OTTAWA LETTER

Emergency Rations and the Uproar Mr. Monk's Charges Created.

All the Ministerial Bluster Could Not Cover Up What Appeared to be a Very Suspicious Transaction,

And Mr. Monk Will Probably Get His Committee of Inquiry-Ordered by Speaker Bain to Produce the Papers Connected With the Case.

OTTAWA, June 7.—The finest uproar that has been seen during the lifetime of this parliament was witnessed yes terday during the discussion of Mr. Monk's charges respecting emergency rations. It was not a general quarrel and throughout the discussion there was less anger than one often sees. The noise was occasioned by general shouts and cries of "Order" and "Chair" during a series of attempts to rulings and enforce them. Speaker Bain is an excellent man, but his mild manner, his lack of precsion, a certain hesitation he has about taking the final plunge, and an after-thought which seems to haunt him as to whether he has ruled right, serve to weaken his authority. Mr. Bain undoubtedly rules according to his conscience and his idea of parliamentary law, but when he gives reasons they are often absurdly weak, and he is apt to appeal to the house when he ought to command it. In the middle of an uproar the appeal is apt to be disregarded, even when it can be heard. Besides, it is inconvenient for a Speaker to find ministers disobeying

Mr. Monk of Jacques Cartier is an able lawyer and a law professor. He is one of the most moderate men in the house, speaking always with dignity, and with strict regard to the amenities and courtesies of parliamentary life. Yesterday he spoke with deep feeling. But the expressions of feeling were not in the way of animosity toward the government, but in peakable crime, if one has been committed, of providing our soldiers in the field with emergency rations of a poor quality, and of allowing their needs to be exploited for the benefit of dishonest con-

The story he told is this. There is a company in Montreal called the Hatch Proto company, which makes a specialty of prepared and condensed food. A year and a half ago the Hatch company employed Dr. Devlin, a physician in Montreal, to bring before the government the merits of one of their preparations. This Proteine food was described as an article containing in small bulk and weight a large amount of nutriment, and therefore suitable to be carried on long marches or to be used in situations of emergency. The department sent Dr. Devlin to Kingston to have a prac tical test made of this food, and under his direction five members of the permanent force were fed on this preparation for 30 days. They came out all right at the end of the period, and their statement on oath was taken and filed for future reference.

It appears that Hatch thereafter communicated with the minister about furnishing supplies for the militia in the Yukon. In January of this year, when the second contingent was leaving for Africa, Dr. Devlin proposed to furnish at \$2 per lb. a ton or more of prepared food for their use in emergencies. The government bought 2,300 lbs. on the same day or the day after he submitted his offer. Four days later he got his pay.

Now, in the meantime, Dr. Devlin had separated from the Hatch company. The goods he supplied to the government were not produced by that firm; they were not called Hatch's Proteine Food, but appeared under the name of Vitaline. They were manufactured by another firm with which Dr. Devlin was now associated. The whole question is whether the Vitaline so purchased was the same goods or the same character of goods as that tested at Kingston. Mr. Monk has spoken and given his information on the subject. Dr. Borden asked Mr. Monk to delay his motion, and in the meantime fortified himself" with all the evidence he could collect to support the department. The solicitor general, the minister of marine, the premier and Mr. Dobell have all discussed the question.

But on the evidence of the ministers themselves it is clear that the contract with Dr. Devlin was made with out any test as to the practical value of the Vitaline which was bought. They claim that there was no time to repeat the Kingston test, and this may be true. But there was not even an analysis made to show that the Vitaline contained the same ingredients as the Froteine. The only evidence before the minister when he made the contract was the statement the foods were the same, but who has given no reason for the statement. The only evidence now given in support of the director's statement is a letter from Sgt. Cotton, who says that he has seen the article bought, and that it is the same as that which he, with his four comrades, lived on at Kingston for thirty days. But this letter was obtained long after the food was bought and sent to Africa, and

pear that he was furnished by Dr. Devlin with a sample of Vitaline, described to him as the same as was bought, and that he found the taste to be the same as that tested at Kingston. There is also a statement of the Montreal analyst, made two days ago, on samples of both goods supplied to him, and he pronounces one to be as good as the other. In this case the samples were not furnished by the government, but by the contracting firm, to which the report was made. Dr. Borden refused to say that the sample tested was the same as the goods bought. In fact, the goods bought do not appear to have been tested at all, either before or after purchase, in the regular way by extracting samples from the goods furnished. The only examination before purchase was that made by the director general, which was without analysis, and which seems to have been only a sample furnished by the contractors.

On the other side there is first the fact that the goods tested at Kingston are a registered and patented food, which only the Hatch Company have a right to make or sell. It seems to be obvious that no other article, furnished by another company, and having another name, can be identical with this preparation. In the second place, it is shown that Hatch, when he heard that the government was buying Vitaline, wrote to the miniater, pointing out to him that this was not the genuine article which Dr. Devlin had brought to the attention of the minister, and which had been tested at Kingston. This letter Lr. Borden received before he made the contract and did not even acknowledge. In the third place. Mr. Monk gives the name of a reputable business man in Montreal, who bought from the manufacturers of Vitaline a pound of their food, which they described as the He same sold to the government. sent it to Prof. Horsey, formerly of McGili, who reported that it contained scarcely 17 per cent of Proteins, whereas the Eatch preparation analvzed over 60 per cent. He described it as an ordinary breakfast food such as could be bought for 10 or 12 cents a pound.

Now, the tests afforded by Mr. Monk are not authoritative. It is not proved that the preparation tested by Horsey was identical with that bought by the government. Nor is it proved that the Vitaline is inferior because Hatch said it was. But on the same ground Dr. Borden has no proof that his tests made after the purchase were genuine tests. Even if they had been the question of Dr. Borden's original action must be judged by the facts he had then before him. The fact that he had before him was that a certain food known as Hatch's Proteine had been tested and approved at Kingston, and that a certain other food called Vitaline was offered to him by the same agent, and bought by him without test after the proprietors of the other medicine had warned him of its inferiority, and though the food that had been tested was available at the same price which the gov ernment was paying.

It should be said also on behalf of the minister that he and Mr. Dobell and Mr. Fitzpatrick and all the rest of them contend that since no com plaint has come from Africa it is de cidedly improper that any complaint should be made in the house. But not a minister even undertook to say that a single pound of Vitaline had been eaten by the troops in Africa, or that the second contingent had ever been placed on emergency rations. If they were, and they had enough of the goods, a 17 per cent. food would meet their case as well as one much more highly concentrated. But if the supply was short it would require four times as much of it. Besides one might venture to say that if a swindle has been perpetrated it is the duty of parliament to enquire into it, even though not a single soldier has been starved to death in consequence.

The ministers devoted a large part of their time to scolding Mr. Monk Dr. Borden indignantly insisted that Mr. Monk had made personal reflections upon him, but dared not make a direct personal charge, Sir Wilfrid Laurier in his most dignified manner rebuked Mr. Monk, for what he said was a personal attack upon a reputable citizen of Montreal. Mr. Fitzpatrick raged of the director general, who said that and thrashed the air because Mr. Monk, as he said, dared not make a direct charge that a fraud had been committed. And when Mr. Monk calmly announced that that was just what he intended to do in the most formal manner, the solicitor general taunted him with cowardice because he made his charges in the house, where he had immunity from libel suits. It was amusing to hear the chief law officer of the crown chal-Sgt. Cotton does not say how he es- lenging Mr. Monk to make the charge tablishes the identity. It would ap-loutside which had been read in the

ight either to hold his tongue or to make a specific charge that some individual mentioned by same had committed a crime.

Mr. Monk says that he does not know who committed the offence, and, therefore cannot take the responsibility of making a charge of that kind. He charges clearly and specifically that the goods bought and reported to the house by the minister himself to be the same as those tested at Kingston are not the same, and that there-fore there has been a fraud. If he knew all about it there would be no need of an investigation. At the time that he was required to make his charges specific against individuals the ministers had not consented to disclose the contract or to give the names of the firm from which the goods were bought. Mr. Monk holds, properly as most people will think, that it is not necessary for a member to prove an offence absolutely, to find the criminal if there is one, and to adjust pre cisely the different degrees of blams before he can have an investigation.

Dr. Devlin is the son of that Mr Devlin whose contests in Montreal in the days of D'Arcy Mctee occasioned so many riots and so much disturbance. How much pull he may have it not known, but it is certain that he was able by transferring himself from the Hatch Company, whose goods were tested, to the Vitaline Company, whose goods were never tested, to transfer also the government patronage to that concern. The doctor is a good looking fellow, who sat in the speaker's gallery and listened to & discus sion in which he probably would have liked to take part. At the beginning of the discussion Dr. Borden told Mr. Monk that he could have the committee. The other ministers and Mr. Borden himself rather later seemed to hedge on this question, and assailed Mr. Monk for even wanting a conmittee. They vented to know why further enquiry.

Mr. Dobell delivered himself of one of his solemn sermons which always cause intense amusement, admonishing members that they ought not to make any trouble now over any of these matters until the soldiers come home. The house, however, does not take very seriously Mr. Dobell's lectures, and opposition members invariably remind him, in the most irrele vant way, of his bottle-necked ships that never plowed the waves. Mr Dobell will never live down that Petersen contract. Whatever he says and wherever he goes the will be like John Gilpin:-

Still dangling at his waist."

dignified enough when he suggested to the ministers that there was no occasion for all the noise and bluster. for all their shouting and protests. They had bought some \$5,000 worth of emergency rations which they thought, or claimed were the same as had been tested at Kingston. If they were the same, give Mr. Mcnk the committee, establish that fact, and the government would be vindicated and still demanded that the speaker should the country satisfied. If they had paid decide at once whether further debate for the goods that were tested and was permissable, and whether the had got something else of an inferior papers should not be produced inclass, Dr. Borden more than anyone stantly. The speaker, in his panicky else ought to be anxious to have the fraud exposed. He ought to be glad genial doctor from Haldimand in the meantime to have such information as had been furnished. Dr. Borden had said that he only knew the minister of militia began to say Dr. Devlin as the contractor. If that were so. Dr. Devlin was certainly not that if he did not like his ruling he the man to rely upon now to send samples to the analysts and bring back reports for the minister to read. It was absolutely necessary to have this thing investigated fully and promptly, but Sir Charles Tupper re fused to express an opinion on the merits while the enquiry was pending.

Mr. Fester's remarks on the subject were commended by the ministers as being to the point and fair. He put the question, not as if charges had been made sgainst the minister, but as if a wrong was alleged to have been done, which in the circumstances of the case amounted to a crime Though our troops were not in a position when they had to depend for subsistence on these emergency rations, the food was furnished to them for occurred from it.

The noise and disorder occurred in the evening beginning, when Mr. Mon Neill tried to force Dr. Borden to be more specific in his statement that the two foods were the same. Dr. Borden refused to answer questions. His first speech had left the impression that a thorough analysis had been made by the department and that the food purchased was shown to be identical with the one tested. It was later in the debate that the discovery was made that there was no such analysis. Mr. McNeill struggled patiently with the minister, but finally had to give it up.

Then the solicitor general provoked a new outburst when he said that Sir Charles and Mr. Foster had apologized for Mr. Monk. Both of them had lefended him, Sir Charles especially, and they rose, insisting that Mr. Fitzpatrick should take back his statement. There was a good deal of shouting across the house and several appeals to the chair while this controversy went on.

Then Mr. Fitzpatrick undertook to tell the story, the opposition questioning him as he proceeded. When Mr. Fitzpatrick said that the director general recommended the purchase of emergency food, he was asked "which food." When he said the contract was made in consequence of the test, he was asked which food was tested and with whom the contract was made. Mr. Fitzpatrick grew angry, refusing to answer questions and reading extracts from papers. Then he was brought up with the request to bring

it on the table, saying that he had not quoted from it. Then came the first big uprost. An appeal was made the chair, several members trying ance. Finally Mr. Bain was forced to say something, and he ruled that the paper should be brought down. It was decided, however, that the solicitor general might first finish bis speech. He resumed by stating that an officer had declared the food bought to be the same as that tested. Mr. Menk got leave to put a question and said "Will the solicitor general say that the food supplied to the troops is the same as that tested at Kingston?" "I will not be drawn out of my argument," said Mr. Fitzpatrick. It was then that he turned furiously from Mr. Menk and shouted "He dare not make the charge of fraudulent substi-tution of goods. He dare not charge

The minister was going on in that way when Mr. Monk calmly interrupted him by stating that he did not iniend to make that charge. This brought round after round of cheers from the opposition side of the house. Fitzpatrick rose to the occasion by demanding a change in venue. It was a brave act, he said, to make charge in this safe place. "I defy him to go outside of the house and make Mr Monk said that he claimed no immunities whatever, that as a member of the house he made a charge in the house, and asked here, which was the only place where he could ask it, that the matter should be investigated.

Mr. Bain got his worst ten minutes after Mr. Fitzpatrick closed. Charles was on his feet in a minute asking that the contract be laid on the

Dr. Borden-I don't know that there is any form of contract. Mr. Blair, who had been giving advice and assistance in the minsterial

corner, corroborated this view. Sir Charles Tupper still insisted on having whatever documents there were that constituted the agreement. Finally Mr. Bain was obliged to rule that all the papers should be handed

Dr. Borden then began to speak having certain papers in his hands, and stating that he thought he should read them. Mr. Foster said that the reading was unnecessary; they wanted the speaker's order obeyed. It was pointed out that the solicitor general was still holding some of the papers The speaker was trying to say some thing; Dr. Mcntague and several opposition members were insisting upor the enforcement of the rules. There were calls of "Chair, chair," on one side of the house, and "Order" on the other. The solicitor general had become very much excited, more, even than he had been a short time before when he threatened to find some way to prevent the minority from ruling

Monk was heard to say that there should be no further debate until the papers appeared. The speaker had the papers did not come. Montague was on the fleor insisting that Dr. Borden should not go on talking and demending an instant ruling on that point. The speaker seemed to weaken and hoped the house would allow Dr. Borden to go on with his analysis of the correspondence. Dr. Montague search for a victim, fell upon the ordered him to his seat. The doctor sat down, but rose every time that anything. Mr. Bain told Dr. Montague could appeal to the house against it. but the doctor reminded the speaker that the ruling was perfectly satisfactory and he was appealing to the house in favor of it. All he wanted was its instant enforcement and he proposed to have it. For several minutes the two doctors and the speaker gesticulated at each other, and the other members offered such remarks as occurred to them. It was on the whole a good-natured turmoil, though the speaker grew angry, and Dr. Montague's voice was extended to its utmost capacity, while Dr. Borden could not be heard at all.

The deadlock was finally broken by Dr. Borden handing the papers to page, who bore them to the table amid cheers and uproarious laughter from such emergencies, and if a fraud had the opposition side. There was anbeen perpetrated, the greatest suf- other big laugh when Mr. Monk found fering and loss of life might have that one of the papers had been abstracted, and Mr. Blair produced it. It was not suggested that the minister of railways was stealing the document or intended to conceal it about his person. The misappropriation was apparently inadvertant, but it was rather embarrassing when the discovery was made.

Mr. Monk will get his committee if nothing happens to change the minds of the ministers.

OTTAWA, June 8.-Those who were present at yesterday's sitting of the house will remember the demonstration as long as they live. It would have been an ordinary exhibition of patrictic enthusiasm if Mr. Bourassa had not sfirred the feelings of members to greater intensity. Mr. Lourassa is generally thought to be a rather pretentious little man of no great power. But he was able to turn an enthusiastic house into a shouting, tumultuous assembly. Two or three times within the last three years parliament has stopped business to sing "God Save the Queen." But when it broke off a debate to give three cheers and a tiger. while the air was thick with members' hats. which were thrown up to the ceiling. that was a new experience. Sir John Bourinot has no mention of such episodes in any of his treatises on Parliamentary Procedure.

Everything was in the best of form down to the advent of Mr. Bourassa. The address to Her Majesty was conceived in good taste and supported by

tion in brief and appropriate speeches Sir Wilfrid Laurier spoke with elegance and neatness, as he always does on such occasions. Sir Charles Tupper spoke with more force, but with care and elaboration. Nothing was uttered by either leader that could by any possibility be out of harmony with the other party.

It is one of the anomalies of parlia. mentary life that a member personally of no great significance should attract more attention than the party leaders. That is what happened. Mr. Bourses struck an attitude, and observed that he could not agree with those who had spoken. Though Mr. McCleary suggested that if that were so he had better go out, the member for Labelle proceeded to say that whittever might be the opinion of the house, he was himself expressing the opinions of a large portion of the peo-ple in the dominion, and those not all French Canadians. There were shouts of dissent, but the member went on to denounce the war in Africa as unjust. Then he took exception to Six Charles Tupper's statements that this war had increased the military pres tige of the British Empire. Mr. rassa laid himself out to show that it had the contrary effect; that it had advertised to the world that 200,000 troops, composing the best regiments of England, Ireland and Scotland, and the best that the colonies could send had been eight months trying to conquer a little force of peasants drawn from a population of a quarter of million. Such achievements as this, he said, "will not add an ounce to the glory of the British flag." The house was willing to tolerate

good deal from Mr. Bourassa, but drew the line at this, and cries of shame were heard from the whole opposition party, mingled with a perfect storm of hisses, in which some government supporters joined. One two called out "traitor." Mr. Fielding, from the front government bench, tried to stop the tumult. This is a free ountry, he said, and again when Mr. Bourassa demanded free speech. Mr Fielding repeated, "this is a free parliament." Mr. Mills of Annapolis re-Mr. Fielding's secessionist platform.

It was some time before the man from Labelle could be heard. Then he was found to be attacking Clark Wallace as a man who had raised his voice to urge a portion of the empire to rise in arms against the British crown This seemed to be a reference to some thing Clark Wallace had said about Ulster under home rule. But Mr. sa went on to say that the ingo tories had brought this war upor the British empire, and that England would have to keep 100,000 men in Africa to enforce British institutions on men who did not want them. He declared that this war had been forced upon her majesty and on the free people of England by ambitious men and financiers who wanted to increase their dividends. Then he went on to tell how the British policy, which was sup ported by the address, was the same as that resisted for 50 years by the French-Canadians. It was the policy that had sent to the gallows free men who asked for their rights, and who protested against the policy now to be enforced in Africa. One remark seemed to have an application to Mr. Bourassa's leader. He spoke of those others in the house who thought as he did, but refrained from saving what they thought.

The plea for free speech made by Mr. Fielding and afterwards by the premier is not opposed. Nobody has tried to arrest Mr. Bourassa. No violence has been done him. He goes to the house and talks any treason that occurs to him. But neither premier nor finance minister is able to take away ing the campaign Mr. Bourassa spoke from other members the privilege of all at once, their abhorence and contempt for such utterances. In every free parliament this privilege has been used and probably will be used till the end of the chapter. It is not possible for any minister in this parliament to suppress these expressions or to gain the anti-contingent platform, and as patient and silent hearing to such utterances as those of the member for

ceply to Mr. Bourassa, suggested that

the proper answer was to give three cheers for the Queen, the suggestion was adopted as a happy escape from the necessity of doing something else, and the humiliation of a formal reply to such a speech. With less than a dozen exceptions every member was on his feet in a moment and every voice was raised to the utmost in giving such cheers as were never heard within those walls before, and the national anthem, into which the members broke spontaneously, was never sung with such enthusiasm and energy. The most conspicuous figures were those of the members who cheered and sang, but of those who refrained. Mr. Fielding sat still in his seat. The premier rose, or partly rose, but on a remark from the finance minister sat down again and took no part in the demonstration. Mr. Bourassa sat back trying to look like Papineau and proudly observing the tumult that he had raised. The solicitor general pretended to write at his desk, and the minister of agriculture followed the example of his leaders and retained his seat. A few French-Canadians on the government side refused to rise, and a few who did rise sat down when they saw the front benches. Mr. Blair and Mr. Mulock stood up with the shouters, as did Sir Louis Davies.

When the turmoil was over Mr. Charlton delivered an address of a most patriotic character, in which he treated Mr. Bourassa with more seriousness than most members though necessary. Then the premier appealed to the house to be calm, and reminded the members that it was a free parliament, which seemed to be an unnecessary remark. On the other hand "put it to the hon. member" whether this was an opportune time to make the remarks which had fallen from him, the sincerity of which the premier did not doubt.

Mr. Bourassa had no more to say. If he had spoken he would perhaps have said that he was only following the example of the minister of public works. What Mr. Bourassa said



Ask the girl who has tested it.

Surprise Soap if it is not, a pure hard soap; the most satisfactory. soap and most economical. Those who try Surprise always continue to use it.

SURPRISE is a pure hard Soap.

Ask any one who has used

the whole British army was said by Mr. Tarte at St. Vincent de Faul and suggested by him in his speech in parliament. Mr. Tarte had also spoken in the house of the Transvaal war as a war of conquest on the British side. What is lawful for Mr. Tarte, the practical head of this ministry, can hardly be an offence in Mr. Bourassa.

But what does the premier mean by

talking of "opportune" times and places? Only this, probably, that Mr. Bourassa ought to keep silent in torted that Mr. Bourassa had adopted the house and continue his campaign in those parts of his own province where it will do the most good. The member for Labelle has spoken in French in many French districts just as he spoke yesterday. He did not in those meetings denounce the premier for sending troops to Africa; he has denounced Sir Charles Tupper for compelling the premier to send them. He excused the premier on the ground that if he had not yielded he would have lost his office. That is the argument which is made in public meetings in many Quebec districts, and by other members besides Mr. Bourassa. They are the kind of speeches which Sir Wilfrid Laurier considers opportune. Rut it is another thing when a man comes in the house, and speaking in English addressing all Canada, makes the same speech that he and his fellow members make in their own s in support of the premier. Wilfrid raturally does not find this opportune. The reproach from him is safe because it does not put the premier in an attitude of hostility to Mr. Bourassa. The understanding between the leader and his admirer is thus pre-

Bourassa say his say. He resigned his seat and appealed to the constituency on this very issue. He is carrying out in the house the policy which he set forth on the Labelle hustings, and which he was elected to maintain. His electon in Labelle was not opposed by the government, though the liberal majority is so large that the mier was in a position to defeat Mr. Bourassa if he desired to do so. Durin every village in his riding. Not a expressing strongly, immediately, and minister nor a supporter of a minister said a word against him. The only liberal members who went into the riding to speak went there to support Mr. Bourassa, and the cause which he supported then and supports now. When Mr. Bourassa was elected on an advocate of the Boer cause, he was introduced into the house as a government supporter, by Mr. Tarte, the dominant minister of the crown. When Dr. Montague, disdaining to His election has been claimed in every liberal paper in Canada as a victory for the government. There is not a paper which has not published a list of the by-elections carried by the government. In every one of these lists the election of Mr. Bourassa, after he had resigned the seat and appealed to the riding on the anti-British issue, is found recorded as a government victory.

And after all why should not Mr.

Mr. Bourassa claims that he stunds on the same platform on which Sir Wilfrid Laurier stood on the fourth day of last October. He claims, and with perfect correctness, that he represents the same principles advocated in Quebec in the campaign literature used by the Laurier party in the last election. It is, therefore, with some show of contempt that he looks on the members who have been fighting in campaigns by his side, who have gloried in his success in the Labelle campaign, and who joined him in uttering in many political meetings through Quebec the sentiments which he now speaks, and sees them joining in a patriotic demonstration against him, and in favor of the Empire and the war. One could fancy Mr. Lourassa saying to these members. "Wait till I get you with me in some of our liberal meetings, in Quebec, and then you will give me my proper recogni-

The grandson of Papineau, who tries so hard to make the house think that he is a Papineau too, may possibly have an expanded head. But it was only the other day that he appeared before the public accounts committee to tell how great an international personage he was. Sir Wilfrid had insist ed on his joining the international commission at Quebec and Washington. Even after Lord Herschell had brought out a secretary for the British side, Mr. Bourassa was kept there, though there was nothing for him to do except to entertain visitors and perform diplomatic courtesies. Before the committee Mr. Bourassa with lofty disdain explained that he kept no account of his spendings. He got off down the contract to which he re- the premier and leader of the opposi- about the few poor peasants resisting with \$14 a day, week in and week out,

a grea We most of the follow some

ernme paren have and happy want fusal

been such what ten that not could Blair parlia try is intercloade onial It ap 1900,

> Janu Mar

same

had

the The world the At water as a