

have to pay for registration if you want to protect yourself, but that is a small item and I think \$40 or \$50 would be a big fee for this work. I know that lawyers in the House do not like to criticise the bills of other lawyers; they have a sort of feeling among themselves, but some of us who have to pay these bills sometimes feel like criticising them.

Mr. ALCORN. I would like an explanation of the item. I do not think there is a gentleman of that name practising in Belleville.

Mr. FISHER. I really cannot say. I will have to inquire about this. The Justice Department tax these bills always and authorize the payment.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. That is not satisfactory. If there are two departments concerned in an item, both ministers should be here. It has become a common practice for the other ministers to be absent when one minister is getting his estimates through, but we should be able to get these explanations fully.

Mr. FISHER. I am willing to get the information for my hon. friend, but he knows that there is a lot of this detail about which the minister does not know anything.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. There are your officers.

Mr. FISHER. We cannot have the officials here all the time. I will see that the information is given.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I have not asked who Mr. Butler is because I think I know.

Mr. FISHER. Perhaps he will tell the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn)?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. My impression is he is a brother of the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals and a very respectable man.

Mr. FISHER. Is he a lawyer?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I think he is.

Mr. FISHER. Is he at Belleville?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I think he was, but I do not know whether he is there now or not. I think he is a brother of Mr. Butler, the deputy minister, for whom I have the greatest respect, but that does not make any difference.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to know just what the hon. gentleman wants?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I want a detailed statement of what these law costs were for.

Mr. FISHER. I shall get the details.

Dominion public buildings—post office renewals, repairs, &c., \$16,000.

Mr. U. WILSON.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I presume the Brockville public building is included under this. I see a charge of about \$6,000 for that at V-62.

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that was a settlement of an old claim on the Brockville public building.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. There is a charge for interest?

Mr. FISHER. When the claim was settled, as the money had been retained for some time, interest was paid.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. There are apparently three claims, as there are three items of interest.

Mr. FISHER. There were three different claims at three different dates, and the interest had to be reckoned on each claim up to the time of payment.

Mr. MONK. If the minister is in a position to explain, I think it would be interesting to learn something respecting the award to Tompkins, Crain & Company, in connection with the Brockville public building. An award was made on June 13, 1904, of \$2,102.50, and Tompkins, Crain & Company were paid \$6,046.60. The difference between these two amounts apparently is for interest—some \$4,000. The minister can no doubt find out from his officer how there came to be such a large amount paid for interest.

Mr. FISHER. This claim was dealt with by a special board of arbitration, composed of the deputy minister, the chief engineer of the department, and the engineer of the Ottawa river works. They examined witnesses under oath, went into all the facts of the case, and eventually made this award. It was a special item, voted by the House with an explanation. The interest on the award was from 1886 to 1906, twenty years.

Mr. MONK. Was that included in the award?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Do I understand, from the vote just passed for the Chatham armoury, that the contractors, who I understand have completed their contract and want their money, will now be able to get their money?

Mr. FISHER. They will when this vote has passed parliament.

Guelph armoury, \$50,000.

Mr. ALCORN. I notice that in connection with this \$543.70 has been paid for advertising.

Mr. FISHER. That is for advertising for tenders.

Mr. ALCORN. Is it the practice of the department to advertise every contract in