

which has been proposed by my right hon. leader, and it was left to the Government of the day to accept or reject that amendment. If the Government had accepted the Bill as amended, the people of New Brunswick, as well as those of every other province, would have enjoyed the benefit of the money which was there provided for. I do not know what the Senate will do with this Bill when it is brought before it again, but I shall vote for the amendment of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, because, after all, it leaves equal control in the hands of the provinces, and I would prefer that the Prime Minister should withhold his Bill until we have a conference with the provinces during the recess in reference to the matter. The provinces would be further ahead by waiting another year and they would be sure of getting the subsidy to which they are entitled by reason of the increase in the revenue, which means an increased expenditure in the different provinces because, as the development of the country goes on, the expenditure of the provinces increases accordingly. Therefore, it would be more advantageous to the different provinces if my right hon. friend the leader of the Government would leave in abeyance this measure and call a conference of the provincial representatives. Then we would come here next year prepared to grant a full measure of compensation to the different provinces, a proposition that will be far more popular than the measure now before the House.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take part in this debate, but I have just a moment ago taken cognizance of a letter which the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Rainville) read in this House on the 21st inst., and on which he bases his contention that the Dominion Government should retain control over the expenditure of the grants requested from this House by the hon. Minister of Agriculture for the purpose of improving the roads and highways in the various provinces.

The hon. gentleman apparently admits that under the constitution that exclusive control should be attributed to the provinces; but he is fearful lest the provincial Government should not fairly distribute the said grants, and should use them to promote party ends. The hon. gentleman believes, no doubt, that if such patronage was handed over to him and to the hon. member for l'Islet, in their respective counties, no such danger would exist any longer.

Now the letter in question which has been handed to him by the hon. member for l'Islet (Mr. Paquet), bears the signatures of seventeen farmers who to my

Mr. TURGEON.

knowledge are supporters of the hon. member for l'Islet, staunch Conservatives. These gentlemen must have been approached by two or three persons hoping to be favoured in the distribution of that patronage, if it is entrusted to the impartial hands of the hon. member for l'Islet.

The only reason pointed out in that letter is the fact that at a meeting held in connection with the annual fair of the agricultural and horticultural societies of the county of l'Islet, at St. Roch des Aulnaies, on September 24, 1912, the Hon. J. Edouard Caron, Minister of Agriculture for the province of Quebec, is stated to have declared that the management of the moneys voted by the Dominion Government for agricultural purposes in the province had been entrusted to him, and that the Hon. Mr. Burrell put greater confidence in him, as regards the management of these moneys, than in Dr. Paquet, the federal member.

I was not present at that meeting. But the county of l'Islet adjoins the one I have the honour to represent; St. Roch des Aulnaies is the parish in that county closest to the western limit of the county of Kamouraska, and I am well acquainted with the circumstances which preceded and accompanied the annual fair of that agricultural society in 1912. I have no hesitation in stating that the Hon. Mr. Caron could not have uttered the words referred to and never made the statement which are attributed to him in that letter of a few disappointed Conservatives of the county of l'Islet.

The hon. member for l'Islet was not present at that meeting and took no part in that exposition of two important societies in his county. His staying aloof was due merely to the fact that the directors of those societies had decided to hold that exposition at St. Roch des Aulnaies, while the hon. member wished that St. Jean Port Joli should be preferred. The representatives for the county of l'Islet in the local House, Mr. Morin, was also conspicuous by his absence. But there were present at that meeting men whose high standing and spirit of fairness are a guarantee that the statements then and there made had no partisan character. And I believe I can say that the hon. member for l'Islet need only inquire from them to satisfy himself that the letter he communicated to his fellow-member for Chambly and Verchères is absolutely at variance with the facts. At that meeting there were present Rev. Father Athanase, O.C.R., professor of horticulture at the agricultural institution of Oka; the Rev. Mr. Pelletier, of the College of Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, the Rev. Mr. Bois, professor at the school of agriculture of Ste. Anne de la Pocatière; the Rev. Mr. Dupuis, parish priest of St.