

—but this is not the first feature, from a public standpoint, of the 'encouragement,' that has been extended to this 'infant industry.' A deep water terminus was necessary, so this company set to work to build a wharf—

Did the minister contradict that statement or say whether this company had begun to build this wharf for themselves or not? The statement made by the Minister of Public Works to-day is that they began to build it and expended \$34,000 upon it.

—by extending out in the bay, a rock embankment from the excavations along the line of railway to a distance of about eight hundred feet, or to a depth of about ten or twelve feet of water, where the first section of a timber wharf about two hundred feet long and thirty feet wide was placed, and filled up to low water with stone from the excavation. This much was accomplished last year; but towards the close of the season the North Shore Power, Railway and Navigation Company discovered that they had undertaken an expensive experiment, and ways and means were discussed to induce the government to undertake the expense of providing this company with the wharf and terminal facilities for their own business; and, strange as it may seem, the Department of Public Works have taken over and paid for all the work and material supplied by this company on account of the terminal facilities required for its own use.

There is another statement that the Minister of Justice did not deny. And the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) proves that the statement is correct.

There is not a habitation or living man residing within miles of this wharf, and no person will ever use it, but this pulp proposition if it ever is finished.

Did the hon. minister contradict that statement? We were told last year that there was a village growing up around there, and yet this sentence says that there is not a habitation within miles.

I understand this scheme was worked last year by the Hon. 'Charley' Fitzpatrick, who induced the Minister of Public Works to put an item in the estimates (\$25,000) for a wharf at Seven Islands.

Twenty-five thousand dollars was in the estimates last year and the House voted the money on the statement made by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. James Sutherland), who is not now present. Who induced him to put that \$25,000 in the estimates? We have no correspondence on the subject before us. The Minister of Justice is the member of the cabinet for that district, and no doubt it is through him, as stated here, that the item was put in the estimates by the Minister of Public Works. If there is any correspondence on the subject it is not brought down. Is it not fair to assume that the Minister of Justice must have been consulted in reference to this \$25,000 that was voted last year? The Minister of Justice did not contradict that and did not say that he was not a party, with the Minister of Pub-

lic Works, to putting this item of \$25,000 in the estimates of last year. The hon. minister has not contradicted a single statement made here, except that he is not a member of the firm of Parent & Co. I accept that statement of course. But this document does not say that these timber limits were bought in any but an honourable way—

Then during the present session of parliament an appropriation of \$60,000 has been asked—

And it will hardly be said that the hon. minister contradicted that statement for we have this item of \$60,000 now before us to carry out this scheme not in the interest of the country but in the interest of this pulp company.

—making it all so far \$85,000 to aid a scheme that is no earthly use to any one outside the aggregation comprising this pulp syndicate.

Did the Minister of Justice say that this expenditure would benefit anybody else? He says that it will make a harbour. But there is a harbour there, and building a dock will not improve the harbour in any way. It is not put there for the purpose of the harbour, for vessels that are under stress of weather can go in there now and anchor and so avoid the storm. The only reason for building the dock is that vessels may go there and take away the pulp wood, as was intended by the company when they began to build this work. Every one thought that the Minister of Public Works last year was making correct statements, and yet we find the facts to be different from what we understood them to be from his explanation. I have read this document, and it will be seen that the minister has not contradicted categorically or otherwise any statement except that he is not a member of the firm of Parent & Co., but he cannot say that he is not counsel for this company and that they were not the parties who got this charter. And so in every respect it is seen that the statement of the hon. member for North Essex is not correct.

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND. I will only say, in answer to the remarks of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), that the whole tone of his address after reading that document would convey the impression that in some underhand and improper way the Minister of Justice or his friends had given a benefit to these people, and I said that categorically the minister had denied every such imputation.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not lay it at the door of the Minister of Justice, but I say that it is done by the government. But the evidence as we have it here, including the statements made by the Minister of Public Works last year and by the acting Minister of Public Works this year, can lead to no other conclusion but that there is a job behind this vote. And it will be the duty of the opposition now, and in concurrence if