

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Fraser does not know. The arrangement was made with the Sault St. Marie Tug Company.

Mr. BENNETT. The other day we had the statement from the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce), who had the advantage of being on the ground, that Captain Sullivan was in charge. He made further the statement that there is no such concern in the town, at least known to him. The correspondence shows that there was a tug called the 'Boynton,' whose register I cannot find in the books. But one thing is evident from this correspondence, and that is that no one had any confidence in the tug 'Boynton':

White Fish Point, December 20.

B. H. Fraser,  
Assistant Chief Engineer, Marine and Fisheries, Ottawa.

Arrived here in northwest gale, going on to Caribou soon as weather moderates; gale too strong for 'Boynton.' Followed us for several miles then turned back. I will leave to work up north shore.

B. H. BRUNEL.

Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, December 19, 1904.

B. H. Fraser,  
Assistant Chief Engineer, Marine and Fisheries, Ottawa.

Keepers relatives no faith 'Boynton,' request me to go with Reid, Caribou, leaving now, cannot find Boyd.

B. H. BRUNEL.

All I can say is that this shows wonderful lack of business capacity in the department. But one thing is certain the country has to pay \$8,000 or \$10,000 on these expeditions. One tug was hired, then two were brought to help her out, and finally a third was brought to help those out. Then when they start out after the lighthouse keepers, you hire a tug called the 'Boynton,' in which no one has any confidence, which is utterly helpless, and you pay \$125 a day for her. No wonder the expenditure of the country has increased forty million.

Mr. BRODEUR. I thought I had made very clear the circumstances under which these different arrangements were made. There were very pressing requests made upon the department to see that this channel was kept open. That was most important for the trade of the country, because otherwise it would have been impossible to move the large quantity of wheat which was then at Fort William and Port Arthur. We were asked by the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and other public bodies to keep the channel open and at the same time to see that the lights were kept up, so as to give a chance to vessels to go through Lake Superior and the Soo canal and reach Georgian bay. My hon. friend says that the department did not show much business experience in what it did. Well, it was a new venture. There was a sort of crisis, and we had to

take all the steps available to meet the difficulties of the situation. And I may tell my hon. friend that the department has received the thanks of all those interested—the thanks of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and other public bodies—for the work that was done there. My hon. friend now says we had too many vessels, that we had tugs which were not powerful. His first charge against the department was that the tugs were not powerful.

It was simply a question of keeping the channel open by keeping the ice from forming. For this purpose it is not necessary to have powerful boats. We succeeded in keeping the channel open and the object in view was realized. The light keepers were left at their lights later than usual because the shipping season was prolonged. Suppose we had removed these lighthouse keepers before navigation actually closed, would not the department have been severely criticised? At one time there was a very serious uproar in Sault Ste. Marie because the light keeper on Caribou Island was supposed to be dead or to have risked his life by leaving in an open boat. A vessel was sent over to that light and gave the ordinary signals, but received no responsive signals from the lighthouse. The thing was reported to the department and, in order to save the life of this man, and to bring him to his family in Sault Ste. Marie, no effort was spared and no time was lost. Another vessel was sent up and the man's life was saved. But we are blamed for sending that vessel. I do not think the department should be blamed for what it has done in these matters.

Mr. NORTHROP. I do not flatter myself that I shall be able to explain to the minister why the department should be blamed, for all that one can do is to repeat once more the statements which the hon. minister has, so far, not attempted to answer. We make definite, specific charges and from the very first evening when the hon. gentleman appeared here to explain the estimates of the department, he has pursued the same course—he has not deigned to answer in any way any charge that we have made. But, if it happens that anybody from the province of Quebec is concerned in the charges made, the minister holds up his hand and protests that an attack is being made upon the people of Quebec, and especially upon the French Canadians of that province. There is no hon. member of this House—why, Mr. Speaker, there is not a page sitting at your feet, but understands what we have been saying. The one person within these walls who fails to grasp, to the slightest extent, the meaning of the statements made by hon. members on this side is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) himself. If I might venture to make a suggestion it would be that if the minister would condescend to listen to what