

the leader of the government or the head of the department concerned, such explanation as he may think necessary to give.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to bring to the attention of the government the fact that the documents which have been printed, purporting to be a return to an address of the House of Commons dated the 11th May, 1902, for copies of all Orders in Council and other documents having reference to the granting of provincial autonomy to the North-west Territories, are extremely defective. I had procured a number of prints of these documents from Regina, and, doing the work of a clerk this morning, I compared them with the return which has been brought down, and I found that a very great number of the documents have not been brought down, or at least have not been printed. In order to show my right hon. friend how very incomplete is the return as printed, I will read a list of the documents which have not been included in it, some of which are of no great importance, but others of which are of the greatest possible importance for the purpose of an intelligent discussion of this question. I may say that one or two of the documents which I have included in the list, while not directly referring to the question of provincial autonomy, are nevertheless in answer to correspondence which does touch that question as well as the question of better financial terms; and these, I think, ought to be brought down, because they are part of the consecutive correspondence dealing with these matters. The letters which have been omitted, which I had to take from a number of documents and therefore have not them arranged in chronological order, are as follows: January 31, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; February 11, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; February 9, 1903, Mr. McGee to Mr. Haultain; February 16, 1903, Mr. Keys to Mr. Haultain; March 19, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; March 21, 1903, Mr. Sifton to Mr. Haultain; April 15, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; December 17, 1902, Mr. A. L. Sifton to Mr. Clifford Sifton; February 5, 1903, Mr. Sifton to Mr. Haultain; February 11, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; February 21, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; April 16, 1903, Mr. Fielding to Mr. Haultain; April 17, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Fielding; April 20, 1903, Mr. Fielding to Mr. Haultain; April 20, 1903, Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. Haultain; April 20, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Fielding; April 24, 1903, Lieut.-Gov. Forget of the North-west Territories to the Secretary of State, inclosing an address; June 2, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Sir Wilfrid Laurier; June 6, 1903, Mr. Fielding to Mr. Haultain; June 15, 1903, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Fielding; July 25, 1903, Mr. Pelletier, acting Under Secretary of

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

State to Lieut.-Gov. Forget; January 30, 1901, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; March 21, 1901, Mr. Sifton to Mr. Haultain; March 30, 1901, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; April 5, 1901, Mr. Sifton to Mr. Haultain; June 4, 1901, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; June 5, 1901, Mr. Sifton to Mr. Haultain; August 11, 1901, Mr. A. L. Sifton to Mr. Clifford Sifton; August 14, 1901, Mr. Clifford Sifton to Mr. A. L. Sifton; January 11, 1902, A. L. Sifton to Sir Wilfrid Laurier; January 22, 1902, Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. A. L. Sifton; March 15, 1902, Mr. Haultain to Sir Wilfrid Laurier; March 18, 1902, Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. Haultain; March 27, 1902, Mr. Sifton to Mr. Haultain; April 2, 1902, Mr. Haultain to Mr. Sifton; April 29, 1903, Mr. Pelletier, acting Under Secretary of State, to Lieut.-Gov. Forget. I thought it would be desirable to read this long list in order to indicate to my right hon. friend how very defective is the return which has been brought down and printed. I recollect that at the time the papers were first brought down, the right hon. gentleman mentioned to the House that there would be some other papers. Possibly these have not yet been prepared; but might I be permitted to suggest that, in bringing down correspondence of this kind, it would greatly diminish the labour of members who desire to deal with important subjects of this character, if the documents could be printed in chronological order, beginning with the documents, of an earlier date. That has not been done in this case, and if we have another return printed, with the documents that I have mentioned, I am afraid that the matter will be in rather a confused condition. Possibly it would be advisable to have these documents arranged in chronological order, if it would not take too long, and printed, so as to have them in an intelligible form before the House. The correspondence is quite voluminous, and it will be difficult to gather its bearings unless we have it in that form.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I think that some part of the difficulty arises from the fact that my hon. friend's remarks dealt with two subjects, which probably the officials who prepared the return did not associate together, although they do in some respects touch each other. My hon. friend's remarks had relation to the question of provincial autonomy, and he has mentioned some correspondence which took place between Mr. Haultain and myself which has not been brought down. I had no correspondence whatever with Mr. Haultain on the question of provincial autonomy. I did have correspondence with him with respect to the grants to the North-west Territories, and I quite admit that the two questions touch each other, though they are distinct from each other, and I think that may be the explanation of the absence of these documents.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That explains two or three of these documents, but not all. Two or three communications, principally telegrams, passed between Mr. Haultain and the Minister of Finance. I referred to those in mentioning that some of the documents contained no reference to provincial autonomy. But there are a great many other documents not brought down which refer to provincial autonomy, although they may refer principally to better terms. Some of those omitted relate entirely to the question of provincial autonomy.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). When I brought down this return I stated that something more would have to come. I note that some correspondence subsequent to the date of my hon. friend's motion is not included, but I will have this brought down. Would my hon. friend be kind enough to let me have the list he has just read?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am afraid that it is not legible to any one but myself, but I will have a copy made.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will be in 'Hansard,' and can be got there.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to bring to the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior the fact that he promised to bring down a return which had been moved for by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche). I do not know whether it has been brought down or not, but I have not seen it. When we were proceeding with the estimates a few days ago, the hon. gentleman said that it would be brought down the next day or the day following. He said also that he would bring down certain information with regard to the lands still obtainable in the organized territories for homestead entries.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). I gave instructions to have the return referred to by the hon. gentleman brought down and expected to have it this morning. It is, however, being attended to. As to the lands, I gave a statement, but my hon. friend was not here at the time. You will find it in 'Hansard.'

Mr. LANCASTER. I desire to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Marine to a return ordered the 1st of June for correspondence with regard to fishing rights in James Bay. When may we expect this return?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It must be in the hands of the Secretary of State, because I sent him the papers a long time ago.

THE COLUMBIA RIVER IMPROVEMENT COMPANY.

On the Order for:

The second reading of the amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 150, to incorporate the Columbia River Improvement Company, Limited.

Mr. GALLIHER moved that the said amendment be amended by striking out the words 'section seven' in the second amendment and inserting instead thereof 'sections seven and eight.' He said: It is inexpedient to include section seven unless section eight is also included, as section eight covers waters not mentioned in section seven. The Senate, in section fourteen, proposed the following amendment: After the word 'operate,' in the first line, they wish to insert 'on the waters mentioned in section 7 hereof.' That would make the section read: 'The company may acquire and operate, on the waters mentioned in section 7 hereof, the works of any company having powers wholly or in part similar to the powers of the company.' Now, that would only give this company the privilege of acquiring the works of other companies at a point on the shores of Upper Arrow lake, or at a point on Upper Arrow lake where the Columbia river enters it, but would not give the powers which they require of acquiring works of other companies that might construct works upon the Columbia river above Upper Arrow lake or upon navigable tributaries of the Columbia river. Evidently the Senate did not notice that there were different points asked for as covered in section 7 and section 8. By inserting the words 'sections 7 and 8' we cover the waters mentioned in these sections, and the company would acquire what they really ask for and what is necessary in their interest.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand, then, that in this section, as it was at first the provision was general, but the Senate has limited it to the point referred to in section 7. Section 8 is a companion section to section 7, and, if it is restricted, you should refer to both these sections.

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes, that is it.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

CENSUS SCHEDULES, 1891, HALTON, CARDWELL AND PEEL.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

How many schedules were filled in, either in the counties of Halton, Cardwell and Peel in whole or in part, by the census enumerators for 1891?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). The number of schedules filled in, either in whole or in part