

take a large appropriation and put up something that will stand the test of the weather and not go on making these expenditures from year to year to no purpose. This is like other expenditures made in that county—simply to put into the hands of political heelers public money. The object of the appropriation seems to be more for the purpose of circulating money among those who are doing party service than for any public benefit. It is very remarkable, if this work has been swept away by a recent storm, that the department has not heard of it. Although in one sense it is not so surprising, since the work has been in the hands of the persons who have been desirous of seeing it carried on simply for the purpose of participating in the expenditure. Mr. J. D. Irving has also been receiving large amounts of money on account of this work. Reference has been made to the fact that this same gentleman has been drawing \$2 a day for a scow worth \$50. He had been receiving that rental year after year, for a scow which cost him \$150; in four years he has received over \$600 rent from the government. This same gentleman has been selling hemlock stumpage for the purpose of this work. I understand the logs are cut by men employed by the government, and paid by the government, and Mr. Irving receives \$4 for what he pays the local government 40 cents for. The men employed by the government do all the cutting and do all the work that is involved in the removal of the logs, which means that he gets \$4 for stumpage for which he pays only 40 cents to the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope my hon. friend will seek to verify the statements, which may come to him from time to time. I am sure he has been the victim of a good deal of exaggeration. Now he made a similar statement with regard to Richibucto Cape some days ago, and my deputy informs me that he has made inquiry and he finds my hon. friend was entirely misinformed with regard to it; and he is not unlikely to have been misinformed also with regard to the breakwater at Richibucto Cape. We have no information in the department that the breakwater has been washed away. With regard to Mr. Irving selling material for a breakwater, I make the same remark. This is before the Public Accounts Committee. It appears in the reports of 1908, and if the hon. gentleman thinks that too much money has been paid to Mr. Irving or anybody else, I would invite him to have witnesses before the Public Accounts Committee to that effect.

Mr. CROCKET. With regard to the statement I made, I received it from the largest property owner at Richibucto Cape.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the name?

Mr. CROCKET. Mr. Richard O'Leary. He would have more interest in this work than any one else.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is that the gentleman who wrote that letter to Mr. Waterbury?

Mr. CROCKET. It is the same Mr. O'Leary, from whom Thomas O. Murray bought the sawdust wharf for \$700, to sell to the government for \$5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A wharf in respect of which no man from Richibucto, with the exception of Richard O'Leary, could be produced and swear that the property was not worth \$5,000.

Mr. CROCKET. I do not propose to discuss the Richibucto wharf now, we will have occasion to discuss that in more detail later on. But the minister asked me to verify these statements. I have made statements here in reference to expenditures in Kent county, based upon information received from that county. I have afterwards had the opportunity of examining witnesses, upon oath, in reference to those statements, and in every case, I may say the information which I had received was completely borne out by sworn evidence, even though some of it had to be extracted from unwilling witnesses. Unfortunately when Mr. Irving was on the stand, I omitted to question him about the item of hemlock stumpage, but I have no doubt had I done so, my information in this matter would also have been verified.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 113) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

On section 2,—time for construction of railway, Sudbury to Little Current, extended.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. I opposed this section as it was introduced in committee. My reason for doing so was that I thought the time should be made in accordance with the provisions of a Bill passed in the Ontario legislature, at its session of last year, relating to this company, which limited the time for the completion of the entire line from Sudbury to Little Current to not later than the 31st of December, 1911. Before the committee I urged the modification of the Bill, and the promoters, I am glad to say, saw the reasonableness of my contention and acceded to the view that the time should be extended only two years. I make this remark because of the fact that in a