

Hon. Mr. POPE—Are those three men the only men we are paying?

Hon. Mr. TALBOT—I think there were only four summoned here—so the Chairman told me. The others were down here with reference to the Grain Bill. That was the object of their coming here.

Hon. Mr. POPE—I should like to say, as a member of that committee, that when it was decided that these men should be sent for and this expense incurred, why should I not have been informed that they were summoned, when we had a meeting three or four days before they appeared; they had been summoned days before that; Why should I not have been notified, instead of the committee holding this closed door proceeding, as it were. I have watched the proceedings from beginning to end. Whether it is intentional or unintentional—I do not wish to impugn the character of any gentleman on that committee—I want to tell the House that the conduct of that committee has not been fair, has not been above board for many days. If the object was to get information on one side, and to carry out that object by printing the evidence and sending it broadcast to the people in the country, I can see very clearly why we were dodging around the post, and the evidence of the fact of the case was being kept from many of us who were members of that committee. It was apparent. There was a plot, a scheme, which is now to be carried out by this House printing this imperfect evidence, one side of the case only—not even half the case completed. There is no question about it, we are not going to rest with the evidence simply from three or four provinces of the west.

They are going to have the other side of the political question from ocean to ocean before this matter is completed, and then on the other side there will be evidence called from ocean to ocean; when that has been done it will be time for the publication of the evidence and not before. I protest, as a minority member of that committee, first to these men being called without the committee being made acquainted with the men that were going to be called and then when they were called

that we did not have a proper notice as to who was coming to give evidence in order that we might have had the same number of men on one side as the other. I say it is not fair to have this evidence published and sent broadcast throughout the land. I take that position and I desire to enter my protest against the conduct of this matter in the committee and in the House.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN—We might as well come to a conclusion. We have been discussing this matter for over an hour and now we have discovered that the evidence has been printed every day after each meeting and the printed copies are on the Table of the House.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR—Let it stay there until next year.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN—We have been an hour and a half discussing as to whether the evidence will be printed or not.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The evidence may be on the Table but nobody has seen it.

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—I think that under the circumstances one copy of that report would be sufficient for each senator and each member of the House of Commons. My office is stuffed full of printed matter that is of no use to anybody. I move that the report be amended by striking out the word 'ten' and inserting the word 'one' and that one copy be sent to each member of the Senate and the House of Commons.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—I think this has been a most miserable and paltry discussion. This report is in the hands of the press already. The meetings of this committee were held with open doors and there was no objection to the press having the entire report. As a matter of fact it is now in the hands of the public. It is actually on the table of the House and I think it is a paltry thing to reduce the number of copies from ten to one. Although we were not in attendance at the committee we are entitled to copies of the evidence and why should we not have twenty copies if we want them.