

Mr. CLANCY. What was the answer?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps my hon. friend was not here. The answer was that when any Bill for a change in any of the departments was presented, the House would be fully advised of its object and purpose.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman knows that we have not to depend on the courtesy of the hon. gentleman leading the House when a subject takes the shape of a Bill, because it is public property.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend knows, he need not ask.

Mr. CLANCY. It is because I do not know that I ask. For the hon. gentleman to say that the information will come with a Bill is not an answer. The hon. gentleman knows that the First Minister thought the matter of sufficient importance only a day or two ago, to say that he would put the House in possession of the information in the early part of this week. We have reached past the middle of the week, and I think the hon. gentleman ought to say that he will give the House the information, as promised by the First Minister.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In view of the announcement in the speech from the Throne, that this department was to be reorganized. I think it most unfair that these estimates should have been placed before this committee first; and also, in view of the fact that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries absents himself from this House while these estimates are being passed, and when he could have stated his policy in case he should have the spending of the money. Under these circumstances, and as there is no doubt of the reorganization of this department taking place during the present session, I think these estimates should be allowed to stand, until this reorganization takes place. I therefore now beg leave to move—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I wish to suggest, then, that these estimates stand until the reorganization is announced to this House.

Mr. McCREARY. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is about time this wrangling were at an end. We sit here night after night endeavouring to pass estimates, and we have not yet got half through with the estimates of one department. I think that if some of these gentlemen lived three or four thousand miles away from here, they would not be so much disposed to waste the time of the House. The hon. member for East Elgin said that it was a serious matter whether this money was expended by the Minister of Public Works or by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It may be a serious matter, from a party point of view, but I submit that not one

per cent of the people of Canada care which department spends the money, so long as it is spent properly and well. I see three or four officials here, who have been coming here for several nights, while these estimates have been before the House. How long is this thing to go on? It is a crying shame that the money of the people of Canada should be wasted in this manner. If there is anything in these items which hon. gentlemen opposite object to, it is their duty to move that it be struck out; but they are afraid to do that, because it might affect some of their friends. If this thing is to go on we should meet here on Monday morning at nine o'clock, and sit right on doing business till Saturday night. I thank God the time is coming when the dog will wag the tail instead of the tail wagging the dog—when the western members will make these members come here and stay here. It may not be at the end of this census, but it will be at the end of the next census. We had three or four weeks of oratorical fireworks over the budget, during which we had a rehash of speeches that are gray with age—yes, some of them are bald-headed, and with whiskers on them. If you look at 'Hansard,' you will find some of these same speeches were made twenty-five years ago. I trust that the men who are objecting to these estimates will seriously consider the losses that many western business men have to suffer in coming here. It is no wonder that it is hard to get men in British Columbia or the North-west Territories to come down here. If they could get through in two or three months, they would not mind; but, very few can afford to be away from their homes half the summer. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite to take these things into their consideration.

Mr. INGRAM. I am not one of those who take up the time of the House speaking on the budget. I have not spoken on the budget since I have been in the House. I have my own reasons for that. I think a good many government supporters wish to have an opportunity of speaking, and that is a good time for them to do so. I think the hon. gentleman has not seriously considered this question, or he would not have spoken in the manner he has done. We find a minister leaving the city of Ottawa and going to the province of Quebec and giving the public information which has been refused to the members of this House. Is that a proper position in which to place the members of this House. If the hon. gentleman, when he made that statement in Quebec, made an incorrect statement he should be manly enough to get up here and deny it.

An hon. MEMBER. What was the statement?

Mr. INGRAM. That the Department of Public Works was to be divided and that