

Mr. INGRAM. I bring forward the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) as a witness. Does he dispute his own statement?

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not say that no one should be there. The point I was making was that these men should not be there, conveying the idea that other men should be in their places.

Mr. INGRAM. And that the wrong men were there, and too many of them were there, and that is what the hon. gentleman was objecting to. And the right class of men, I fancy, were not there.

Mr. EMMERSON. There should be men there who were not traitors to the minister. My point was that the minister was surrounded at that time by men who were traitors to him and traitors to the railway. They are not there now.

Mr. INGRAM. My hon. friend is getting on to dangerous ground. I think he took a trip once to Moncton himself, and that was not the act of a loyal man.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What does the minister mean by traitor?

Mr. INGRAM. What the hon. gentleman means by a traitor is a man who leaves the city of Ottawa and goes down to Moncton and induces another man to steal a memorandum which he gives to the hon. gentleman. So the hon. gentleman can come back to Ottawa and pretend to be in sympathy with the Minister of Railways and yet be able to hold a club over his head in the shape of this memorandum. Is that the class of men he wants to surround the Minister of Railways and Canals? Then there was the question of the ties. It is a well known fact that the hon. gentleman cannot take credit to himself for being overloyal to the late Minister of Railways. I am simply giving that instance. Knowing what it is to be disloyal himself, he is now taking particular care that he will not be surrounded himself by disloyal railway employees. I fully agree with the hon. gentleman, and so long as he confines himself to taking off the heads of the disloyal employees I am willing to support him. If he find any employee of the Intercolonial who will use his position in order to make it difficult for the management of that road to conduct it in the public interest, I for one will support the hon. gentleman in cutting off his head. But if he means that because a man entertains different political views from himself he will cut his head off, I will oppose him in that contention. It is for that reason we complain. The hon. gentleman from Pictou (Mr. Bell), who was in the county of Guysborough at the time of that by-election, has made a statement in this House with regard to certain government employees taking part in that election. When he mentions certain names such as Mr. Kirk, we find the mem-

ber for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) very much exercised, and he rises up and disputes it. But the member for Guysborough has not said a single word about these other nine men. What has he got to say about Mr. Leblanc? What about these two men by the name of Peoples? What about Crittenden, what about the two McGuires, Reeves, Marr and Grant? Does the member for Guysborough deny that these men did not take part in that election? The hon. gentleman dare not deny it, he dare not put himself on record in this House as denying it. But when he thinks there is a good chance of making a denial in some particular case he is ready to do so. The hon. gentleman has put himself in an awkward position. He has not given the Minister of Railways an opportunity of knowing whether there is anything in his statement or not; therefore we have a right to assume that these nine men, government employees did take part in the Guysborough election.

Mr. BELL. That is only one department.

Mr. INGRAM. This government is getting into a peculiar strait. We first find the Department of Agriculture trying to administer the Department of Militia. Then we find the Minister of Railways in nearly the same difficulty. Instead of trusting his manager, issuing circulars from the head office to his management in Moncton and allowing his manager to act unfettered and freely, to administer the government railways without any partisan interference, and holding him responsible for their management, he himself is putting every obstacle in the way of their management by allowing political interference, placing his manager in a false light. That is the position of the manager to-day, and that will be the position of the manager, I care not how capable a man he may be. You may take the ablest railway manager in America, place Mr. Hays of the Grand Trunk at the head of the government railways of this country, and what will be the result? The result will be exactly what it is to-day, a large deficit on the government railways. The only way you can avoid that is by giving the manager of the railroad a free hand and holding him responsible for its proper administration. When you do that, instead of having a deficit you will have a surplus, and that is what the people will appreciate. I make this statement boldly to-day, that it is owing to the political administration of that road that we have these deficits from year to year. It is not owing so much to incompetent management, but it is owing to the fact that the manager's hands are tied so that he cannot administer the road as it ought to be administered. I am sorry that any official should be placed in that awkward position. The officials of that road are interfered with from one end of it to the other, they are subjected to political interference, they have not a free hand.