

re-elect him, he would cheerfully bow to their decision, whatever it might be.

MR. MITCHELL said the hon. Minister, in endeavouring to make a little political capital in regard to him, had made a mistake. The hon. gentleman had alleged that he had interfered with his county and his Department, but he had not interfered with either. He did not, at the election, send down telegrams to the hon. gentleman's county.

MR. DYMOND rose to a point of order. The incidents of last election did not form the subject of the Bill before the House.

MR. MITCHELL said the hon. member had discussed the administration of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and had chosen to refer to his interference with the county of Westmoreland. He never attempted to interfere in the hon. gentleman's election, but the hon. member, at the last election, sent down telegrams to his (Mr. Mitchell's) county which were read from the hustings.

MR. DYMOND asked if the hon. gentleman was in order.

The CHAIRMAN ruled that the hon. member was out of order, and asked him to confine his remarks to the amendment before the Committee.

MR. MITCHELL said the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had chosen to assume that he had interfered with his constituency, which was not the fact. He had chosen to say, because he (Mr. Mitchell) neglected his duty to his constituents—

MR. SMITH: I rise to a question of order. I do not think that I made any such statement; but, I said I did not prostitute my power, as a member of the Government, to press claims from parties in any county.

MR. MITCHELL said he did not know what the hon. gentleman meant by prostituting authority. Did the hon. gentleman apply that term to him in any way? If this were done outside of the House, he knew what he would do. He had never prostituted his position in the House; he came there to represent the interests of his constituents, and to get justice.

He approached the Government with these claims, but he could get no justice, because he was an opponent of the Administration. He said this fearlessly. It was beyond contradiction. His hon. friend the member for Westmoreland need not bring up these cases in regard to which the hon. gentleman said he did not prostitute his position. Perhaps it better suited the hon. gentleman to occupy the position of Cabinet Minister, to enjoy his salary, than to press the claims of his constituents. If this was what the hon. gentleman meant, he was welcome to it. The amendment of the hon. the Minister of Public Works did not meet the case of which he complained, and would not give speedy justice; it gave no remedy to the poor man. It was stated: Let him go to the Supreme Court; but there was no remedy for him there or anywhere. The Bill proposed to give the Government power to appoint one of their own nominees in this regard, and even his decision was not to be final, save when the Government chose; this was no remedy at all.

MR. HADDOW said he was very glad that the Government had taken some steps in this matter. Not many counties along the railway had more reason to complain in this respect than his own county. Many very serious cases had long been open, which wanted to be settled; and, on coming here, he was asked to seek for settlement. He had applied for it, and he found that, in certain cases, the amounts offered were altogether inadequate for the claims in question. He had asked what was the next step to be taken, and he was told that the only other thing that could be done was to go before the Dominion Arbitrators; but, before doing so, such claimants would have to give bonds that all expenses would be paid, provided the award of the Arbitrators was not equal to what the Government had proposed to pay. A poor man could not do this. He understood that such claimant would be exposed to the payment of counsel and witnesses' expenses, and the Government was likely to employ the best counsel. He was very glad that this amendment was proposed. It was a question whether an