

of the country, that the matter should be investigated, and that the truth with respect to it should be ascertained and made known. It is satisfactory to observe that the American Government have not been much startled by the statements of this gentleman; for I have not observed that they have found any reason to enter into correspondence with respect to it. At the same time public opinion in the United States has been affected to a considerable extent by the allegations made by this gentleman who puts "professor" to his name, and who has figured in our history very creditably hitherto. I had the pleasure of knowing Professor Hind for many years, and I formed a high opinion of his ability and talents; but my own impression on reading these documents, is that the gentleman is reaching that period of life when, either through disappointments or decadence of mental power, he is not entirely responsible for what he says. I am sorry to be obliged to find that solution as applicable to this case. But it appears to me that enough has been said to justify an inquiry. We cannot ignore statements received as these have been, and commented on in official, or at all events parliamentary circles, and it would be desirable to put an end at once, if possible, to even a suspicion of the *bona fides* of the Canadian Government in this transaction. In the first place, it strikes me that his whole case is at fault in this; that the frauds which are alleged to have been perpetrated by the officers of the Fishery Department would be to the disadvantage of Canada. If they were relied on for any purpose in the adjudication of this case, I cannot see that their effect on the arbitration would be to increase the amount demanded from the American Government for the privilege of fishing in Canadian waters. If we have exaggerated the catch of fish, how can anyone believe that the American counsel, or the witnesses they produced, would have been influenced by that circumstance? They have their own statistics of the catch of fish by their own fishermen on our shores, and I apprehend they relied on their own evidence, and not on anything that Mr. Whitcher might state. On the other hand, I suppose it might be said that the advantage to us was greater by reason of the privilege of sending our fish into their markets free of duty. If we caught twice as much fish as they, I suppose that would be an advantage to us; but that would lead to a diminution in the amount of money to be paid to us. So that on both sides of this question it appears to me, that Professor Hind is entirely mistaken in regard to these mistakes, or blunders, or frauds. They could have no influence or effect on the award itself. It it were proper to argue that two wrongs would make a right, I think the people and the Parliament of Canada might go back a little in the history of international arrangements, and might find plenty of evidence to justify them in saying that in the case of the Geneva Award statistics must have been used that subsequent investigation proved to have been greatly exaggerated, because it is notorious that a very large sum of money, amounting to several millions of dollars, remains in the hands of the American Government unclaimed to-day, and the amount of the award must have been based on some evidence of the extent of damage that was done. I apprehend, therefore, that if we are to have an international inquiry, it ought to affect both cases, and we might find that we could set off any excess on the one hand by a large excess on the other. This matter ought, at any rate, to be investigated, the facts ought to be known, and this false charge, as I think it appears to be on its face, ought to be exploded.

Motion agreed to.

#### SELLING OF HAY.

Mr. DOMVILLE moved for copies of all correspondence and telegrams relating to the selling of hay through King's  
Mr. MACDOUGALL,

County, in the Province of New Brunswick, on the Intercolonial Railway; copies of notices asking for tenders for the purchase of hay and tenders received; also all orders issued by the officials on the Intercolonial Railway for the selling of hay, permits given to officials to cut hay for their own use, authority for issuing such orders, and all papers relative to the withdrawal of such orders and tenders. He said: The matter which I have to bring before the Minister of Railways is one which is not so much departmental as a question of right. When the first portion of the Intercolonial was constructed, that portion known as the European and North American Railway, it started from the city of St. John, passing through the counties of King's and Westmoreland and finishing at the place called Shediac in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The people whose lands the railroad traversed, in those days prior to Confederation, gave the right of way, in many instances, for nothing. As far as I can learn an Act was passed authorising the Government to take the lands, and compensate the people in some way for the right of going through, at the same time giving the Government power to take deeds of the lands by a certain form laid down to be registered at the Registry Office. For twenty years the people had enjoyed the privilege of cutting hay free on the lands traversed by the railway, and for which it is claimed they never got compensation, the right of way having been given the road free, on the ground that the people would derive great advantage through having a railroad passing their doors, and on the understanding that they would not be interfered with in regard to the hay. Last year, however, a pre-emptory order was issued stopping the right to cut hay, thus bringing the question at once to the issue of testing the rights of the people along the road. I do not propose to find fault with the Government, but wish to have this matter settled. If the people gave the right of way, on the understanding they were to have the hay, and were not paid for the land, and enjoyed the right of cutting the hay for twenty years, it seems hard that at a moment's notice that right should be taken from them. The argument has been brought forward that this order applied, not only to the Province of New Brunswick, but the whole country traversed by the Intercolonial, and therefore the people of King's and Westmoreland had nothing to complain of. I am not prepared to accept that doctrine, because the railroad when first built only passed through those counties. The sole difficulty arose in King's county, because in that county the road passed through hay growing districts. In my opinion their rights should have been considered. This question should be tested with one or two, and not with every farmer on the line of the road. When the Government asked for tenders for the sale of the hay, none of the farmers would tender, because every man was interested in getting the hay along the line close to his own property, and one farmer would not interfere with another. As to outsiders, it was impossible for them to cut the hay, because if they had tendered, and their tender had been accepted for the purchase of the hay, they could not have got the right of way to take it off the banks of the Intercolonial within the fences. The Government should select some one person in a county and test the question with him. When I found this order existed, I appealed to the Government, and the Government very properly stopped what I considered to be an injustice to my people. The matter rests there, and now I bring it before the hon. the Minister of Railways in order that some settlement may be arrived at. I know the hon. Minister will give it attention and justice, notwithstanding the criticism in some of the local press of my Province, to the effect that the hon. the Minister of Railways was hostile entirely to any of my constituents interests. I offered the authorities of the road to make