

commence with \$5,785.38 was paid, the cost of the building being \$38,525. There was paid net loss \$5,542, and on account of accident to goods, \$1,682.89, or in all \$5,785.38. I would like the hon. gentleman to explain this in view of his former statement to the House.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The arrangement was in the nature of a guarantee of so much on the investment, and the Department of Justice read that in such a way as required us to pay sufficient to give them 5 per cent on their investment.

Mr. CLANCY. That was only \$38,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was a loss in the working of the scheme which made up the difference, and I was informed by the Department of Justice that we were liable under the wording of the agreement for that, and the payments were made in consequence.

Mr. CLANCY. That is certainly a very bold confession. The hon. gentleman came to the House last year on a similar vote, and declared in the most explicit terms that the sum to be paid was one-half or two-thirds, and that the government would be the judge of what it was to be paid upon. Then the hon. gentleman enters into a contract with a private concern; and it now turns out that the public purse must stand the interest of 5 per cent on the whole investment, and the deficits on the business of the company. Surely the hon. gentleman did not enter into a bargain of that kind; and instead of paying about \$1,600, he has paid \$6,000. It is the most shocking statement that ever came from a department; that the Minister of Justice has construed a contract made by whom? By the hon. gentleman himself, the government must pay this large sum. Surely this country will, in future, look for contracts to be submitted to the Minister of Justice before they are entered into, if we are to have a recurrence of transactions of this kind? I think it is not creditable to the hon. gentleman to be forced to make such explanations to this committee.

Mr. MONK. Was there a written opinion delivered by the Department of Justice on that point?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman off-hand whether there was or not. I consulted the Department of Justice, and they informed me that that was their opinion.

Mr. MONK. I suppose we could have communication of that opinion if it was in writing? Will the hon. gentleman lay it on the table?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If it is in writing, I will.

Mr. CLANCY. There is another item here with regard to a firm at Charlottetown. Did the hon. gentleman guarantee the deficit of the concern there as well?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We guaranteed certain earnings on the cold storage warehouse less the revenue, that is to say, the balance; and this is the payment of that.

Mr. CLANCY. That was a private enterprise too?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has adopted these as a sort of step-children, and is now taking care of them. In the case of the concern at Charlottetown, there is a guarantee of one-half the deficit of the rental of \$1,650 and the earnings of \$403.26. What is the amount of the rental?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman does not read the item as I do: 'Guarantee of one-half deficit between rental of \$1,650 and earnings of \$403.26.' The rental was carried on by Mr. Rattenbury and space supplied for the public, and the earnings were the smaller amount, and he made up half the difference.

Mr. CLANCY. What sum was to be paid by way of rental?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That depended upon the amount of space.

Mr. CLANCY. What space was the hon. gentleman to have? How much did he pay per cubic foot or cubic yard?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that there were two chambers there, and if the two were required all the time, we were to pay \$1,600. The rentals depended on the amount of space utilized; that is to say, the space in the warehouse which was built by Mr. Rattenbury for a pork-packing establishment, in which he had cold storage chambers and plant erected. He set aside certain chambers, which we helped him to pay for, for the use of the public. There were two chambers which were available, and the rental was to be according to the use of the chambers.

Mr. CLANCY. Was there a written contract?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was a written contract between Mr. Rattenbury and the department.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman lay that on the table?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can.