

OTTAWA LETTER.

Georgian Bay Canal Project Explained by Mr. Poupore.

Rev. Mr. Maxwell of British Columbia Wants to Keep the Chinese Out of Canada.

The Demoralizing Effect of a Minister Pledging his Word in the House One Day and Breaking It the Next

OTTAWA, June 6.—We do not get much further in the discussion of the international issue. Sir Wilfrid Laurier might have attracted some attention when he brought down the protocol on the Yukon boundary if the whole text had not been published in the public press in England and called to every newspaper in this country. Sir Wilfrid's explanation goes no farther than the papers he brought down in England, for while he explains that negotiations have gone on since the time the public correspondence closed, he is not able to give any information about it. As Sir Charles Tupper points out, the British commissioners went a long way when they agreed to allow the United States possession of any settlements or territory which had been in occupation by the United States or Russia for 50 years. Such possessions might very well come in Venezuela or any country where the lines are not accurately defined, but one would expect that it would not be allowed to prevail in case the territory occupied were closely assigned to the power by definite treaty. However that is the way it stands, the United States government is not satisfied with this concession, but insists that no matter how the treaty reads, all territory occupied by the United States at the time the present treaty is made shall be retained. That is to say, if the United States has within the month taken possession of country clearly belonging to Great Britain, it shall become United States property merely by the fact that the flag has been raised there.

In the fifth and sixth parliaments of Canada, Dr. Cameron of Inverness was accustomed to make an annual speech. It was usually a long speech dwelling upon the inconvenience of transportation in Cape Breton and the claims of that island upon the government of Canada. The great majority of the members there in the house knew very little and cared very little about Cape Breton, and Dr. Cameron, though he spoke well, did not draw a full house. The doctor himself was quite conscious of the fact that his annual speech was an infliction, but he continued to inflict it. This year, however, Dr. Cameron became a silent member of the commons. One day the writer asked him if he had got tired making his long speech and had concluded to cease from troubling the members. "Do you think I made these speeches for fun?" said Dr. Cameron. "I urged the construction of a railway in Cape Breton. I got it. Now that I got what I want for my people, I am showing the house that I know how to hold my tongue."

Mr. Poupore of Pontiac had adopted the Cameron programme. He is offering an annual speech on the Georgian Bay canal project. It is a great scheme offering the largest possibilities. If it can justify the claims of its advocates, the idea is to utilize the Ottawa river and other waters to establish an open waterway between Montreal and Georgian Bay, and the other Great Lakes. This is the most direct route from the St. Lawrence to the lakes and is represented to be 350 miles shorter than the journey by way of the Lake Ontario and the present canal system. Through a considerable part of its length the Ottawa river is navigable and there is a considerable chain of lakes, including Lake Nipissing, on the route. Still a good deal of work will require to be done at various points where there are shallow waters and cataracts, as for instance right here at the Chaudiere Falls. Mr. Poupore states that the estimated cost of the canal is \$25,000,000. Other more sceptical people say that it will cost two or three times as much.

Mr. McLeod Stewart, ex-mayor of Ottawa, has led the scheme in charge for several years. He inherited it from his father, who advocated such a waterway a half a century ago. Mr. Stewart is an energetic man and has made several journeys to England in connection with the organization of a company. He returned the other day with the announcement that a strong organization had been formed, having a capital of several millions, of which \$200,000 is paid up and deposited in a Canadian bank. All he wants now is the assurance of the satisfactory government subsidy and the work will go ahead. Last year the government was asked to subsidize the canal to the extent of a two per cent guarantee on seventeen million dollars. Further exploration and enquiry have caused the amount to be raised, and parliament is now asked by Mr. Poupore and the company to raise the vote from \$30,000,000 a year to \$60,000,000. This is two and a half per cent on \$24,000,000. With this guarantee the company's bonds would be gilt-edged and marketable at par.

Mr. Poupore is a capital speaker and made a favorable impression upon the members, as he did last year. He is a conservative, but occasionally offers a conciliatory vote on the government side, as he did on the Drummond railway scheme. He is a contractor by profession, and has no quarrel with the government which is carrying on building operations. Particularly Mr. Poupore has no quarrel with Mr. Tarte. He quoted yesterday Mr. Tarte's statements that if he had his way he would build the Georgian Bay canal, the Trent Valley canal, and two or three railways between the upper and lower lakes. Mr. Poupore has no sympathy with the cri-

alism of Mr. Tarte's promise to spend a great deal more money than has been spent heretofore. He observed that Mr. Tarte was a man of whom the country ought to be proud.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier also gave encouragement to this scheme in the course of some of his discourses. Mr. Poupore tells him that he will do on and cause this canal to be constructed, his name will be written high in the annals of fame. The late government deserved infinite credit for the construction of the C. P. railway. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, according to Mr. Poupore, will keep his end well up if he pushes through the Georgian Bay scheme. By the time Mr. Poupore finished his address and Mr. Pelcourt of Ottawa had got fairly under way with his it was six o'clock. The order of business changed and the Georgian Bay canal stands over till next week.

Then came on the Rev. Mr. Maxwell. The Speaker will not allow him to be called "Rev." in the house, but the Speaker has no jurisdiction over these letters, in which Mr. Maxwell will have justice. The rev. member for Burrard wants to keep the Chinese out. He says they come in notwithstanding the \$50 tax, and he proposes to strike them with a \$500 fee. Mr. Maxwell is opposed to Chinamen. He does not like their habits, he does not like their rate of wages, he does not regard them as possible citizens, capable of assimilating with the population. In fact, he would not allow them to assimilate if they wanted to. Mr. Maxwell set forth his ideas in a sermon of considerable length, closing with two scriptural allusions. One of these was a reference to the importunate woman of the New Testament who finally succeeded in her appeal to a judge who feared not God nor regarded man. This last allusion to the present ministry was tempered with a scriptural reference to Laurier as the Moses who was going to lead British Columbia into the promised land. Mr. Maxwell had a quotation from some pledge given by Sir Wilfrid that he would do all he could to help the British Columbian people in their crusade against the foreigner. The comparison of Sir Wilfrid to Moses falls in one respect, in that Moses was rather more given to performance than to promise.

If Mr. Maxwell had pinned his faith up to Henri Joly he would have been on stronger ground. Sir Henri is a cavalier of the old school, who tries to keep his word, and we have his own story that in the awful moments when he separated from his friend and comrade, Li Hung Chang, he fell on his neck (or words to that effect) and solemnly promised "I will never desert you." Sir Henri remembered this promise and gravely rehearsed it in the house the first time an anti-Chinese bill was proposed. He cannot have forgotten it now.

The premier was a little uneasy about this bill of Mr. Maxwell's, and gave a hearty welcome to a point of order taken by Mr. Ellis that a private member had no right to introduce a bill imposing a tax. The speaker was away, and what Mr. Brodeur, the deputy speaker, did here, point of order is neither here nor there. Sir Wilfrid rose to the occasion by asking the Speaker to reserve his decision, and so Mr. Brodeur is reserving the decision of Sir James Osgear on the question. Meanwhile Li Hung Chang's doubtless watered down some of his many palaces to learn whether the comrade of his old age and his fellow traveller through Canada and the United States is going to desert him after all.

S. D. S.

OTTAWA, June 7.—Some time after three o'clock this morning the minister of railways, with a few other ministers and members, walked down the middle walk from Parliament Hill on their way home to bed. As they walked they pondered the question whether they had made any gain by keeping the house sitting until that hour in order to force the opposition to accept the Grand Trunk bill, all its clauses, at once, without further information or detailed discussion. The house rose at three with exactly the same amount of business done that there was at twelve. At midnight Mr. Foster, who was leading the opposition while Sir Charles Tupper was addressing the Macdonald Club in Toronto, observed to Sir Wilfrid Laurier that no purpose would be gained by trying to force this bill and schedules through committees at midnight. Sir Wilfrid and Mr. Blair, backed by a shouting majority, disagreed with this view. They insisted that the house should be held until the proper amount of progress was made, no matter how much explanation opposition members might give, and how many facts might be withheld. Three hours later one of them remarked to another that they might just as well have adjourned at midnight. That remark was probably the truest one made during the evening.

If Mr. Blair had not been so anxious to contradict Col. McLennan of Gungahary, the delay might not have happened. Col. McLennan being a contractor, naturally gives attention to the cost of railways. He had his own figures of the cost of the roads and bridges issued from the Grand Trunk. He made the statement, that built for half a million dollars. Mr. Blair found it necessary to make the value three times as large. But Mr. Blair is not a railroad builder, and he felt it necessary to back up his assertion by evidence. That is how he came to make the statement that he had a report from his own engineer giving the cost of one bridge at Richelieu River at \$400,000, and of a bridge over the Yamaska at \$300,000. Now Mr. McLennan made a careful calculation to show that the Richelieu bridge would only cost \$30,000. He gave the number of feet of masonry, the amount of excavation and the price of superstructure, as obtained from the Dominion Bridge Co. The extraordinary difference between \$400,000 and \$30,000, when both computations were supposed to be made by technical men, was rather paralyzing. Moreover, Mr. Blair's calculation makes a bridge 330 feet long cost more than one-third as much as the C. P. R.

bridge, 3500 feet long, over the St. Lawrence.

This is why Mr. Foster and other members pressed the minister of railways to bring down the exact statement of his engineer, so that the house should know how he reached these extraordinary figures. They were supported in this demand by a well known parliamentary rule which requires that when a minister quotes a public document he should produce it in order that all the members may have access to the original. Mr. Blair refused to produce it. It was Mr. Blair's refusal which led to some entertaining scenes later on. Suspicion grew that Mr. Blair's engineer was a character resembling Mr. Tupper's friend Mr. Harris. It was unparliamentary to say that Mr. Blair had invented the engineer and his estimates, but several members threw out suggestions of an equivalent character. Mr. Blair has been in the habit of supporting himself by the evidence of his assistants, which opinions are not produced in full until an atmosphere of skepticism has gathered around him, such as would be impossible if the statements were made by such a man for instance as Richard Cartwright or Sir Henri Joly.

After exhausting all other methods to ascertain who the engineer was and what he said, the question was brought to an issue by Mr. Borden, who after charging Mr. Blair with obstructing his own measure by withholding information, took the point of order that the rule required the papers to be brought down. Mr. Brodeur, the deputy speaker, being in the chair, the committee did not waste much time in calling against Mr. Borden. Mr. Brodeur never does waste much time in deciding in favor of the government side. A compendium of Mr. Brodeur's decisions would form a unique contribution to parliamentary history. They are a mass of self-complacencies and constitutional impossibilities with one vein of consistency running through them. Mr. Brodeur is never "agaia the government." No appeal can be taken in the committee against the chairman's decision. The remedy is for the committee to rise and refer the matter to the speaker and the house. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper asked that this be done. Mr. Brodeur has evaded a rule of his own, and compelled the member for Pictou to make a motion. This motion he put to the committee, who it was voted down. Then ensued a lively discussion, the opposition members showing that by this process they could never get to the speaker at all, seeing that the government holds the majority in the committee.

Then Sir Wilfrid began to crawl down, seeing that this proceeding must be made a matter of record for all time to come. He informed Mr. Brodeur that the committee should report to the speaker in the chair and allow him to proceed. Now Sir James Edgar had long since sought his virtuous couch. Mr. Brodeur did not have him called, but in his capacity of deputy speaker he took the chair himself to review his own decision as chairman of the committee. It was a little inconvenient for Mr. Flint, the chairman, to make a report to Mr. Brodeur, the speaker, seeing that a man cannot stand on the platform facing the chair and also in front of the chair facing the platform. Mr. Brodeur's ingenuity was equal to the occasion. He had a report, which he is always ready for any odd job, and Mr. Flint stood forth announcing on behalf of the committee that he had been instructed to report progress and ask leave to sit again. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper was on his feet that night and protested. Mr. Brodeur had not been chairman of the committee nor an officer of the house, and had no business to appear in that capacity. He renewed his protest later when Mr. Brodeur, as speaker, announced that Mr. Flint as chairman, had introduced a report. Mr. Flint was asked the ground of his objection. He had no other grounds than that the statement of Mr. Brodeur was a deliberate falsehood, since Mr. Flint was not the chairman of the committee. This right and trifling objection was ruled out, after which Mr. Brodeur as speaker gravely announced that in his opinion the ruling of Mr. Brodeur as chairman was sound. The official record will probably show that it was Mr. Flint who gave the decision in the committee. But this is doubtful in case of Mrs. Harris, for it is doubtful if Mr. Flint had even heard the decision, as he was probably asleep in the back benches at the time. However, the chair was sustained by a vote of the house and the proceedings went on.

Or rather the proceedings did not go on, but only the objections. During the evening Mr. Foster had made a strong protest against Mr. Blair's course in refusing information. Mr. Bell, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Borden of Halifax, Mr. Bennett of Simcoe, Messrs. Bergeron, Sproule, Wallace and other members set forth their views, not only on the conduct of the minister but on the whole question. Mr. Bell in a strong argument advanced the idea that the government might have accomplished the same purpose that the contract served by obtaining the right to put in another track along the Grand Trunk line.

Mr. McLennan in the course of the night informed the chairman that he did not see a quorum present. At that time there were only 12 members in the house. Mr. Brodeur did not hurry with his counting. While he waited Sir Louis Davies furiously rang a bell communicating with the restaurant and the room where the government supporters congregated. In due time Mr. Brodeur discovered a quorum. At three o'clock Mr. Foster was obtaining a few explanations from the minister of railways. Mr. Bell of Addington, who rarely speaks, had several pages of notes ready for use. Mr. Clancy was prepared to argue. Mr. Wallace was down stairs getting a bite to eat with Jimmy Kelly and other Orangemen who are returning from Grand Lodge. His desk was littered with notes of the oration he intended to deliver after daylight. Mr. Bennett had spoken for an hour, and all was prepared for a conference that night and forenoon sitting. Suddenly Sir Wilfrid came to the conclusion that this was the time for the exer-

cise of his sunny ways. He ignored the declaration made by himself earlier in the evening that the house would not adjourn until this particular business was done, and cheerily moved that the committee rise and the house adjourn. So ended the first lesson.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier brought down a batch of papers relating to Prince Edward Island, containing the last memorial from the government of that province and Sir Wilfrid's reply thereto. Many of the papers are the same as were brought down last year, but there are some additions. Included in the new matter is a minute setting forth that a view of the decision of the privy council of May 1898, Prince Edward Island is entitled in its own right to receive from the dominion that portion of the award of the Halifax commission to which it would have been entitled had the amount of compensation belonging to P. E. I. been separately awarded. The provincial ministers ask that the whole question between the dominion and the province be left to arbitration, one arbitrator to be appointed by the province, one by the Queen and one by the dominion.

The old claims need only to be stated in general language. No. 1 grows out of the failure to establish continuous steam communication.

No. 2 is the financial claim which was set forth very fully by Mr. Martin in a recent speech in the house. It grows out of the fact that when the province entered the union the debt of the dominion was assumed to be \$45 per head, and on that basis the total of \$50 per head was made to Prince Edward Island. But the real debt of the dominion was much greater than was then supposed, when the cost of completing the public works then under construction is considered. The provincial government estimates that the allowance should have been \$75 per head in order to make it equitable, and a claim of \$2,174,705 is made out on this basis. But the late dominion government recognized this claim to the extent of increasing the subsidy to the extent of \$20,000 a year.

Another claim grows out of the fishery award. The provincial government says that two years before the arbitration to Halifax the fisheries of Prince Edward Island were free to the Americans. The island was at that time not a part of the dominion, and is therefore entitled to compensation on its own account.

The other claims are in respect to certain pensions to Mrs. Whelan, the judges' salaries, which the provincial government considers too low. The Island judges have their salaries eked out by certain fees, and the government thinks that the dominion should recoup the provinces these amounts.

Then there are claims growing out of the public wharves which have been many times stated. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's replies to these claims bear date of March 28th, 1899, at which time the provincial ministers were here. He takes up the claims one by one, after stating his intense desire to do justice and explaining that Sir Louis Davies is a great friend of Prince Edward Island.

Sir Wilfrid concedes that the winter communication claims will be made as near right as possible when the new steamship is on the route.

As to the big financial claims of over \$2,000,000 he is not so explicit. But he is of the opinion that if certain railways were built in Prince Edward Island these demands would be to some extent met. At all events the financial position would assume a different phase. He says that Sir Louis Davies has been presenting the claims of a railway from Charlottetown to Murray Harbor, and that surveys have been made, and the government will soon be in a position to make recommendations. Negotiations have been going on with the provincial government to secure the assistance of the province in the building of this bridge. This is the only undertaking that Sir Wilfrid makes in regard to that part of the claim.

As to the claim for two years' damages from United States fishing prisms, Sir Wilfrid quotes the minister of marine as stating that this matter is involved in legal difficulties. It can only be settled by stating a case and having a new adjudication.

Sir Wilfrid will not promise to take over any pier and pay for them. He will not take the pension question to the department of justice to settle. He will also submit to the department of justice the question of judges' salaries in Prince Edward Island, and if anything is incumbent on the dominion to do that will be done. This is the substance of Sir Wilfrid's reply to Sir Edward Island's demands. S. D. S.

OTTAWA, June 8.—Dr. Barrett is inspector of inland revenue for the western district, of which Winnipeg is the centre. He is a man who apparently knows his business. The doctor has a high opinion of the abilities of Mr. H. A. Costigan, whose conduct is under enquiry in the public accounts committee, and seems disposed to give him the benefit of all possible doubt. His story of the various departures and financial operations of Collector Costigan confirms everything which Mr. Christie had previously stated. Dr. Barrett explained that the first difficulty occurred early in 1897 and was due to Mr. Costigan's weakness for drink. Mr. Costigan himself admitted that he had taken the Virden remittance entered in the book and soon afterwards, having a gripe complicated with whiskey, he overlooked the whole matter until he returned from the hospital. Then he reported voluntarily, though as we know from Mr. Christie's evidence, the destination of the lost money had previously been ascertained. Mr. Costigan, however, frankly stated that whiskey had got the

better of him, and gave a solemn undertaking that if the offence were overlooked he would touch no more intoxicants while he remained in the public service. This confession and pledge Inspector Barrett forwarded to Ottawa, recommending that they be accepted and that Mr. Costigan be given another chance.

From February to July nothing happened. Then Mr. Costigan got \$400 for the contingent account during the year then commencing and received the two sums of \$20 each from Richard & Co. and the McIntyre estate for warehouse permits. Without accounting for the \$40 Mr. Costigan took his departure and was for a time lost. As the \$400, according to Dr. Barrett, was "not available," the inspector telegraphed to Ottawa asking that a cheque be issued to Christie, the deputy collector, to meet the contingencies and also to pay the salary account. When asked why the \$400 was not available, the doctor said, "because Mr. Costigan was not there." The inspector could not investigate the matter in the collector's absence, but he seems to have kept up a correspondence with the department and to have made all possible attempts to discover the missing collector. On the 8th of September he wrote to Ottawa, "I have heard nothing further from the absent one." When the collector showed a cheque he issued to Christie, the deputy collector, to meet the contingencies and also to pay the salary account. When asked why the \$400 was not available, the doctor said, "because Mr. Costigan was not there." The inspector could not investigate the matter in the collector's absence, but he seems to have kept up a correspondence with the department and to have made all possible attempts to discover the missing collector. On the 8th of September he wrote to Ottawa, "I have heard nothing further from the absent one." When the collector showed a cheque he issued to Christie, the deputy collector, to meet the contingencies and also to pay the salary account.

Dr. Barrett did not know of any public duties that Mr. Costigan performed in his absence, but he heard that he reported to the customs authorities about a matter of cigars. Mr. Costigan presented to him for audit an account for expenses during his absence on "preventive service." The witness declined to recommend payment. He wrote to Costigan: "I deeply regret that I cannot approve of this item." The inspector reminded Mr. Costigan that on a previous occasion he had dealt with Ottawa direct in a matter of this kind and he advised him to do it again.

Mr. Costigan's next absence took place on November 28th, two months after his return from the disappearance before mentioned. On December 7th, the inspector wrote to Commissioner Miall that Mr. Costigan had been gone since November 28th. He said that he would not be anxious if Mr. Costigan had not been drinking. He had been seen in an intoxicated condition for two or three days after he left the office and when last seen he was heading for the station. As the office accounts were not paid, the inspector asked for money to meet them. On December 21st, Mr. Costigan returned, and the inspector wrote to Ottawa, "Party inquired for returned this afternoon." While he was gone the discovery was made of the payment of \$209 into the office and that Mr. Costigan had obtained a personal cheque for the amount which he had endorsed to a saloon keeper. In reference to this Dr. Barrett wrote to the department that Mr. Costigan's conduct was "inexcusable from a departmental standpoint." Nevertheless he was sure there was "no dispositive intention" in the consequence of alcohol. Under its influence the collector was "morally speaking as irresponsible for his conduct as the vilest lunatic." At this stage the chief commissioner ordered the suspension of Mr. Costigan and "instructed" Dr. Barrett to take charge of the office. He also ordered Barrett to hold an official investigation and report the facts fully. Witness explained that the \$209 was made good to the department after Mr. Costigan's return by Dr. Barrett's own personal cheque. It was not his own money, however, but was met by funds placed at his disposal by Mr. Costigan's friends. On January 2nd, Dr. Barrett reported this payment and asked whether he should go with the investigation, remarking that he could not see how an enquiry could reveal anything not generally known. The inquiry did not take place.

Mr. Costigan was suspended December 18th. Dr. Barrett was in charge of the office until the following July, but during April, May and June Mr. Costigan was paid his salary as collector at Winnipeg. He was at Ottawa and the cheques were forwarded back to Mr. Costigan at Ottawa. Dr. Barrett understood that he was acting collector at Ottawa during that period. He has since been made collector at Ottawa.

In cross-examination, Mr. Barrett testified that Mr. Christie had been kind to Mr. Costigan in his trouble, and was himself a first class officer and a man of the highest honor and integrity. He testified that Mr. Costigan was an excellent officer when sober; that he took the Gold Cure after the last of the above occurrences, and that it was the fixed policy of the department that any officer failure to make a report of money received should not be retained.

Hon. John Costigan got in his work by asking the inspector whether there had not been a return in the office who were lax in their duties. He called witness's attention to one person who was on the pay list for a time, and Dr. Barrett said that this man was a special officer not on the regular staff and that he knew of nothing he ever did except draw his pay. He might have performed duties, however, of which the witness did not know. One day this officer while intoxicated abused the collector with violent language. Mr. Costigan made complaint. Dr. Barrett made investigations. The case was reported to Ottawa and the young man disappeared from the public service. Mr. Costigan asked whether this officer was not a relative of the "prosecuting counsel" in this case. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper objected that this language was insulting, as he was not a prosecuting counsel, but simply a member of the committee. The young man in question was a relative of his by marriage. Mr. Costigan withdrew the offensive language and having shown that the late government did not retain the services of the young man in question, he discontinued his questions.

We had five hours' discussion in the house yesterday over the Grand Trunk strike, which is a matter of grave in-

SURPRISE SOAP
gives the whitest, sweetest, cleanest clothes on wash day.
The peculiar qualities of Surprise does it easily, quickly, economically, But 'tis good for all general uses.
To have the best Soap for all purposes insist on having
SURPRISE.

interest in Ontario and Quebec. This matter comes home more closely to parliament since two members have been taking part in the negotiations. It is now known that the intervention of the members was due to a suggestion of Mr. Wainwright, the assistant general manager of the Grand Trunk. The two members representing the labor organization are Mr. Manager Hays and went over the whole question with him. The manager declined to negotiate unless the men would first go back to their work, and he assured Mr. Powell and Mr. Taylor that if he only on the men, he would be willing to go to Ottawa or to Mr. Taylor's home in Ganouque and discuss the labor trouble. Mr. Powell and Mr. Taylor with some hesitation advised the men to accept these terms and open negotiations. It was therefore something of a surprise when it was learned that the men had been refused work when they returned to their duties. Mr. Powell is positive and emphatic in the statement that the men were all to be taken back, and there is a general feeling that Manager Hays has been playing a sharp trick not only on the men, but on the members of parliament who accepted his statement. The debate was rather one-sided, as there was a general expression of belief that the Grand Trunk management deserve the strongest condemnation.

It is too early to write the full history of last night's session. At ten o'clock in the evening the house got into committee on the Grand Trunk deal and before an hour there was another deadlock. The difficulty is not alone that the government refuses the information necessary to an understanding of the contract. The main course is a grievance. But the condition is intensified by the fact that Mr. Blair has promised information which he refuses to give. There is also the unpleasant suspicion mentioned yesterday, and still further deepened by subsequent events, that the minister's statements as to information from his officers cannot be safely accepted.

As to those two bridges, the Richelieu and the Yamaska, Mr. Blair positively stated that he had the calculation necessary to know how the one bridge would cost \$400,000 and the other \$300,000. Mr. McLennan pledged his reputation as a contractor that the bridges could be built for less than \$100,000 and \$40,000 respectively. Naturally with this wide difference the house wanted to know how Mr. Blair's engineer made up his figures. Mr. McLennan was ready with his. He gave the quantity of masonry for each pier, the price per yard, and the cost of the superstructure. Last night he backed up his first statement by a report from an engineer whom he sent down and who figured out the work on the spot. This engineer, after making generous estimates for contingencies, estimates the cost of the two bridges at \$42,000 and \$102,000. The total sum is just one-fifth of the estimate and calculation of Mr. Blair's real or imaginary engineer. But though the figures begged and as often challenged to produce his calculations, Mr. Blair has refused to bring them down.

The other difficulty is essential. The basis of agreement which Mr. Blair is trying to pass through the house requires that the expenses of maintenance shall be divided between the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial in proportion to the number of cars hauled over the road by each party. Some time ago the statement was made that the Grand Trunk hauled 100 cars for every car sent over by the Intercolonial. Mr. Blair himself in this session gave the proportion as 21 to 1. The other day he gave the ratio as 8 to 1. Now the agreement under which operations have been going on for over a year required that the company shall furnish to the government a full statement of the number of cars belonging to each party taken over the road. This is to be done every month. Thirteen days ago Mr. Blair promised Borden of Halifax to give him these monthly statements for the past year. Two days ago when Mr. Borden stated that they had not been given, Mr. Blair assured him that he was mistaken, and that the return had come down. It turned out yesterday that no such return had been produced.

Then Mr. Blair came out with the astonishing declaration that he did not have the statement and would not obtain it, and consequently would not produce it. This brought matters to a climax. The government had positively understood that the bill should go through committee at this sitting. At noon today the house was still in session and party taken over no progress. Mr. Foster some time after midnight gave a pretty strong opinion of Mr. Blair's conduct. The rules of the house do not permit a member to call another a liar, but he does not prevent one member from proving another to be one. Mr. Foster stated the case very clearly, pointed out the demoralizing effect of a minister pledging his word in the house one day and breaking it the next. It had been the boast of members in the worst times that a minister would not lie on matters of public business in their place in parliament. "The members cannot say that any longer," said Mr. Foster, "while they sit behind this minister," pointing his finger straight at Mr. Blair. Mr. Blair being

agala
a do
such
a rep
prom
Fost
ed if
sorte
erict
out.
to b
the
went
durin
fresh
sion,
gave
full i

Six H

Three

HA
ceved
that
had n
sterna
the m
Canada
left H
monta
way.
river.
After
The sur
Names
Dixon,
unmar
H. Br
marrie
marrie
P. Bo
head
rid m
the pa
Lates
are D
They
dared
two de

HAL
Alpha
Victor
partic
who le
monit
pation
Frank
manag
but D
sufferi
Boutli
the cit
Six of
fears n
are L
Brent
worth
Bouti
ning o
camp o
had as
dred as
the Be
it for
cross th
The th
pled on
Alan g
indep
tent in
take th
ling str
into th
the tra
Dixon
to find
bars an
cate the
the oth
attemp
compan
With
made 6
packs in
Denise
stricken
brought
have be
Boutlie
of rest
news ir
doubted
KING
The R
and
The R
night.
T open
were u
Upon th
dent, M
F. Foth
romas
many h
corridor
men we
is one
week-ni
Rev. M
rest of
eringha
dent, su
to be al
upon the
had fur
the full
other org
because
philanth
Those w
women,
they alo
Fotheri
ing the
ried on
and succ
After s
Manning
he was
Daught
The beat
educativ
work th
one of
trusted
had been
rise up
ters ble
Hon. R
the cong
extended