

page 116 of Blackmore's Speakers' Decisions, I find this statement: 'Hypothetical questions should not be put,' and he cites two cases, the Esquimalt Dockyard and the protection of British subjects in Mashonaland. It is not necessary to argue the case. It is perfectly clear.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—The first question not being hypothetical, if the government reply that they intend to do the thing it asks for, then, as a consequence, the other questions cease to be hypothetical. If on the other hand the government declares that they have no intention to do what is asked by my first question, then there is no necessity to answer the other questions and the government will probably decline to answer them.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I have no objection to answer the first paragraph; no decision has been come to by the government on the subject.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—That settles the other questions.

The SPEAKER—The form is somewhat altered, but is covered, I believe, by practice. The first question being in order, if it is answered in the affirmative, the others are in order although the form is not according to the general traditions.

PAYMENTS TO MR. PARENT.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY inquired:

Over and above the \$24,250 already received by Mr. Parent for the payment of so-called services rendered to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company; and besides the bonus of \$3,000 which the company voted to Mr. Parent, the day after the collapse of the bridge, and which is not comprised in the \$24,250 above mentioned, did the company on the first day of the present month owe any amount whatsoever to Mr. Parent?

What is that amount?

Is it also for the services rendered?

What services?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—As to the first inquiry, the answer is, none, nor is the bonus claimable in any way. Mr. Parent refused it when the shareholders voted it to him at their annual meeting last year. The other inquiries are all answered by that.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—The bonus is claimable for the simple reason that the motion giving it has not been cancelled. One day

Hon. Mr. POWER.

or another Mr. Parent will have it with the accrued interest.

CLAIM OF MR. ULRIC BARTHE.

INQUIRY.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY inquired:

Over and above the \$16,890 which as secretary of the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company he has drawn, and the \$425 which he has received for his travelling expenses, has Mr. Ulric Barthe any other claim against the company for his services as secretary, for additional travelling expenses, or for any other object, up to the 1st of May instant?

To how much does such claim amount?

Has it been paid?

How much has he received and how much remains due to him?

Hon. Mr. POWER—It seems to me that inasmuch as this question deals with moneys which are not public funds, but moneys of a private corporation, the government cannot be expected to answer it.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—But the government is responsible.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I should like the ruling of the Speaker on that point. I am prepared to answer it, if it were not to be taken as a precedent, because I think the government are only bound to answer questions where they are in a sense responsible that the money is properly expended. This money the government have no control over.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—It is taken out of bonds guaranteed by the government.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Then under that, the government would be responsible for the expenditure of millions of money they guarantee. They have guaranteed the bonds of the Grand Trunk Railway, of the Canadian Northern, and various other enterprises, but no one will say that they should be held responsible for the expenditure of that money. That would not be sound doctrine.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—The government has already answered those questions.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It is a matter of grace where the parties choose to give the information, but we cannot compel them to give the answer, and I do not think the House is entitled to it. I would ask the ruling of the Speaker.