

SUPPLY—ABUSE OF FRANKING PRIVILEGES—*Con.*

Hughes, Sam. (Victoria and Haliburton)—1811.

During the last campaign in my riding there were great parcels containing Liberal campaign literature circulated in my county—1811. It had no postmark on it but only a monogram, the last letter of which was a plain B—1812. Literature mailed here during the session by thousands of copies has never reached its destination yet?—1816. No; but franked by the Liberal Conservatives in this House, who have a perfect right to frank it—1818. Would Mulock be good enough to tell us whose frank was used—1822.

Lancaster, E. A. (Lincoln)—1807.

Where were they mailed from?—1807.

Lennox, H. (South Simcoe)—1813.

I do not see that any difficulty would arise from asking members to put their initials on letters—1813-14.

Maclean, W. F. (South York)—1808.

What Mulock says applies simply to our own post office—1808. And to collect the postage—1809.

Mulock, Hon. Sir William (Postmaster General)—1807.

The use of the frank for such a purpose as this is certainly contrary to the meaning and the spirit of the Act—1807. I am quite prepared to adopt whatever regulation appears to recommend itself to the good judgment of this House—1808. I should qualify that, by assuming that members have not been sufficiently guarded in the quasi authority they may have given—1809. I challenge any one to produce any political literature franked by me during the recess—1810. Knowing the fidelity of my private secretary I am satisfied—1811 that he never allowed my stamp to be so used, and I am sure it never was used during the recess in question—1812. If Hughes will produce to me any of this franked literature, I will endeavour to trace it up—1813. Was it of a non-partisan character?—1815. Taylor said I did—1817. Mail matter mailed in this House, no matter by whom, is delivered to a man who is an officer of the House—1818. I feel certain that no such thing has occurred as Hughes (S.) has charged—1819. It is not a question of legal right it is a question of propriety and good taste—1820. Would Sproule give me the name of that postmaster?—1821. I then gave an explanation which will appear in 'Hansard'—1822.

Speaker, Mr.—1810.

The Postmaster General denies that his frank was so used, and I do not think that the statement should be insisted on—1810.

Sproule, T. S. (East Grey)—1820.

It is generally believed that a large amount of literature which we sent out of this House last session never reached its des-

SUPPLY—ABUSE OF FRANKING PRIVILEGES—*Con.*

Sproule, T. S. (East Grey)—*Con.*

tinuation—1820. A privilege that was enjoyed by one side ought to be enjoyed by the other side as well—1821.

Taylor, George (Leeds)—1812.

Everybody ought to do the same—1812. As whip of the party it has devolved upon me in the sessions preceding general elections to send out literature—1815. In direct contravention of the law this literature was sent out during recess by officials of the government—1816. Mulock and his colleagues have franked campaign literature to be sent out during the recess—1817. It was national political literature—1818.

White, Hon. Peter (North Renfrew)—1809.

I trust Mulock will have some regard to the abuse of the franking privileges by members of the government—1809. Had I known Mulock would deny the charge, I would have had the evidence here—1810. This system not only affected beneficially the Liberal party, but it affected prejudicially the Conservative party—1811. I shall endeavour to do so—1812.

Zimmerman, A. (Hamilton, West)—1821.

I think that many people are guilty of abuse of the franking privilege to which allusion has been made—1821. Is it customary to allow private advertisements to be franked by members of parliament?—1822.

SUPPLY—ARBITRATION BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

On motion that House go into supply Mr. Foster introduced the subject of arbitration between government and Grand Trunk Railway—68.

Barker, Sam. (Hamilton, East)—69.

The claim made by the government was in respect to the diversion by the Grand Trunk of traffic that ought to have been given to the Intercolonial Railway—69.

Emmerson, Hon. H. R. (Minister of Railways and Canals)—68.

The question was submitted mutually to the arbitration of these gentlemen in 1903; it is sub judice at the present time—68.

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles (Minister of Justice)—68.

This is in respect to differences arising between the Grand Trunk and the government under diverse contracts entered into at different times—68. There has been no action entered by the Crown, but the Crown has had claims arising out of non-fulfilment by Grand Trunk of contracts—69.