

perty had been injured by an earthquake; when some one was consoling with him because of the loss he had sustained he said that the only consolation he had in the matter was that although he had been married for forty years this was the first time that any accident had happened that his wife had not blamed him for. It seems that there are members of this House who will blame this government even for loss caused by an earthquake.

Passing from the speech of the hon. leader of the opposition to that of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the hon. member for North Toronto, speaking of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), said that he had given the whole force of his address to an endeavour to break the strength of the manifesto of the Liberal Conservative party. I did not notice that the Prime Minister devoted a moment of his time to breaking the strength of the manifesto of the Liberal Conservative party, but he did devote a few minutes to showing the House and the people of Canada that there was no strength in the manifesto of the Liberal Conservative party. The hon. member for North Toronto—I am sorry that he is not in his place to-night and if he were in his place I would speak more boldly perhaps than I will speak in his absence—went on and laboured strenuously to prove that there were some planks in the platform laid down by his leader that did not contain a loophole, or, as he put it, an 'if' or a 'but.' One of the planks in which he thought there was no loophole, was: Honest appropriation and expenditure of public money in the public interest. Well, Sir, any leader who places that plank in his platform pays the greatest possible compliment to the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Let me read it again: Honest appropriation and expenditure of public money in the public interest. That is the principle that has been acted upon for eleven years by the Laurier government and the Reform administration. I think it was the leader of the opposition who said that no reference had been made to the moneys that had been paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company, or to supplying the steamer 'Arctic' for her voyage to the northern seas. Well, I know of no reason why any speaker upon the Reform side should not mention the money spent on the North Atlantic Trading Company. If there is any one charge that the Conservatives of this House ought to be sick and tired of it is their charge with reference to the North Atlantic Trading Company, for they signally failed in proving the truth of their charges in connection with the government's transactions with the company.

Mr. AVERY. Who were they?

Mr. MILLER. If your leader had taken the information that was twice or thrice offered him he would have known who

Mr. MILLER.

they are. I say that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) ought to be ashamed of his record in this House with respect to the North Atlantic Trading Company and the gentlemen connected with that company.

Mr. AVERY. Do you know who they are to-day?

Mr. MILLER. I do not care a button who they are so long as I know the work they have done and the terms upon which they have done it. The hon. member (Mr. Foster) when he knew an inquiry was to be proceeded with, and before he heard the evidence, rendered his verdict and he accused men who were not in this House and who had no opportunity of defending themselves, of rascality and dishonesty. I say, Sir, that when the evidence was given and when the witnesses proved that the hon. member (Mr. Foster) was wrong in the charges he had made, had he been the kind of man that ought to represent a constituency in this House he would have apologized for the charges he made and the words he used, but so far no apology has come. Men may honestly differ as to the wisdom of the contract made with the North Atlantic Trading Company, but there has not been one iota of proof that there was anything dishonest in the dealings between this government and the company. And as to the voyage of the steamship 'Arctic,' why should any Reformer be ashamed of anything in connection with that incident. We find that in the year 1904-5, the year in which great complaint was made as to the expenditures for the supplies for that steamer, \$112,050 had been expended, but I point out that in the year 1905-6 the expenditure for the supplies for that steamer was only \$12,813 and in the year 1906-7 the expenses were only \$11,558. The supplies laid in 1904-5 have been largely sufficient for the steamer's use in subsequent years, and about \$25,000 worth of supplies have been removed from the boat and placed in store at Quebec for future use. In addition about 12,000 pounds of provision, rope, tobacco, &c., were left in the Hudson Bay district, in caches for emergencies, in case vessels should be wrecked or require provisions. And those of us who are as well informed as we ought to be, know of the splendid work the 'Arctic' and her officers have done for Canada since that investigation took place. We know that the 'Arctic' has gone to the northern seas, has taken possession for Britain and for Canada of islands that might otherwise have remained disputed territory; we know that the Union Jack was planted on islands over which it never waved before; we know that the Hudson bay has been marked without any uncertainty as a closed Canadian sea, a matter which will probably prevent very great friction between this country and the