

and I think I am right in the position which I have taken. It is a question as to whether or not I was right in the judgment which I exercised in the matter, but the charge which is made is a different thing, and it is a more serious matter. If there has been any official in the department who has given out that information, and it is known, either by the back or the front door, and if my hon. friend from Algoma has any information in respect to any official doing that in violation of his instructions, I think it is due to me, due to the department, due to all concerned and due to the public, who have confidence in the officials of the Department of Railways and Canals, that he should give me, either publicly in this House or privately, the information as to who the man is or who the men are.

Mr. HAGGART. Just one word.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me? I think the discussion has been running out of order. Several hon. gentlemen have spoken twice on each side, and those who have spoken before will not have an opportunity again unless with the permission of the House. The motion is that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. OSLER. Mr. Speaker, just one word. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) states that these plans were at least one day deposited in the ordinary manner and treated as ordinary plans. He says that he thinks it was the morning following that on which they were deposited that he gave instructions to have them sealed up. It is six months nearly since they were deposited, and the hon. minister's memory may be quite astray within a day or two, and it is quite possible the plans were kept in the department in the ordinary way for two or three days before his instructions were given.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend pardon me for just a moment? I have the right to assume that when Mr. Schreiber asked me that question he had not previously to that moment shown any one these plans; else, why would he come and ask me?

Mr. FOSTER. Nobody suggests that he did.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes; that is the suggestion which has been made.

Mr. OSLER. I assume that they were deposited in the office in the ordinary manner, and it is exceedingly likely that all sorts of people would want to see these plans. I fancy it is a common occurrence that people want to see plans the moment they are filed in the department, and if they were deposited in the ordinary way in the minister's office for three or four days, or it might be longer, it is more than likely that these plans were seen.

Motion (Mr. Boyce) to adjourn, negatived.

## PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he can give any information to the House as to the probable date at which the second reading of the Autonomy Bill will be taken up?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not this day, but I think I can inform the House early next week.

## SUPPLY—MUNICIPAL TAXATION, C. P. R. LINES.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I wish to direct the attention of the House to a very important judgment delivered recently by the Supreme Court of Canada. The court pronounced on the contention of the western municipalities that the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway were subject to municipal taxation, and the holding was absolutely against the municipalities in that respect. I would suggest to the Prime Minister that when he is preparing any more measures dealing with territorial autonomy he should have this judgment before him, because there are laid down in it certain very important interpretations of the constitution. It is well also that the general public should become acquainted with those interpretations in view of other questions which will be discussed in this House, and I therefore ask the Prime Minister to have the judgment of the Supreme Court printed. From the copy of the decision I have been able to get, I read these extracts from words of the chief justice speaking the unanimous opinion of the court.

I am unable for myself to reach the conclusion that the principles with regard to legislation generally and specially with regard to India laid down in the *Burah* case have or can have any application to the special tentative and uncertain powers of legislation which were vested in the Lieutenant Governor in Council or by and with the advice of the assembly for the Northwest Territories in 1881.

Further he says:

Reliance was placed in the judgment below and in the argument before us upon the education clauses of the Territories Act of 1880, section 10, as the section was originally enacted in 1875 and re-enacted in the Consolidating Act of 1880, its operation was expressly made contingent upon a system of taxation having been first adopted in the district. That limitation upon the operation of the section was, it is true, abolished in 1885 by parliament (48-49 Vic., cap. 51), but when the latter statute was passed the Northwest Territories Council had already in 1883 and 1884 passed ordinances introducing systems of taxation for municipalities and school districts throughout the territories, and the words of limitation were no longer neces-