

Mr. FRASER. If there were to be no appropriations in the Supplementary Estimates, that remark was meaningless.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I move that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Before the motion is put, I would say that I think the time has arrived when we should adjourn. We have made a good deal of progress during the night, and I think the result of our efforts will be of lasting benefit to the people of Canada. I have no doubt that the little discussion which we have had to-night will save to the people of this country thousands and tens of thousands of dollars. There were never more scandalous estimates submitted to any House than these estimates.

Mr. BOWELL. Use a milder word.

Mr. CAMPBELL. No milder word would express the truth of the matter. Not a single hon. gentleman has ventured to rise in the House and defend these votes, except only so far as to say in some instances that the Government have to go on with the work because they have been pledged to it, but no man has got up to defend them because no defence is possible. It is perfectly ridiculous that public money should be voted for the purposes for which these votes are taken, and I have no doubt that our criticisms of them will have a wholesome effect on the Government and will prevent similar estimates being brought down in future. Therefore I think those who have to defend these votes in the country, and who are in their hearts as much opposed to them as we are, should give us their thanks for the assistance we have given them on this occasion. There are many matters in connection with this question which have not yet been touched upon and I think will require several hours more to discuss, and it would therefore be well that the committee should rise, report progress and ask to sit again.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that, after this debate, it is plain that there was much to be said on the question which is before us. I am going to try to explain as briefly as possible the position I intend to take in this matter. I could sum up my argument with the simple statement of the figures which I find in the last report of the Postmaster General, and which shows that there are in the Province of Quebec 113 post offices yielding more than does that for which we are now asked to give a vote. I will take this opportunity to say a word or two in answer to what has been said by the hon. Minister of Finance, about the alleged corruption practised in the Province of Quebec during the last elections. In a moment of ill-humour, which he must doubtless now regret, the hon. Minister said that at the last elections certain Liberal members had been elected through corruption, and by means of money stolen from the public treasury. It is very curious to see this hon. gentleman with such a paternal solicitude for the Province of Quebec. It is very curious to see this paragon of virtue so mindful of the Province of Quebec, when he and all his Conservative friends protected men that are certainly more guilty and who practised corruption on a much larger scale than Pacaud. The Liberal party has repudiated Pacaud, and I do not see how the

Mr. ROWELL.

Minister of Finance can have the face to say that in the Province of Quebec certain members were elected through corruption, when he and his friends have not the courage to grant an investigation into the more serious charges recently formulated against one of his colleagues. They intend to maintain him here, and they use all means to prevent the truth from being known.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Translation.) The hon. member ought to speak to the question of the committee rising and reporting progress.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) I am, no doubt, an inexperienced member, but I have always understood that on a motion of adjournment one could speak on any subject; besides, my remarks go to answer what was said by the hon. Minister of Finance. But to come back to the question before the House, I will say that the Government has in no way justified the vote which he wants given in favour of the post office at Farnham. I wish to explain in English what I have said in French about Farnham and the beet-root sugar industry.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we should draw the line at beet-root sugar.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are supposed to understand both languages here and the hon. gentleman has no right to repeat in English what he said in French.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have a right to explain in English so that my friends here will know what I said.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a fine constitutional question, Sir, and you must not interfere with the rights of us four Englishmen here who wish to know what was contained in the admirable speech of my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Brodeur).

Mr. BRODEUR. The principal industry of Farnham is the beet-root sugar industry, and if the Government refuse to give that industry the bonus which was granted last year the population of that place is sure to decrease. If on the other hand the bonus is given the population will increase, and we must not pass this item until we know that. I understand that the Government is willing to protect all the big monopolies in Montreal who contribute to the reptile fund for election purposes, but they will not give that industry in the town of Farnham justice which it is right it should have.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I regret exceedingly that the Minister of Justice is not here. I would like also to have the senior members of the Cabinet here. I don't care so much to talk to the junior members. I am glad, however, that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is here. I understand that he has been in Stratford and that he delivered an address there on the Farnham post office.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That has nothing to do with the question before the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Most undoubtedly it has. This Farnham post office is a matter of great importance. However, the speech was not in Stratford on Monday night, but it was in the *Citizen* on Tuesday morning.