

## OTTAWA LETTER.

No Member of Parliament,  
Not Even Bourassa,

So Effectually Rebuked as John  
Charlton Was on Wednesday  
for His Pro-Boer Resolu-  
tions.

All of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's Quebec  
Supporters Save Half a Dozen at  
the Most, Did Not Remain in the  
Chamber When the Vote Was  
Called.

OTTAWA, April 23.—At the close of yesterday's discussion resulting in the further suppression of Intercolonial railway evidence, a conservative member talked to me this morning. "It must be admitted that we opposition members are not much in hysterics. If such an outrage had been perpetrated by the conservatives when in power what a tornado of furious oratory would have followed. What a wealth of invective, what perfect Klondike of abuse Sir Louis Davies would have flung across the house. What a wreckage of desks would have been heaped around Mr. Patterson's fighting ground. How earnestly and piously Fraser of Gushyore would have appealed to heaven against these enormities. How Sir Wilfrid Laurier would have exhibited his tender conscience to a sympathetic audience. How the tortured air would have vibrated and shivered as Sir Richard Cartwright poured out a torrent of well deserved wrath upon the evil doers. It would have been a grand sight, a most moving spectacle. But here we have one after another calmly presented our case, argued that the government ought to allow the tax to be brought out, pointed out the necessity of this enquiry, insisted as well as we could that it was indecent and inequitable to exclude the people from a knowledge of the manner in which their money is expended. We have had witnesses headed off whom we desired to bring to establish important facts. We have had papers refused that we considered necessary to bring out the whole transaction. We have witnesses ordered not to speak by the head of the department in which they serve, and we have twice had the house voting down an appeal in favor of a full investigation. Yet we have not raised the roof and have not spoken loud enough to be heard more than one hundred yards. No speaker has been obliged to call us to order for using profane language, and we have never once threatened the government with the vengeance of eternal fire in the world to come."

This member probably did not desire a return to the old noise and tumult, and yet he has some sort of idea that the public might not fully realize the seriousness of the situation. It is undoubtedly a fact that the public accounts committee as now organized and as protected by the majority in the house, is a very feeble machine for investigation. More than half of the members are there apparently for the express purpose of suppressing information dangerous to the government, and so far as the Intercolonial is concerned not a single man has testified who is not under the direct authority of Mr. Blair and liable to be dismissed the next moment after he gives evidence unsatisfactory to that minister. We have had contracts produced claiming to be complete which are incomplete. Papers have been refused that are necessary to explain purchases made very year. And at last we have found government supporters in the committee carrying around in their pockets letters of instruction sent by the minister to the government employee and taken from the owner's desk without his knowledge.

Mr. Haggart appealed to the house against the refusal of the committee to allow Peter Archibald to be called. He was voted down. He appealed again against the refusal of the committee to allow an examination in a contract for locomotives made before 1901, and again he was voted down. Precedent after precedent was quoted showing that in other years and under another government papers were brought down covering eight or ten years of operation, but the answer is the same. One majority is worth more than a score of precedents.

About twenty years ago or more a railway company set out to build a road at Red Deer between Calgary and Edmonton. This company had the promise of a land grant and other encouragement. The road was not built. On several occasions the company came back to parliament and got an extension of time for their charter. Years passed. Some of the promoters died, and some got poor. No road was built, settlers flocked in and the land intended for a subsidy, which was worth very little when it was offered, became very valuable. Coal was discovered in the neighborhood, and the charter became an object of desire. A group of Toronto capitalists, the same that got the benefit of the Crow's Nest Pass deal, and have been concerned with other enterprises assisted by the government, saw a great opportunity. They stopped the company with much cost the rights of the old corporation and came to parliament for a renewal of the charter.

Meanwhile the people in the west began to think they had something to do with the matter. They perceived that the wealth of land and minerals supposed to be given to this railway company was several times more than sufficient to pay for the road. They wanted the land for settlement, and were very anxious that no corporation should gobble it up. Already far too large a part of the lands in Alberta is held by large corporations, and there is no question so important to that young country as the land question. Mr. Oliver, the member for Alberta, who is a liberal and a pretty good party man, says that he was in-

structed by his constituents without respect to party, to oppose any action that would again lock up these lands. As the old promoters have gone out of existence, and the new ones have no stake in the transaction, there is no earthly reason why the lapse of charters should be revived. To extend the time now is in the view of all the western men nothing less than a new grant of land to a new group of people. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Mr. Sifton and other ministers are solemnly pledged against further land subsidies in the west, and Mr. Scott of Assiniboia declared yesterday that all the members supporting the government in the west made these promises on the part of the administration.

But the promoters have a great pull and in the railway committee the fight was almost an even one. Members of the government used their influence in favor of the charter and the land grant. But their supporters in the west opposed it. When it came to a vote it looked like an almost even division of the seventy odd members of the standing committee who were present. After Chairman Charlie Hyman had put the question, "shall the preamble of the bill be adopted?" and while the clerk was taking down the names of the members as they recorded their votes, three members came rushing together. These were Mr. Johnson of Cape Breton, Aubrey Morrison of British Columbia, and Mr. German of Newfoundland. They all voted for the bill, which was declared carried by a majority of one. Then a member called attention to the fact that votes had been taken of these members who were not in when the motion was put. In accordance with the rule the chairman asked them whether they heard the motion put to the meeting. Members are thus put upon their honor, for if they say they heard the motion their vote is good. The Cape Breton member surprised the objector by stating he heard the question put from the chair, and his vote was duly counted. But the other two admitted that they did not hear it, and Mr. Hyman struck their votes out. The bill was thus defeated and the committee so reported to the house.

But the capitalists had no idea of giving it up that way. On their behalf Mr. Cowan of Red Deer rose and asked that the bill be sent back to the committee for further consideration. The reason he gave was that the absence of these members was an accident and that the true sense of the committee would have been in favor of the measure. Mr. Oliver, with true western strenuousness, made his fight over again, and was supported by the leader of the opposition and by the western members on his own side. The debate continued through the afternoon, the minister of railways vehemently demanding the return of the bill to the committee. Sir Wilfrid Laurier also made an appeal to his followers, and the question resolved itself into a party division.

A few days ago Mr. Bell of Pictou was advocating a return of a certain bill to the committee on the ground that some misunderstanding had occurred there. At that time Sir Wilfrid took the other ground, contending that the report of the committee ought not to be reversed by the house unless important reasons were shown. The premier then took the particular grounds on which the bill should appear on the records of the committee and should not be those raised by members in the house purporting to set forth what occurred in the committee. If members were to come from the committee, each with his own story, there would be no end of contradictions and confusions. Yesterday Sir Wilfrid Laurier based his argument on the statement made in the house that two members were too late in the committee to be counted, a fact which did not appear on the record. Mr. Bell promptly brought the premier to book, showing him that he was taking exactly the opposite ground from which he took against Mr. Bell a few days before. It is nothing new for the premier to take opposite ground to himself. He is doing that every day, but the exposure is not often as direct and prompt as it was this time. The premier's reply was characteristic. He appealed to the chair that Mr. Bell was breaking the rules by referring to a previous debate. Here also Mr. Bell confronted him with his record, for only a few minutes before the premier had been discussing the self-same previous debate. The result was that Mr. Bell induced Sir Wilfrid to allow him to go on with his speech. But all the same the Red Deer bill goes back to the railway committee.

OTTAWA, April 24.—Mr. Charlton claims that he brought up his South Africa resolution from a strong and overpowering sense of duty, and does not care what people think about him so long as he has the approval of his esteemed conscience. Nevertheless he gave very obvious signs that he did care when his speech brought out cries of dissent from opposition and government ranks alike. Mr. Charlton has made some South Africa speeches before, which had the approval of one side and part of the other. This time there was a general feeling that he should have let well enough alone, and that feeling was manifested rather strenuously. While Mr. Charlton professed to be careless about it, he went out of his way too much in his attempt to make that appear. A man who is altogether careless would not spend minutes setting forth the fact. A friend of mine used to quote the remark of the lover of Clara Vere de Vere, who says that the lion on her own stone gates was not more cold than he. My friend's comment was that the lion would not take the trouble to tell her how cold he was.

The report of the discussion has already appeared in your columns, and it is only necessary to call attention to one or two features. Mr. Bourassa's statement that the concessions made to the Canadians were given on compulsion, because England was really beaten in that war, would be hard to sustain. Mr. Charlton was certainly wrong when he said that one of the terms of peace after the United States civil war was a general amnesty to all offenders. As a matter of fact the South surrendered practically without

condition. Mr. Charlton is absurdly incorrect when he says that no political disqualification followed. The truth is that local self-government was taken from the South for years, and the party in the majority there was left absolutely without control while the Southern States were ruled by Northern delegates.

But these precedents hardly need to be discussed. The terms of peace in Africa cannot be settled in Canada. We have no people here qualified to arrange them and our knowledge is so insufficient that it is a mere impertinence for this parliament to intervene. Sir Wilfrid and Mr. Monk pointed out clearly enough the mischievous character of the resolution. The officers in the field are arranging terms of peace and even the British parliament refrains from interference. While these brave officers are endeavoring to bring the war to an honorable conclusion a member of the Canadian parliament is offering an excuse to thousands of miles away asks other members, who know as little about it as he does, to dictate to the persons in charge what terms they shall offer. If these terms are less advantageous than Kitchener demands, Mr. Charlton is offering an excuse to the Boers for refusing them and holding out an inducement to them to break off negotiations.

So far Sir Wilfrid Laurier was right. When he expressed the opinion that the discussion had done good as far as it had gone, he was obviously wrong. If the discussion had stopped there it would have done great harm, for it would have left the world in ignorance of the real feeling of the house. At that stage only Mr. Charlton and Mr. Bourassa had spoken. Mr. Charlton contending that the Cape Colony rebels ought to be treated generously and granted a full amnesty, and Mr. Bourassa maintaining his original position that England was all wrong in the war and that Chamberlain was criminally responsible for it. Having these speeches, it is much better to have had in addition the speeches of Dr. Sproule, Col. Hughes, Mr. Kemp, and Mr. Oliver, and the dignified statements of Mr. Monk, backed as they were by the practical business vote of parliament. The statement that now goes out from this discussion is that not only is the Canadian parliament unwilling to interfere, but that it does not endorse Mr. Charlton's position as to the terms which should be made. Sir Wilfrid endorsed him after Mr. Charlton had taken out his amnesty clause, but there is no reason to suppose that he was speaking the mind of the house.

Col. Hughes does not believe that a complete amnesty would be made, and he is certain that no amnesty conditions will be made part of the terms of peace. He expresses pretty strong opinions of the character of the Cape rebels, of whom he has some personal information. He is quite clear in his mind that the British are more likely to make a mistake on the side of severity to the loyalists and generosity to the rebels than they are to go to the other extreme. All the precedents in Africa at least indicate a British weakness for yielding too much to the enemies of the British empire. Another strong opinion against another compromise, such as Mr. Gladstone made a quarter of a century ago.

Mr. Oliver, who is pretty closely associated with the Strathcona men and other westerners who fought in Africa, speaks out with true western businessness. He speaks of the treachery of the Cape rebels, who are peaceful burghers one day and plundering marauders the next, who rob their neighbors and shoot their fellow citizens in the back and then come in at the end of the war to ask for a vote. He speaks of the damages which their own treachery has brought upon them. In Oliver's opinion, these men, who have added treachery to treason and murder to both, do not require sympathy from the Canadian people, so much as the children who were made fatherless and the families whom they had made beggars. Mr. Oliver brought upon himself the rebuke of the speaker by a strong suggestion that the disloyalty of these Boers was reached by similar disloyalty among a few people in this country, and he made a broad suggestion that Mr. Charlton and Mr. Bourassa were at heart traitors, too. It is rather significant that Mr. Bourassa, who has sided with the Boers from the beginning, should now be in harmony with Mr. Sifton, and that Mr. Charlton, who devoted his deal of time to a discussion of the loyalty and contentedness of the French Canadians, should be the same man who two years ago, speaking in his own county, urged the establishment of a French-speaking garrison in the province of Quebec. Mr. Kemp did not fail to remind him of this.

In spite of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and notwithstanding the apparent anxiety of Mr. Charlton to withdraw his motion, there were very obvious signs that he insisted upon forcing it to a vote. Mr. Hughes could have had his way if the members would have been called in and the votes would have been counted. But the oral response to the speaker's call seemed to be unanimous. There may have been four ayes, but perhaps there were only three. It should, however, be stated that out of fifty of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's supporters from Quebec, not more than half a dozen at the most, including Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Monk, who supported him, remained in the chamber when the vote was called. No member of parliament, not even Mr. Bourassa, has been so effectually rebuked as Mr. Charlton was on this occasion. Some part of the rebuke attaches to the premier, who had it in his power to stop the proceeding before the discussion commenced, and who made the mistake of practically approving the discussion down to the time that he himself addressed the house.

To turn to a subject of more peaceful character, the minister of agriculture believes that the greatest problem before the Canadian people just now is that of ocean transportation. He says that in spite of Mr. Fisher's claim, Canada is a long way behind the rest of the world in the means of transporting dairy and fruit products to outside markets. The minister of agriculture admits that Canada lost last year \$2,000,000 because the cheese sent

to England was not of the quality required there. The English people now want a soft cheese and Canada has not the means of delivering that class of goods on the British market without damage. Senator Ferguson says that the ships now employed are quite inadequate for this class of freight. He is equally positive that they are not suitable for the transportation of fruit. Senator Ferguson known about this, for he is himself a fruit grower and fruit shipper, and is entitled to the honor of opening up to the Prince Edward Island fruit growers the prospect of an English market. He referred to a shipment of apples sent across the ocean which was exposed to 110 degrees of heat in the vessel's hold, and asserts that very little fruit had been shipped without very great damage and loss. Fruit sent to the Glasgow exhibition under special arrangements arrived in perfect condition, and a package of pears was sold 50 per cent. higher than those shipped in the ordinary way. Mr. Ferguson himself lost \$150 by damages incurred on shipment on one car load of apples, which would have yielded him a handsome profit if they had arrived in good condition. The substitution by the Fisheries Minister of inferior ships for the Lyallist and Evangeline caused immense loss to fruit shippers.

Senator Ferguson did not mention the fact, but it can be learned through the public records, that part of the shipment of chickens fattened at the government station in Charlottetown, under charge of Mr. Haggart, arrived in England in a mouldy condition. The result was that 120 of the chickens were sold for \$1.50, or a little more than a cent apiece, while the freight charges and other expenses amount to 13 cents each. Some of the product of other fattening stations in P. E. I. also suffered. Undoubtedly Senator Ferguson is right in holding that ocean transportation is one of the great questions to be settled in the future, and that it is of more importance to the Canadian exporter than any other.

Mr. Fisher has not been very successful in his attempt to explain why this census is going to cost between two and three times as much as any previous census of Canada. He has been ready to say as much, and there are now over 200 people at work in the bureau at a cost of some \$10,000 a month. No doubt the census will be the worst one ever taken as well as the most expensive, and Mr. Fisher's answer to be quite inadequate. He says the cost of clerical work is very much higher than it was ten years ago, but as a matter of fact he is paying the employees in the bureau exactly the same rate as was paid in 1891. It is true that there are a few new questions in the schedule, but the larger part of them do not require an answer in a great majority of houses. The real work of the enumerator is scarcely any larger than it was ten years ago.

The truth appears to be that Mr. Fisher had to appoint two or three commissioners to do the work formerly done by one in each district, and two or three enumerators where formerly one was engaged. All these officials have to be instructed and are paid during the time of their instruction. It takes a long time to instruct three officials as it does one, and all these are paid without any more work being done during the preliminary period. Mr. Fisher says that he had a hard time to get the enumerators he wanted, so abundant was other employment. But the members questioned him closely and found that he had nothing to do with the applications. They were made to the members supporting the government or to defeated candidates, and Mr. Fisher accepted their recommendations.

Here are some of the incidents. Mr. Haggart informed Mr. Fisher that in his county the enumerator farmed out his job for \$20 to another enumerator, who does not appear to have been a member in. Of course it cost more money if two men have to live on the job while one man does the work. Mr. Clark reports that in his riding 30 men were required to do the work performed by 15 the last time. There was an increase of 250 people and it cost \$1,400 more to count them. Mr. Ganong informed the minister that he counted enough girls in Charlotte County to take the census all over New Brunswick at the same price paid in 1891. Mr. Bennett of East Simcoe says there has been no increase of population in his riding, but the cost of counting increased from \$2,304 to \$4,750. There were two men in the place who claimed the patronage recommending different commissioners, and so Mr. Fisher appointed and paid them both. Mr. Fisher explained that there was considerable French population in East Simcoe and that the area was very large, to which Mr. Bennett replied that the commissioner for the large area was a cripple and neither of them could speak French, while a justice of the peace who was appointed enumerator was in the habit of signing his papers "A B Justus Face." South Simcoe is much more populous as it was ten years ago, but the cost of counting the population increased from \$1,341 to \$2,794. West Bruce cost \$2,133, which is nearly double the cost ten years ago, though the population decreased over 4,000. It was suggested that the enumerators were paid to hunt for the lost 4,000. The enumeration of Centre Wellington cost \$1,591 ten years ago, last year \$2,581; East Grey \$1,334 in 1891, \$3,593 last year; West Northumberland increased from \$1,536 to \$3,322; South Ontario from \$1,232 to \$2,663. The whole province of Ontario from \$147,442 to \$381,401. West Elgin from \$1,600 to \$3,300. Mr. Fraser of Gushyore insisted that he appointed good men in his place, and that if he made two commissioners instead of one, he did it to save money. He claimed that at least \$200 was saved by doubling up the work. But it cost \$2,391 in 1901 to count the people of Gushyore, whereas they were counted ten years ago for \$1,239. Mr. Monk had heard some queer stories about the enumeration in Jacques Cartier, and ascertained from Mr. Fisher that this county was enumerated in 1891 at a cost of \$342, whereas last year it cost \$2,700.

OTTAWA, April 25.—The railway discussion which has been going on for a few days has developed very little of original and absorbing interest. Mr. Blair's three hour speech, which has been pretty fully reported, will be seen to contain practically nothing that has not appeared in his previous statements. He affirms that he has made a great railway of the Intercolonial, increased the business by sixty per cent, and would have made some profit out of it if it did not cost so much to run the road. It hardly need be stated that if a road which paid its way with \$3,000,000 earnings could be run at the same expense when it is earning \$5,000,000 there would be a balance on the right side. But it is an extraordinary feature of the Intercolonial as distinguished from all other railways that the increased traffic produced by the great activity of the time has not improved the balance sheet. Other railways have gained as much business as the Intercolonial and the stockholders have got the benefit of the increase. Roads that made a deficit are now making a surplus. Roads that paid dividends on their bonds now pay dividends on their shares. Roads that divided something among the preferred shareholders now pay good returns to the common stock. But the Intercolonial, which six years ago paid its way, has an acknowledged deficit of half a million dollars.

Mr. Blair seems to think that he explains this when he says that he paid more for coal last year than he did the year before, as if other railways had not done the same, and that he paid more for wages that he did in other years, though he still admits that he does not pay more than other railways. He also shows that it costs more to maintain the way and equipment than it did six years ago, as if it were a remarkable thing that it cost more to keep up the additional stock of locomotives and cars and the track when these larger engines and cars are running over it. He also might have remarked that it costs more to maintain a railroad of spruce ties than will last four years and cost 25 cents when other ties that would last six to ten years can be bought for 30.



The rest of Mr. Blair's speech was largely occupied with the statement that the Intercolonial was in the government's hands to study while Mr. Haggart wanted to sell it to a company, and in the vehement declaration that there is no politics on the Intercolonial. This latter statement could have been shouted ten times as loud as it was without obtaining credence, and does not require great attention. Mr. Emmerson has tried to show that the favorable contracts given by Mr. Blair were mostly secured by conservatives. It may be that a good many of the minister's pets do designate themselves. Mr. Pugsley, for instance, is a conservative, and so for that matter has Mr. Blair frequently recorded. But these conservatives are of a class who vote for the minister of railways. As to the statement that Mr. Haggart was about to sell the railway to the Canadian Pacific, it is not forgotten the only public advocate of that measure was Mr. Blair's own organ, the St. John Telegraph, then the property of the present member of St. John's county. All the newspapers supporting the late government opposed the transfer, and its only support was found in the Blair organ.

As Mr. Haggart's reply to the minister was pretty fully reported, I pass on to the very excellent and concise speech of Mr. Barker, member for Hamilton. Mr. Barker is a railway man himself and perfectly understands railway finance. To begin with he tries to ascertain what the actual deficit of the Intercolonial was the last year. Mr. Blair has stated that he is charging his new rails to capital account. Mr. Haggart related the road with heavier rails than paid for them out of the earnings of the road. Mr. Blair is able to show that this was carried over many years, and did not usually involve more than \$100,000 each year. Mr. Blair is putting the rails down faster and is easily able to show that he has no earnings to pay for them. He might do as the Grand Trunk is doing, divide the amount among the earnings of several years, but in any case, as Mr. Barker shows, he ought to charge the revenue of any year with the wear and tear for that year.

That is ordinary railway finance, as Mr. Barker puts it, "the A B C in this matter—and there is no exception by any railway company between British and Mexico—is that when capital has been provided a property, whether it be a rail or a locomotive, or a coach, the going concern shall maintain that at the expense of its revenue. If capital has provided a 55 lb. rail, when that comes out by being broken in a week or after 20 years' service, the revenue of the concern must replace it. If a company has 200 locomotives it must maintain them out of revenue. If some are smashed or worn out revenue must replace them. If the road has kept every locomotive efficient and buys 50 more it may charge those others to capital, but it cannot charge one locomotive to capital so long as the old ones are off working."

Mr. Barker goes on to show how many rails were placed on the Intercolonial before Mr. Blair came in and how they were all charged to revenue, though the additional weight might properly have been charged to capital. But Mr. Blair took another method.

He began by laying 83 miles in Cape Breton, replacing 56 lb. rails. He should have charged 56 lbs. of these rails to revenue and the other 24 might have been charged to capital, though Mr. Haggart's method would be to charge all to revenue. Mr. Blair charges \$350,491 for these rails less the value of the old ones for junk. He also charges to capital \$200 a mile for the work of replacing them. The total capital charge on that division, which ought to have been paid for out of revenue, is \$17,682. Between Moncton and Truro he took up some 67 lb. rails and replaced them by 80 lbs. There was a charge of \$47,240, which was improperly taken to capital. Altogether he should have charged to revenue \$258,548 and to capital \$144,000. But he charged \$402,000 to capital.

Mr. Barker then went on to show that Mr. Blair is not keeping up his rolling stock out of current account. He is charging to capital new locomotives that are required to take the place of old ones. He has a right to charge additions to the stock, but no substitutions, and he is charging both. Taking Mr. Muirfield's evidence Mr. Barker shows that of the new locomotives bought only six were charged to revenue, whereas at least 25 old ones were condemned. There were really more than 25, because Mr. Muirfield says that those lent to the C. P. R. were also useless. Therefore Mr. Blair is not charging the income of the year with the cost of maintaining the rolling stock, and Mr. Barker shows plainly that the minister spent \$248,000 to capital, which was really required to keep his equipment good. Perhaps the old engines now piled up about the road may be worth \$46,000. The other \$300,000 is an addition to the deficit.

It is the same way with cars. In three years the minister has added 1,851 cars or 20 per cent. of the whole at the expense of capital. There were at the beginning of last year 442 condemned cars on the line, and during the year he condemned 145 more. He rebuilt 223 and still leaves 364 unfit for service. But during that year he bought 1,119 and made them a capital charge. According to Mr. Barker he should have charged 364 of them to revenue, which would have cost him \$250,000. The result of it all is that Mr. Blair's real deficit is \$1,296,000 instead of \$488,000.

The minister contends that it really makes no difference, since the people pay for everything, whether the charge is against revenue or capital. But Mr. Barker says that this method encourages waste. If the I. C. R. authorities know that a deficit of a half a million or a million dollars is the same thing as no deficit at all they will not trouble themselves to take care of their stock or to be prudent in purchasing. If there are to be capital charges and revenue charges they ought to be made right, and if the minister admits a deficit or claims a surplus the statement ought to be accurate.

Mr. Barker went on to show that apart from these charges there were large payments on maintenance of way improperly charged, that votes taken for one purpose had been used for another, that the minister had taken a vote for \$200 for one service and had spent on it \$137,000 without authority of parliament. He showed that Mr. Blair had paid \$650 for advertising an \$8,000 job, while he was giving contracts for millions of dollars without tenders at all. For three engine houses he spent in advertising \$1,264, and he buys over a million ties without competition.

A very good illustration of the minister's methods was pointed out by Mr. Barker. For the St. John extensions Mr. Blair bought 36 acres of marsh land at \$475 an acre for the construction of sidings and engine houses. Then he bought rails and other materials to build these sidings, paying for them \$46,620. That was in the election year, 1900. Down to this time not a mile of this siding has been laid. The rails are not delivered there yet. He has bought spikes enough for the whole 13 miles, charged them to the St. John extension, and had them piled up for a year and a half. He has bought ties at 30 cents a piece in election year, charged them to capital, and has them piled up rotting hundreds of miles away along the line.

Another little investment is the Copper Crown Works at Pictou, where \$20,000 was spent for sidings. Mr. E. N. Macdonald was interested in that transaction, and he was a candidate in the Pictou election. Mr. Macdonald wrote to the minister some months before the election asking for \$17,500, with another \$2,500 for a larger yard at Pictou. "And I would like to ask that that vote be made \$20,000 for the whole extension to the Copper Works and improvements of the public service at Pictou. Any possible discussion of the vote would be avoided in that way. And there are other reasons of an important character why this should be made, which I could personally explain to you better when I see you." So Mr. Macdonald wrote some months before the election. The matter drifted on until six days before the election, when the company itself had built the sidings. Mr. Macdonald was the solicitor of the company, and just before the election day he got his cheque for \$14,000. The Copper Crown siding has given the railway no business, but the transac-