

They awarded that contract for 15,000 tons. My hon. friend talks about Mr. Smith making from \$60,000 to \$75,000 out of the contract, but he knows that the final agreement was that Smith's books, or the books of the hay company, shall be open to the inspection of Government inspectors and accountants appointed by them, and that they shall not make a profit of more than \$1 a ton on the hay they send out, the limit of which shall be \$15,000, not \$75,000, as stated by the hon. member for Carleton. The hon. gentleman sometimes talks in the language of exaggeration, but it is inexcusable for him to do so on this occasion, having in regard the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture concerning the agreement which was finally entered into. Every precaution was taken to see that everything was done regularly and in the proper manner. Now, what is the complaint of the hon. member for Carleton? Some gentlemen from the county of Carleton made an application for another contract some weeks ago. They said they thought they could supply 1,500 tons of hay, on the same terms and conditions as were contained in the agreement made with the hay company of which Mr. Smith and the Messrs. Peters are members. A contract was given these gentlemen, not for 1,500, but for 1,000 tons, because before they entered into the contract they said that that was all they would undertake to supply. In regard to my hon. friend's assertion that this is the first time that things were done contrary to the wishes of Mr. Smith, I desire to say that Mr. Smith had advised the department that he had no objection to offer if the contract was entered into with those gentlemen for the amount of hay which they said they were able to furnish. My understanding of the matter is that when it came to making the contract, they were willing to undertake to supply only 1,000 tons, intimating that perhaps at a later date, when they saw better how matters were and to what extent hay should be available in the country, they might be prepared to enter into a contract for the supplying of a further amount. The terms and conditions of this contract were the same as those of the agreement entered into with the other contractors, which provided that they could not make a profit of more than \$1 a ton. I was not influenced by fear of schism in the Conservative party in Carleton county. They are good fighting men, as the Liberals in Carleton are, and when a contest comes they are prepared to stand together, more

strongly and more determinedly than they ever stood together in the past. The hon. gentleman says that the facts are laughed at in New Brunswick. My information is of a very different character indeed. The greatest possible interest has been taken in the matter, particularly in the hon. gentleman's constituency, where it is known that he is connected with the matter. If my information is correct, there is a feeling of indignation among the farmers in the county of Carleton over the publication of that contract which proposed to penalize and punish the farmers of the county for thinking of anything so iniquitous as selling their hay to any operator at more than \$8 a ton. However, this is not the time and place to discuss this matter, although my hon. friend no doubt wanted an opportunity of making some reference to the debate that took place in which he and the Minister of Agriculture were the principal participants. I shall say nothing further about it at this time, except to assure the hon. member for Assiniboia and the hon. member for Carleton, speaking in all sincerity, and having regard to the information which I have received, which I believe to be correct, that their suspicions with regard to what was in the report and what was afterwards deleted from it are absolutely without foundation.

Mr. CARVELL: I want to put my hon. friend right: it was not the farmer who might be penalized; it was the merchant.

Mr. HAZEN: He would be penalized for paying the farmer a little more.

Mr. CARVELL: It was not so bad for the Minister of Agriculture to make an argument of the kind advanced by my hon. friend to-night, because the minister did not know what he was talking about. The acting minister talks about this man Smith bringing his books into court, and about allowing him only \$1 a ton profit. The minister will do mighty well if he does not pay \$25 a ton for that hay instead of \$23, because the most glorious set of books ever seen on earth will come before the minister. When you talk to the farmers in New Brunswick about Smith's books being brought before the minister or before a chartered accountant or inspector of the Government—well, my hon. friend is smiling; he knows the circumstances.

Mr. HAZEN: I am smiling at my hon. friend.