

goes a little further and says that the Government find it convenient to pay a Mr. Thorne who is the head of the Liberal-Conservative Association in St. John, \$8,000 a year out of the public funds, in order to keep him dancing around on fishery protection service, then my hon. friend goes entirely beyond the record of what is true. The Government pays, as I said before, \$300 per month, and it has had that vessel now for a little over three years, during which time the owners have kept that vessel in perfect repair. If my hon. friend thinks that a bonanza has been realized on that by the owners he is very much mistaken indeed, for during that time, to my own certain knowledge, very large and heavy repairs have been put upon the vessel, and I doubt if the owners have realized very much more than a fair percentage on the money that she cost during the three years she has been in the service. My hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) is quite wrong. He leaps to conclusions, from wrong information given mainly by the member from Queen's (Mr. Davies), whose information is generally in that direction, that she is owned entirely by Mr. Thorne. Now, it may be news to my hon. friend from Queen's, but I would be willing to enlighten him so far as that goes, that Mr. Thorne is not the sole owner of that vessel. I am not sure whether he owns any part of the vessel now or not; he may, but the owner of the vessel, the man who is chiefly interested in her, has been, up to a very late period at least, a very strong right arm supporter of the party to which my hon. friend belongs. This gentleman is a gentleman, and a thorough gentleman, even though he has been a Liberal and a very strong Liberal: he has not been considering that he has been pampered and petted by the small amount he got from the Government for the rental of a boat of which he was the largest owner. So far as the economy of the boat itself is concerned, I may be a little interested in that, because I think I was Minister of Marine when this boat was chartered. I think I first chartered the boat. I did so because of economical considerations. We, at that time, had some steamers; we had the *Aradlia*, a large steamer for the fishery service specially: she was a costly steamer and one which patrolled the whole coast. We then took schooners for which we paid a monthly rental, and we had to put a much larger crew upon these. The expenses were heavy, and the rapidity and facility with which they went over the ground is nothing compared with the steamer; so that, in looking over the case I took this little vessel and put her on the Bay of Fundy around the coast of Charlotte; and the purpose was simply at that time, as my hon. friend said, that that vessel was to be for the protection of Charlotte and St. John county fisheries in the Bay of Fundy. It was not supposed that she should patrol any portion of the coast of Nova Scotia. She has done that service for which she was intended, and I know my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) will say that she has done that service well. She has been very well fitted indeed for that, and if you take the three years she has been on that service, I am quite sure that you could not have done it in any more economical way; even though it may seem at first sight that \$300 per month is quite a large rental for a steamer. I believe that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has now arranged for the purchase or building of a

Mr. FOSTER.

larger steamer, which shall not only carry on that service, but will be able at any time to cross the bay and to patrol a certain portion of the Nova Scotia coast. I think that is a good method. That vessel would be strong and would be able to do both these services, but it will be found when that is done, and when the cost of the steamer, the extra cost of handling, and the cost of repairs is taken into account, that the service will of course be much more costly than it is under the present arrangement. I rose chiefly to correct what I thought was more than mere misapprehension, because I informed my hon. friend that the \$8,000 was not paid to this gentleman, and even though Mr. Thorne has committed the mortal sin of being a president of the Liberal-Conservative Association, yet I should think he demands fair treatment at the hands of this House.

Mr. PERRY. Does the hon. gentleman—

An hon. MEMBER. Already spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER. We must understand that this discussion should not be conducted as if the House were in Committee of the Whole on Estimates, unless an understanding of that kind is arrived at. Otherwise the discussion would be interminable.

Mr. DEVLIN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not say anything on the subject yet, and I think I may be permitted to offer a remark. I find in looking over the accounts in connection with the steamer *Dream*, that there is an item on page C—127 of the Auditor General's Report, "Hardware, \$53.13." I contend that if the proprietors of the boat are supposed to keep it in perfect order, that item, at all events, should have been found in their own private accounts, and not in the account of the Auditor General. Then again, lower down, there is another item, "Rubber, \$15.20," which shows that all the expense is not borne by the owners.

Immigration—Salaries of agents and employes..... \$24,125

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to make some remarks with regard to the extravagance that appears to characterize the expenditure of many of these agencies. I really think it is time the Government should institute a thorough investigation into the expenditures of the agencies both in Canada and in Great Britain. At the Toronto agency, for instance, we find that an enormous amount of money is paid out every year, and whether it is closely and carefully criticized by the Government or not I cannot say. In the Auditor General's Report I find that there are 16 tons of coal—

Mr. SPEAKER. I would direct the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that we have not come to that item yet.

Salaries, agents, Europe..... \$5,900

Mr. McMULLEN. Now, I wish to say that in Belfast I see that Mr. Merrick is paid a salary of \$1,000, and a *per diem* allowance amounting to \$1,460 a year, and travelling expenses of \$17.05. In addition, there are some other expenses which run up to a very large sum. There is also an assistant who is paid \$436 and travelling expenses. Now, I think that when Sir Charles Tupper is in London a thorough investigation should be made into the expenditures of the agencies in Great Britain. I think we should have some report as to the necessity of allowing to the Liverpool agent,