current, 13350 (vii).
McGregor's Creek, 12103 (vii).
Magnetawan River, 13350 (vii).
Meaford Harbour, Improvements, 12103 (vii).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Michipicoten, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Midland and Tiffin Harbours, 5709 (iii), 12103 (vii).
Montreal River, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Petawawa, 12133 (vii).
Peterborough, Steamboat Landing, 12133 (vii).
Point Edward, Dredging, 5713 (iii).
Port Burwell, Improvement to Harbour, 12135 (vii).
Port Hope, Repairs, 12135 (vii).
Port Stanley, Harbour Improvements, 12136 (vii).
Rainy River, Improvements at Long Sault Rapid, 12136 (vii).
Roach's Point, Wharf, 12136 (vii).
Rondeau, Harbour Improvements, 12137 (vii).
Rossport, Wharf, 12137 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Wharf, 12137 (vii).
Severn River, 12137 (vii).
Southampton, Repairs to Chantry Island Breakwaters, 12137 (vii).
Stanley Island, Wharf, 5720 (iii).
Tobermory, Harbour, 13351 (vii).
Toronto Harbour, Improvements, 12137 (vii).
Victoria Harbour, Improvements, 12137 (vii).
Winnipeg River, Improvements, 12138 (vii).
Prince Edward Island :
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 11292 (vi).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf, 11292 (vi).
New London, 11292 (vi).
Rustico Harbour, Breakwater, 11293 (vi).
Souris, Knight's Point, Strengthening Breakwater, &c., 13341 (vii).
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 13343 (vii).
Quebec:
Anse à la Barbe, Breakwater, 12028 (vi).
Anse à l'Ilot, Landing Pier, 12029 (vi).
Baie St. Paul, 12029 (vi).
Barachois de Malbaie, Training Piers, &c., 12029 (vi).
Batiscan, Dredging, 12029 (vi).
Berthier, Wharf, 12029 (vi).
Bic Harbour, Wharf, 12030 (vi).
Cap St. Ignace, Wharf, 12030 (vi).
Chateauguay, Wharf, 12030 (vi).
Chicoutimi Harbour, Improvements, 12030 (vi).
Clarke City, Wharf Improvements, 12031 (vi).
East Templeton, Wharf, 12031 (vi).
Escoumains, Pier, 12031 (vi).
Father Point, Wharf, 12031 (vi).
Grand Méchin, Breakwater, 12031 (vi).
Grand Rivière (Gaspé), Wharf, 12031 (vi).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 12031 (vi).
Lake Aylmer, Wharf, 12032 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Lake Megantic, Piers, 12032 (vi).
Lake St. John Piers, Repairs, &c., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. Francis (Beauce) Wharfs, 12033 (vi).
Lavaltrie Wharf, 12033 (vi).
Les Eboulements, Repairs, 12033 (vi).
Lotbiniere and Portneuf Counties, Government Wharfs, 12033 (vi).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwaters, &c., 12033 (vi).
Malbay (Gaspé) Boat Shelter, 12034 (vi).
Matane Breakwater, &c., 12034 (vi).
Montmagny, Wharf, 12034 (vi).
Nicolet Harbour, 12034 (vi).
Notre Dame du Portage, Wharf, 12034 (vi).
Petite Decharge, Lac St. Jean, 12034 (vi).
Piché Point (Lake Temiskaming) Pile Wharf, 12035 (vi).
Point aux Trembles, Wharf, 12035 (vi).
Rimouski, Wharf Improvements, 12035 (vi).
Rimouski, Dredging Approach, &c., 12035 (vi).
River Ashouapmouchouan, Training Dykes, &c., 12035 (vi).
River Batiscan, Dredging Channel, 12036 (vi).
River Bonaventure, Training Pier, 12036 (vi).
River du Loup (Fraserville) Harbour Improvements, 12036 (vi).
River du Loup (en haut) Dredging, &c., 12036 (vi).
River du Lièvre, Lock and Dam, 12037 (vi).
River Maskinonge, Dredging, 12037 (vi).
River Ouelle, Dredging, 12037 (vi).
River Richelieu, Ice Piers, 12037 (vi).
River Richelieu, Improvements, 12038 (vi).
River Saguenay, Dredging, &c., 12040 (vi).
River St. Francis, Ice Piers, &c., 12040 (vi).
River St. Lawrence, Ice Piers at River St. Jacques, 12041 (vi).
River St. Louis, Improvements, 12040 (vi).
River St. Maurice, Channel between Grandes Piles and La Tuque, 12041 (vi).
River St. Maurice, Dam at Grandes Piles, 12041 (vi).
River Yamaska, Lock, &c., 12041 (vi).
St. Alphonse (de Bagotville) Addition to Wharf, 12041 (vi).
St. Anne des Monts, 12041 (vi).
St. Francois, Island of Orleans, 12042 (vi).
St. Ignace de Loyola, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
St. Jean des Chaillons, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans, 12042 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
St. Laurent, Island of Orleans, 12042 (vi).
St. Omer, Landing Pier, 12042 (vi).
St. Pierre les Becquets, Pile Wharf, 12042 (vi).
St. Siméon, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf, 12042 (vi).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Wharf, 13349 (vii).
Varennes, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
Yamaska River, Dredging, 5708 (iii), 12043 (vi).
Saskatchewan and Alberta:
Lesser Slave River, 5719 (iii), 13351 (vii).
Old Man's River, 12142 (vii).
Miscellaneous:
Architectural Branch, Salaries, 11096 (vi).
Cement Testing Laboratory, 11078 (vi).
Deep Waterways Commission, 11101 (vi).
Gratuity to Mrs. Thos. O'Leary, 5730 (iii).
Engineering Branch, Salaries, 11093 (vi).
Insufficient Appropriations, 11119 (vi).
International Commission, Red River of the North, 11118 (vi).
Monuments to late Sir L. H. Lafontaine, R. Baldwin, 11118 (vi).
Monuments at Brantford *re* Telephone Invention, 11118 (vi).
Surveys, &c., 11071 (vi).
Technical Books, 11100 (vi).
Telegraph Service, Salaries, 11097 (vi).
Temporary Assistance, &c., 11099 (vi).
Roads and Bridges:
Shellmouth Bridge, 12143 (vii).
Telegraph Lines:
General Operating Expenses—
Lower St. Lawrence, &c., 12143 (vii).
Maritime Provs.:
Generally, 5730 (iii).
Quarantine:
Salaries, Public Health, &c., 5504 (iii).
Railways and Canals—
Canals—
Carillon:
Dam. 12768 (vii).
Chambly:
Macadamizing Towpath, 12226 (vii).
Cornwall:
Gate Lifter, 12226 (vii).
Repairs to Bank, 12768 (vii).
Galops:
Generally, 5671 (iii).
Generally, 5696 (iii).
Sunday Work, 13174 (vii).
Lachine:
J. Richard, Loss of Horse, 13174 (vii).
Leak at Lock No. 1, 5672 (iii).
Slope Walls, 5663 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Canals—*Con.*
Lachine—*Con.*
Staff, 5696 (iii).
Walls, 12226 (vii).
Murray:
Houses, 12226 (vii).
Quebec Canals, Steam Road Roller, 12225 (vii).
Rideau:
Generally, 5689 (iii).
Improvements, 12227 (vii).
Sault St. Marie:
Construction, 12223 (vii).
St. Lawrence Canals, District Office, 12225 (vii).
Soulanges:
Improvements, 12225 (vii).
Manning and Macdonald's Claim, 5668 (iii).
Trent:
Construction, 12225 (vii).
Dam at Buckhorn, 12227 (vii).
Improvements, 12227 (vii).
New Lock, &c., Lindsay, 12227 (vii).
Properties, Damages *re* Flooding, 12768 (vii).
Welland:
Dredge Slide in Deep Cut, 5673 (iii).
Electric Lighting, 12195 (vii).
Port Colborne, Improvements, 12211 (vii).
Port Maitland, Entrance, 5673 (iii).
Queenston, St. Bridge, &c., 12207 (vii).
Surveys, 12207 (vii).
To Purchase Boat, 5691 (iii).
Widen Canal, 12210 (vii).
Railways:
Hudson Bay Ry., Surveys, 12704 (vii).
Intercolonial Railway:
Additional Line, Moncton to Truro, Survey, 12760 (vii).
Amherst Improvements, 12233 (vii).
Antigonish, Accommodation, 12229 (vii).
Campbellton, Improvements, 12258 (vii).
Chatham, Improvements, 12757 (vii).
Double Tracking, 12236 (vii).
Fredericton, Improvements, 12758 (vii).
General Vote, 5693 (iii), 10126 (v).
Halifax Accommodation, 5548 (iii), 12227 (vii).
Increased Accommodation, &c., 12259 (vii).
Indiantown and Blackville, Improvements, 12258 (vii).
Machinery for Shops, 12257 (vii).
Moncton Shops, &c., 12250 (vii).
Mulgrave, Improvements, 12229 (vii).
New Glasgow, Accommodation, 12230 (vii).
North Sydney, Improvements, 12229 (vii).
Petit Rocher, Spur Track, 12759 (vii).
Pictou, Accommodation, 12230 (vii).
Rolling Stock, 5549 (iii), 12257 (vii).
St. Cyrille and Drummondville, 12756 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Railways—*Con.*
Intercolonial Railway—*Con.*
St. John, Accommodation, 12257 (vii).
Ste. Rosalie, Improvements, 5558 (iii), 12259 (vii).
Sackville, Improvements, 12235 (vii).
Springhill, Accommodation, 12233 (vii).
Stellarton, Accommodation, 12230 (vii).
Strengthening Bridges, 12259 (vii).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation, 12229 (vii).
Sydney Mines, Extension, 12229, 12759 (vii).
Truro, Accommodation, 12231 (vii).
National Transcontinental Ry.:
Surveys and Construction, 12238, 12728 (vii).
Prince Edward Island Railway:
Hillsborough Bridge, 12762 (vii).
Surveys of Branch Lines, 12764 (vii).
Miscellaneous:
Arbitrations and Awards, 10329 (vi).
Compensation to C.P.R. *re* Right of Way, 5561 (iii).
Extra Clerks, &c., 10342 (vi).
G. T. P. Ry., Inspections, 10390 (vi).
International Congress, Subscription, 10377 (vii).
Legal Expenses, 10357 (vi).
Miscellaneous Works, 10328 (vi).
Ry. Commission, 10361, 10385 (vi).
Ry. Statistics, 10328 (vi).
Remuneration to A. Brunet, 10378 (vi).
Staff and Repairs, 10304 (vi).
Statistical Offices, 10317 (vi).
Surveys, &c., Canals, 10338 (vi).
To provide for Quebec Bridge Plans, 12769 (vii).
Scientific Institutions:
Astronomical Observatory, 9737 (v).
General Vote, 12262 (vii).
Hydrographic Surveys, 13169 (vii).
Steamboat Inspection:
General Vote, 12262 (vii).
Supt. of Insurance:
General Vote, 12160 (vii).
Trade and Commerce:
Chinese Immigration Act, 12264 (vii).
Concurrence:
Assay Office, Vancouver, 13573 (vii).
Geological Survey, Explorations, &c., 13574 (vii).
J. G. Artz, Salary, 13578 (vii).
Mines Branch, Investigation of Ore Deposits, &c., 13569 (vii).
Sessional Clerks, 13577 (vii).
South Lake, N.S., Opening Channel, 13568 (vii).
Telephone Invention, Monument *re*, 13567 (vii).

Supreme Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 121.'
Supreme Court of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Supreme Court, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
——— Registrar's Official Uniform: in Com of Sup. (Mr. Owen) 5507 (iii).

Surveys of Dom. Lands: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Surveys of Public Lands: *See* 'Dom. Lands.'
Surveys, Slides and Booms: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).
Sussex Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9836 (v).
Sussex St. Property Purchase, Payments to Jos. Riopelle, Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3844 (ii). *See* 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
Sutherland Rifle Sight Co. Ltd., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contract *re* Additional Number: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5257 (iii).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
——— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5206 (iii).
——— Number, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 569 (i).
Swamp Lands in Man.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 10105 (v).
Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 693 (i).
——— Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
——— Settlement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Sydney Cement, Quality, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. C. Ross) in Com. of Sup., 11227 (vi).
Sydney Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Sydney Mines, Extension, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
——— Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
Sydney to Sydney Mines, Branch Ry., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7201 (iv).
Synod of the Diocese of Keewatin: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Taché, J. C., Apptmt. in Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8180 (iv).
Tancook Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).
Tatamagouche Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Tatamagouche Dredging, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11701 (vi).
Technical Books of Reference, Public Works Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 11100 (vi).
Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry: Prop. Res. (Mr. Gutherie) 2856 (ii).
——— Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12660 (vii).
Tecumseh Park Breakwater, Dangerous Condition: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 12657 (vii).
Telegraph Branch, P. W. Dept., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11097 (vi).
Telegraph Cos.: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 and 118.'
Telegraph Lines, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
——— Marconi System: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).
——— Operating and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vii).
Telegraphs and Telephones, and Man. Boundaries, Legislation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3042 (ii).
Telegraph, Yukon, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup,. 13178 (vii).
———ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 37 (i).
Telephone Invention, Monument at Brantford: in Com. of Sup., 11118 (vi).
Telephone Rates: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 and 118.'
Telephone Wires, Applications to cross Ry. Tracks: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 690 (i).
Temiskaming Wharf, Montreal River: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Temperance Colonization Society, Land Grants to, Terms of Settlement, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 4774 (iii).
Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. in Yukon: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1126 (i).
Temporary Govt. Loans, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 233 (i). *See* 'Finance,' &c.
Tenders, List of Papers *re* Advertisements: Read (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 7476 (iv).
Tenders, Opening of: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Haggart) 2738 (ii).
Tenders for Public Works, &c.: *See* 'Advertisements.'
Tercentenary at Quebec, Apptmt. of French Canadian Commission: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4770 (iii).
Tercentenary at Quebec: *See* 'Battlefields,' 'Quebec,' &c.
Territories Real Property Act, Payments *re* Land to Alberta and Saskatchewan: prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 7094 (iv).
Teulon Immigration Sheds, Number Cared for: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 892 (i).
Thames River Wharf, Damages to: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 7506 (iv).
Thanksgiving Day, Change from Thursday to Monday: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) 13085 (vii).
Thessalon Post Office, Charges *re* Postmaster: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).
'Thin Red Line': *See* 'Dom. Elections Act.'
Thirteenth Hussars, General Service Medal: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13533 (vii).
Thompson River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Coal Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).

Three Rivers, Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Thunder Bay, Ice-breaking, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5041 (iii).
Tidal Service: in Com. of Sup., 3215 (ii).
Tignish Harbour, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 682 (i).
—— Breakwater Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3229 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Tiffin Harbour Dredging: in Com .of Sup., 5709 (iii).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Tiffin Dredging, Tenders *re* Owen Sound Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8892 (v). *See* 'Midland,' &c.
Tilbury Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).
Tilsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Timber Berths awarded between June, 1904, and July 15th, 1896, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crawford) 3851 (ii).
Timber Berths granted in Man. and N.W.T., Petition by Original Grantees: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2546 (ii).
Timber Berths: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 4833 (iii).
Timber Berth, East Sask., Conditions of Ownership: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3839 (ii).
Timber Berths in Man. and N.W. Ters. under Licenses, Applicants' Names, Amounts paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 852
Timber Berths Nos. 645, &c., Original Tenders, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. McCraney) 4247 (iii).
—— Nos. 652, &c., Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. McCraney) 4589 (iii).
—— Nos. 1031, &c., on Order for Ret.: Amt. (Mr. White) 850 (i).
—— Nos. 1046, &c., Original Applications: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 4247 (iii).
—— Nos. 1048, &c., on Order for Ret.: Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 850 (i).
—— Nos. 1050, &c., Bonuses, Rentals, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 852 (i).
—— No. 1100, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 364 (i).
—— No. 1168, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 363 (i).
—— Nos. 1220-1272: on Order for Ret., Amt. (Mr. Lake) 849 (i).
—— No. 1279, Applications, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
Timber Berths, Opening of Tenders: Ques. of Priv. *re* Speech of Mr. Foster (Mr. Turriff) 11303; Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 11304; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11304 (vi).
Timber Berths, Original Documents: M. for Papers (Mr. Lake) 2855 (ii).
—— Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2856 (ii). *See* 'Documents.'
—— Original Documents: M. for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 2983 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 3318 (ii).
Timber Berths, Par. in Toronto 'News': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff) 5077 (iii).
—— Tenders, &c., Original Documents: M. for Ret. (Mr. White) 2983 (ii).
Timber Berths, &c.: *See* 'Documents, Original.'
Timber Cutting by Sawmill Owners, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2168 (ii).
Timber Lands, Sale to Messrs. Rutherford, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1293 (i).
—— Sale or Lease, subsequent to Ret. of April, 1907: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
Timber Leases *re* Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.: on M. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 8697 (v).
Timber Licenses, Applications to Mr. Mackenzie's Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 3242 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3038 (ii).
Timber Licenses cancelled from May, 1905, to Nov., 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 181 (i).
Timber Licenses, Conditions and Forms in force at present: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 359 (i).
—— Grants to Messrs. McLeod, Lundy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 236 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1739 (i).
Timber Licenses in Manitoba and N. W. Ters., Renewal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 691 (i).
—— during 1896-7: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2396 (ii).
—— Man., Sask. and Alberta, Renewals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1127 (i).
—— Renewals in N. W., Number of Miles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 181 (i).
Timber Limits, Application of Mr. Gentles: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7100 (iv).
—— Denial *re* Application (Mr. Taylor) 7100 (iv).
Timber Limits, Applications, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Talbot) 3578 (ii).
Timber Limits, Leasing, Alienation, &c., Com. of Investigation *re*: Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2269, 2310, 2466, 2595; Amt. neg. (Y. 55; N. 111) 2736 (ii).
Timber Limits, Statement quoted by Mr. Turriff: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2386 (ii).
Timber Limits: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3580 (ii).
Timber Marking Act Amt: *See* 'B. No. 193.'
Timber Permits to Settlers, *re* Cutting in Twp. 39, Range 11: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11495

Timber Permits to Sawmill Owners, O.C. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 179 (i).
Timber Sales to Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.: Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8751 (Amt.) 8778; Neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 8833 (v).
Timber Sales, &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Burrows) *re* Par. in Winnipeg 'Telegram,' 9023 (v).
Tobacco Customs Seizure at Charlottetown, Penalties, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2982 (ii).
Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Tobacco Excise Taxes, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 566 (i).
Tobacco, Foreign, Total Amount of Refund, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 4402 (iii).
Tobacco Industry, Amt. to Inland Revenue Act, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Dubeau) 178 (i).
Tobacco Manufacturers, in Mar. Provs., Amounts of Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 363 (i).
Tobacco Manufacturers in P.E.I., Violation of Inland Revenue Act: Cor. read (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9237 (v).
—— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9514 (v).
Tobacco, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. No. 173.'
Tobacco Prohibition, Res. from Moral Reform Associations: Remarks (Mr. Telford) 11302 (vi).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, Pets., &c., *re* Amt. to Inland Rev. Act: M. for Copies (Mr. Dubeau) 899 (i).
Tobacco Resolutions: in Com. on Ways and Means, 6118 (iii).
Tobacco Stamps, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
Tobacco Stamps for Imports, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 816 (i).
Tobermory Harbour Booms: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Tobique Manufacturing Co.: *See* 'B. No. 8.'
Toll Gates upon Island of Montreal, Abolition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3299 (ii).
See 'Montreal Turnpike,' &c.
Toney River Boat Harbour, Amount of Contract, Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9711 (v).
Toronto and Schomberg Ry. Blockade: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3901 (ii).
Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7203 (iv).
Toronto (eastern gap) Harbour, Amount of Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 354 (i).
—— Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 10014 (v).
—— Date of Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1507 (i).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
Toronto (western gap) Harbour, Construction of Entrance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 354,518 (i).
—— Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4587 (iii).
—— Delay in Contract: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 5915 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Toronto Harbour Life Saving Station, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4586 (iii).
Toronto Island Tunnel, Deputation *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5564 (iii).
Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2594 (ii).
Torrens Land Title Fund, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10916 (vi).
Townsend, Arthur James, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 196.'
Townsend Whaling Licenses: *See* 'Whaling.'
Town Site Property, Section 32, Public Works, &c., *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1125 (i).
Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5472 (iii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, Laundry, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
Tracadie Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
Trade and Commerce, Agents' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).
—— Chinese Act: in Com. of Sup., 12264 (vii).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i), (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5199 (iii).
Trade and Nav. Returns: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 7 (i).
Trading Stamps: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Trans.-Canada Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 107.'
Transcontinental Ry. Commission, Expenses in Salaries, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13517 (vii).
Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners' Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
See 'G.T.P.,' &c.
Transportation Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).
—— Georgian Bay Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12145, 13326 (vii).
Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9476 (v).
Trap-Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7204 (iv).
Travellers Life Assurance Co. of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 35.'
Travelling Expenses, Minister of Marine at Colonial Conference: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 985; (Mr. Foster) 998 (i).
—— ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3985 (ii).

Travelling Expenses, Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 562 (i).
See 'Colonial Conference.'
Treasury Board: in Com. of Sup., 5562 (iii).
Treaty-Making Power, Status of Canada: Notice of Motion (Mr. Thompson) 3172 (ii).
Trent Bridge Post Office, Re-opening of: Remarks (Mr .Owen) 609 (i).
Trent Canal, Bradford Canal, Building of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 13476 (vii).
——— Buckhorn Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
——— Cameron Lake Water Levels, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9772 (v).
——— Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
——— Clearing of Logs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com .of Sup., 10310 (vi).
——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
——— Contracts, Deposits, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1734 (i).
——— Damages *re* Floods: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
——— Engineers Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6925 (iv).
——— Extension from Balsam Lake to Gull River, Reps., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2991 (ii).
——— Holland River Dredging Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
——— Holland River Extension: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11939 (vi).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
——— Lindsay Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
——— Surveys: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 10338 (vi).
——— Surveys, Reports *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6988 (iv).
——— Tributary Works, Completion of Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1115 (i).
——— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).
Trois Pistoles Station, I.C.R., Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 12652 (vii).
Trueman, Mr., and N.B. Cold Storage Co.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 9343 (v).
Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3429 (ii).
Truro Inreased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12231 (vii).
Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3480 (ii).
Trust Funds: *See* 'Colonial Securities.'
Tuberculin Tests, Results of: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 9270 (v).
Turgeon, Hon. A., Apptmt. to the Senate: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7935 (iv).
Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve, Preservation of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) on M. for Sup., 7647 (iv).
Two-Cent-a-Mile Rate: *See* 'B. No. 11.'
Under-Secretaries of State, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 25 (i).
U.S., Treaties with: *See* 'Anglo-American,' &c.
U.S. Warships on Great Lakes, Inquiry *re* Armaments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7502 (iv).
U.S. Warships passing through Canadian Canals: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5338 (iii).
——— Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5788 (iii).
——— O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 5800 (iii).
Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 8616 (v).
Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (viii).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Vacancy in Stanstead, Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 569 (i).
Vacant Land Reservation, Instructions to Agents *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1935 (i).
Valleyfield Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv), 10892 (vi).
Valleyfield, Clock in Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7115 (iv).
Valleyfield Floods on Lake St. Francis, Damage, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 7996 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).
Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 11297 (vi).
Valleyfield Regiment, Organization of, Cor., &c., *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Vancouver Bank: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Vancouver Bank incorp. B. No. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) on Order for 2°: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 779 (i).
Vancouver Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (viii).
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Vancouver, New Westminster and Yukon Bridge Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13308 (viii).
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10868 (vi).
Varennes Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
Vaudreuil County, Dredging. Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Vautelet, Mr., Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).

Venoit, Mr., Collector of Customs at Bathurst, N.B., Political Interference: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6406, 7730 (iv).
Ventilation of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vii).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa".
Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii).
Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5471 (iii).
Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 356 (i).
Victoria Beach Piers, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237 (i).
Victoria Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
——— Tenders for Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8893 (v).
Victoria Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 10874 (vi).
Victoria Memorial Museum: in Com. of Sup., 1489 (i), 13477 (vii).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Victoria Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
'Victor' Tug, Repairs to by Govt.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 9774 (v).
'Vigilant' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 682 (i).
Votes and Proceedings, Correction in Names of Clerks: (Mr. Bergeron) 13066 (vii).
Walker, Andrew, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Walkerville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Wallace, Michael J., Emplymt. in Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7500 (iv).
Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contract *re* Cement, Patent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3230 (ii).
——— Contracts with Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3843 (ii).
——— Contracts with Steel Concrete Co., Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3842 (ii).
——— Payments to by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5085 (iii).
——— Purchase of Cement for Heath Point Works: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 4773 (iii).
Warlike and Other Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 12149 (vii).
Washington Fisheries Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1732 (i).
Washington Treaty and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2165 (ii).
Water Carriage of Goods: *See* 'B. No. 178.'
Water Carriage of Goods: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 13416 (vii).
Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 195.'
Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Water Mains across Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Water Power Privileges in Alberta, Sale or Lease of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8378 (v).
Watson, Mr., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Election Frauds: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 6848 (iv).
See 'Cassels.'
Waugh and Perrin, Immigration Agents, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Waugh, James, Immigration Agent, Refund to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4765 (iii).
See 'Immigration.'
Ways and Means—The Budget—Financial Statement, 5137 (iii).
——— For Debate: *See* 'Budget.'
Ways and Means: M. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
——— in Com on Tobacco Resolutions, 6118 (iii).
Weapons, Carrying of: *See* 'B. Nos. 65, 78 & 93.'
Weather Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'
Wednesday Evening Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).
Welchpool, N.B., Wharf, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7935 (iv).
Welland Canal, Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
——— Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
——— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
——— Deepening, Estimated Cost: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 10311 (vi).
——— Dredging Deep Cut Slide: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
——— Electric Lighting, Power Plant: in Com. of Sup., 12195 (vii).
——— Feeder, Rep. of Judge Madden *re* Investigation: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lalor) 852 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 174 (i).
——— Piers and Bridges at Queenston Heights: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
——— Widening: in Com. of Sup., 12210 (vii).
Welland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
Western Block Extension, Total Cost, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
Western Rifle Associations, Pet. *re* Govt. Grant: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).
Western Rivers Improvement Co.: *See* 'B. No. 55.'
West Indian Trade, Reciprocity Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1860 (i).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
West Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 24.'
Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Alarms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9274 (v)

Westville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7179 (iv).
——— Total Amount of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9474 (v).
Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c.: M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10259 (v).
Whaling Licenses, B.C., Moneys Due, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5996 (iii).
Wharfage Dues in Soulanges County, Amounts received, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9276 (v).
Wharfs and Bridges in Quebec, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Wharfs, Piers, Amount of Revenue collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2391 (ii).
——— Harbours Expenditure since 1895: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5078 (iii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 5476 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 5800, 5802 (iii).
Wharfs, Piers, &c., and other Public Works, Expenditure since Jan. 1st, 1897, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L .Borden) 1130 (i).
——— and Revenues Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4867 (iii).
Whisky, Illegal Distribution of in Thetford Mines: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 9894 (v).
See 'Yukon.'
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).
White Head Wharf, Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Whitehorse Townsite, Portions sold and retained, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11496 (vi).
White Pass Ry. Co., Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 10736 (vi).
Wheat Frozen in Shipping from Man., &c.: M. to adjn. House (Mr. Blain) 825 (i).
Wheat Shipments, Feed, Special Arrangements with Ry. Cos.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 893 (i).
Wheat Transportation, Financial Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1938 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 173 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Foster) for copies of Memorials, &c., 899 (i), 2173 (ii).
——— Negotiations with Banks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 171 (i).
See 'Grain,' 'Finance,' &c.
Wiarton Dredging, Payments to Mr. Bowman: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6407 (iv).
——— Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6236 (iv).
Wilberforce Dam, Obstructions to Traffic, Cor., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2988 (ii).
Wiley, Mrs. Louise, Claims against Mr. Congdon, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
See 'Yukon.'
William's Head Quarantine Station Building: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Williams, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2388 (ii).
Willson, T. L., Payments *re* Ottawa Carbide Co.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11498 (vi).
Wilson Cordage Co., Cor., Accounts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Clements) 1129 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. A. Smith: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).
Winding-Up Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 95, 102, 144.'
Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 108.'
Windsor, Detroit and Belle Isle Ferry Co., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Clements) 1131 (i).
——— Expiration of Franchise: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1940 (i).
Windsor Pump and Foundry Co., Ltd., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
Winfield Basin Dredging, Tender, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6461 (iv).
Winnipeg Bank: *See* 'B .No. 19.'
Winnipeg Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
——— Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8573 (v).
——— Military Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
——— Military Building: in Com. of Sup., 10969 (vi).
——— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 10955 (vi).
——— Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8575 (v).
Winnipeg River, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 9982 (v).
Winnipegosis Lake, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 3216
See 'P.E.I.'
Wireless Tel. Stations on Pacific Coast, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Wireless Stations, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5045 (iii).
See 'Marconi.'
Wires Across Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Women's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Wood, Mr. David, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 568 (i).
Wood and Pulp Industry, Preservation of: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 7449 (iv).
See 'Pulp.'

Woodstock Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com .of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster C. L. Smith, Interference in Elections: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 2886 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2794 (ii).
Woollen Industry, Deputations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) 13082 (vii).
—— Legislation *re* Relief: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 12772 (vii).
—— Number of Employees, Value of Output, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7504 (iv).
—— Reply to Manufacturers' Ass'cn. by Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420, 13518 (vii).
—— Specific Duty: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 6988 (iv).
Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada: Ques. (Mr .Stanfield) 5201 (iii).
Wrecks, Investigations: in Com. of Sup., 3147, 3184, 3195 (ii).
Wrecking Plant Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 3221 (ii).
Writs of Elections: *See* 'B .No. 66.'
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12043 (vi).
Yamaska River Lock: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11291 (vi).
—— Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11500 (vi).
Yarmouth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7180 (iv).
Year Book: in Com. of Sup., 677 (i).
Yeomans, Indian Agent, Complaints by John Franklin, &c., Letters *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Knowles) 1513 (i).
York, Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1018 (i).
Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1127 (i).
Yukon Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 169.'
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 150.'

YUKON:
Bank of Commerce Compensation: in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vii).
Boyle Concession, Memorials from Dawson Legislature: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 509, 562, 681 (i).
Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5474 (iii).
Buildings, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11005 (vi).
Clements. Mr. W. H. P., Services in Yukon, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
—— O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sproule) 5801 (iii).

YUKON—*Con.*
Commissioner's Residence, Dawson: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Concession Cases, Appeal from Supreme Court, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 10301 (v).
Charges against Administrators, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 1690 (i), 2170 (ii).
Charges of Dr. Pringle *re* Immorality, &c.: (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 9580 (v).
Congdon, Mr. F. T., Instruction *re* Trust Estates: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12413 (vii).
—— Investigation *re* Estates and Trusts: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12050 (vii).
—— Reply from Yukon: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420, 13518 (vii).
—— Stmnt. *re* Estates Administration: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10111 (v).
Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 565 (i).
—— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 841 (i).
—— Amt. (Mr. Foster) *re* Ret., 1691 (i).
See 'Wiley,' &c.
Corruption Charges in Public Officials, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
—— Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5785 (iii).
Elections Conspiracy, Cor., &c., *re* Trial: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
Expenditures, Total Amount: Remarks *re* Question (Mr .Foster) 1128 (i).
Financial Administration, Rep. of Mr. Beddoe: M. for Copy* (Mr. Foster) 1132 (i).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 6464 (iv).
See 'Revenue.'
Finnie, Mr. O. S., Investigation *re* Charges, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Thompson) 1513 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Thompson) 4316 (iii).
Freight Rates, Rep. of Ry. Commissioners *re*: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 894 (i).
Girouard, J. E., Resignation from Yukon Council: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11938 (vi).
Gold Commissioner's Office, Number of Clerks, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).
Gold Cos., Holdings by Guggenheims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7725 (iv).
Govt. Officials, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10107 (v).
Judges' Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11123 (vi).
Liquor Permits, Agents, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1127 (i).
—— Corrected Answer (Mr. Oliver) 5048 (iii).
Lithgow, J. V., Girouard, J. E., and F. F. Congdon, Emplymt. by Govt., Date of Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5995 (iii).

YUKON—*Con.*
Mail Service: Complaints *re* (Mr. Thompson) 2022 (ii).
Mail Service during Winter: Remarks (Mr. Thompson) 5136 (iii).
Mining Regulations published in 'Yukon World and Official Gazette': M. for Copy* (Mr. Lennox) 5801 (iii).
Money Transmission, Rates *re*: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 2979 (ii).
Morality Charges, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Thompson) 1513 (i).
—— inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10303, (vi).
—— Letter of Rev. Dr. Shearer, Inquiry for (Mr. Sproule) 10689, 11016 (vi).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10303, 11122 (vi).
Placer Claims, Renewals by Gold Commissioner, Fees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4245, 4588 (iii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 4589 (iii).
Placer Mining Act, Grants *re*, Claims, Names, &c., for one year: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 698 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*
Revenue and Expenditure from March 31st to June 30, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1114, 1346 (i).
See 'Finance.'
Sunday Observance Law, Instructions to N.W.M.P. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 565 (i).
Telegraph Service to Prince Rupert, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Telegraph System, Receipts and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
—— Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vii).
Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Gobt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1126 (i).
White Horse Ter., Original Grants of Land, Names, &c.: M .for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2796 (ii).
Wiley, Mrs. Louise, Claims against Mr. Congdon, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
See 'Congdon.'
Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1127 (i).