

Mr. MONK. That is the old argument we hear every time we ask for relief for the province of Quebec. My hon. friend says it is not the business of the federal government to provide free roads for the province of Quebec.

Mr. FIELDING. Or any other province.

Mr. MONK. It is unfortunate that he should argue in that way. He knows it is not our business either to lend money to the trustees of Montreal roads, but we have done that and we are to-day in this position, that we hold \$200,000 of bonds of the Montreal Turnpike Trust on which the interest is not paid, and the masters of the situation are this government. The interest on those bonds has never been paid, and it is in the power of my hon. friend to say to the trustees of the Montreal roads and the local government: It is time this abuse shall cease and we are willing to forego our interest and the capital, provided the necessary reforms are made. Does my hon. friend pretend that when we are voting a sum of over \$1,000,000 for the construction of a bridge, the whole cost of which we shall pay, it is not in our power to say: we will not vote that money unless there will be free circulation on the bridge for the people?

Mr. FIELDING. But my hon. friend overlooks the very important fact that we have already put in our conditions by a solemn agreement between this parliament and the parliament of Prince Edward Island. That agreement is signed, sealed and delivered. It suits the people of Prince Edward Island, and why we should be so anxious to prevent their paying tolls, I cannot understand. As to the Quebec case, we possibly have gone out of our way to lend money to the trustees of the Montreal turnpike road, but surely that is not an offence of which we should be accused. Surely my hon. friend does not consider that a crime.

Mr. MONK. No, but we stand in the position of a creditor who can impose on his debtor what conditions he chooses.

Mr. FIELDING. The one condition which my hon. friend is not willing to impose is that the debt should be paid or any part of it.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that the debt is not collectable. I admit there is a distinction between the two cases, but it was only right that we should find out on behalf of the people of Prince Edward Island what are the conditions for the use of the bridge. There is an agreement in this case, but in that of the Montreal Turnpike there is none.

Mr. WILSON. How much did we pay per mile for the building of the railway? What was the contract price? I understood the hon. minister to say that the whole road

was let by tender, but there is some doubt about it.

Mr. EMMERSON. \$4,621 per mile. That is exclusive of the bridge and of the wharf, that includes rails and equipment.

Mr. WILSON. Was it all let by tender?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes; as I have explained.

Mr. INGRAM. That is surely not in keeping with the statements that have already been made to this House.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have stated it as I have stated it.

Mr. INGRAM. You are not sure of your ground.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have given the history of the matter just as I have now stated it.

Mr. WILSON. What I understood from the minister is that the lowest tenderer was to have got the contract, but the government judged that he was not fit to carry it out, and the next lowest tenderer was given the contract. Is that the case with the whole road?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was extended subsequently, as I stated before. The whole contract was given to the contractor who had received a portion of it at certain schedule rates, and it was continued to completion under that arrangement.

Mr. WILSON. When I asked if this was tendered for in two different parts, I understood the minister to say no.

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not wish to convey a different impression from what I am telling my hon. friend now. They only tendered for a portion of the road originally, but it was extended to the contract for the remaining portion.

Mr. WILSON. Without tender?

Mr. EMMERSON. Without tender.

Mr. INGRAM. That is the truth?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is what I endeavoured to say.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman said in the first place, and led us to believe, that it was given by tender, when it was nothing of the kind.

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not wish to convey that impression, because I had stated differently earlier in the evening. I had given the facts before just as I have given them now.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to say that the province pays \$9,750 a year, which is supposed to be the interest upon the cost of the passenger traffic part of the bridge. Is that in perpetuity or for any definite length of time?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is unlimited.

Mr. SPROULE. We find that in many of these items the contracts are changed from