

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I accept the answer of the government that the company refuses to give the information.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No, not on that ground at all. There are several of the hon. gentleman's questions that I think are not proper inquiries, because the government cannot control the expenditure of the money. He does not mean to say, surely, that when we guarantee the bonds of a railway we are responsible for the way the money is expended?

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I want to remind the House, that I asked a question some time ago as to the amount paid to Mr. Barthe, and the government gave me those figures themselves. I am asking does that amount comprise all that is due, or is there something more? Now, as to the other questions, that the expenditure is not controllable by the government, one must not forget that, here is a company with a capital of \$65,000 subscribed, and nevertheless they have paid their directors \$112,000 merely for attending meetings of the company. The only revenue they have is what the country gives them. They are spending the people's money, and I want to know if there is more of the public money to go to Mr. Barthe for any claim he may have against the company.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—As I said before, I do not want it quoted as a precedent in matters of this kind, and when his Honour the Speaker rules I will reply.

The SPEAKER—The Chair is not in possession of the facts and contracts which relate to the public expenditure, and I would rather leave the government to take their own position inasmuch as they have more information than the Chair can have. I am not sufficiently *au fait* as to the situation between the company and the government.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—All those papers are before the House. The contract between the government and the country forms part of one of our statutes. They are before this House and the country. I am only asking about the expenditure of public money.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I am quite prepared to give the information if it is not to be

regarded as a precedent, because hereafter it may be quoted, and it is a very improper thing to do. I am always anxious to give the fullest information I can to members of the House.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—We shall not consider it as a precedent. I am willing to accept an answer and not regard it as a precedent.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—If the hon. gentleman is willing not to accept it as a precedent, I will give him the answer. The answer is: 'Nothing outside of his monthly salary.' Then the other three questions are answered by No. 1. They made the inquiry from the Department of Railways and Canals and that is the answer they received.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Nothing outside of his monthly salary?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No.

QUEBEC BRIDGE AND RAILWAY COMPANY.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY inquired:

What is the annual salary to which Mr. Barthe has at present a right as secretary to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company?

Since when has Mr. Barthe received this salary?

What was his salary for the same employment previously?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The answers are as follows:

1. \$2,400.
2. Since May 1, 1906.
3. \$2,000 a year.

QUEBEC BRIDGE AND RAILWAY COMPANY.

INQUIRY POSTPONED.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY inquired of the government:

Over and above the \$45,000 paid to Mr. Hoare as chief engineer of the company by the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company of which Mr. Parent is president, has he received any other sums of money from the Transcontinental Railway Commission, of which the same Mr. Parent is also president?

How much, in each year, for the years 1904-5, 1905-6, 1906-7 and 1907-8?

For what services?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—This is a proper question, but I have not the information.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I suppose all the questions that are proper are unanswerable.