

## IN THE PROVINCIAL HOUSE

**Monday's Session.**  
As foretold by the Bulletin on Saturday, the Balfour government, at the session Monday afternoon, took steps to have a royal commission of investigation to ascertain if any officers of the government, or any members of the Legislature, have or had any pecuniary connection with the Alberta and Great Waterways Railway Company.

The resolution, which was given by the premier, is to come up on Wednesday next. It provides that the commission shall be composed of Justice Scott, Harvey, and Beck. The announcement of the premier was received with hearty applause by the ministerial benches, who see in the resolution a possibility of the railway agreement being put in better light before the country.

It is probable that when the resolution comes before the House there will be considerable discussion, the opposition members taking the ground that it is not wide enough in its scope to meet their criticisms. The resolution reads as follows:

**The Resolution for Commission.**  
Whereas it is advisable, in the public interest, that enquiry should be made for the purpose of ascertaining whether any, and if any, which officer or officers of the government or member or members of the Legislature of the province, were or are pecuniarily interested either directly or indirectly by themselves or through others, in the making of, or entering into, a certain contract, between the government and the province and the Alberta and Great Waterways Railway, for the transportation by the said railway of the securities of said company or in the proceeds of, or the amount realized from, the sale or disposal of the said securities.

Be it resolved that the Lieutenant Governor in Council be requested to appoint a commission under the provisions of the Act Respecting Enquiries Concerning Public Matters, with all the powers and authorities in section 2 of the said act set out, consisting of Hon. Justice Scott, Hon. Justice Harvey and Hon. Justice Beck, three of the justices of the Supreme Court of Alberta, to enquire for the purpose aforesaid, into the negotiations preceding and the circumstances of the passing of the securities of the Alberta and Great Waterways Railway Co., being chapter 16 of the Statutes of Alberta, 1909, and entering into of the agreement authorized to be entered into by the said act, and to make a report to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, in respect of the matters herebefore recited, for the information of the Legislature.

As a result of the notice of motion for an investigation given by the premier, the members of the government in connection with the Alberta and Great Waterways Railway files was allowed to stand over at the request of Mr. Bennett, in order that he might "look into the scope of the government motion."

R. B. Bennett suggested that the Boyle resolution might stand over until after the debate on the premier's resolution, if the latter would include an investigation of the missing documents on the files.

Hon. Mr. Rutherford: "It will include everything you wish."  
Hon. Mr. Rutherford: "I stated before, and I state again, that all the papers have been brought down."  
R. B. Bennett: "I have in this House to accept the statement of the Hon. Prime Minister, but I want to see equal force to tell him that there are letters referred to in the letters now on the files that are not to be found. I hope they will be brought into the light."

Premier Rutherford: "I hope it will be brought into the light of the honorable member for Calgary that all the papers are on the table."  
Mr. Bennett: "I know I am not in order, but I can make a statement and show him and the House plainly that the letters are missing. The Good Book says, 'For that which the eye doth not knoweth.' The premier will know the force of the saying and he will perhaps appreciate the meaning."

**Daily Question of Privilege.**  
The question of privilege is becoming a daily one in the Legislature. It was the turn of the member for Sturgeon (Mr. Boyle) yesterday, and following up the rumor that had been brought to the attention of the House on Friday by Mr. Stewart (Sedgewick), he rose immediately after the meeting of the House and called attention to an article which appeared in a Calgary paper and read as follows:

**The Item in Question.**  
The story is that Boyle became infuriated when he heard the government forces were preparing a coup. He is said to have sent one emissary to a member connected with hotels to tell him the opposition was going to win and that if he went with the opposition, he would be able to help in the hotel business. This member refused with vigor and asked Boyle to attempt to make the statement. Boyle was escorted in a room in the Cecil Hotel with Bourdieu, of St. Albert. This member is also connected with an hotel. What they said is known only to Boyle and Bourdieu, but the latter is declared to have avowed the "cou" was given the opportunity to seize the inducements.

**Boyle's Emphatic Denial.**  
"I take this opportunity," said Mr. Boyle, "of giving the House my emphatic denial. When I started out to lay bare the Alberta and Great Waterways Railway deal I expected that every attempt would be made to beset me. There has been lots of mud slinging and I have got a good share. In giving the statement which has been made, it might be interesting to know what really took place."

In the rotunda of the Cecil I met Mr. Weir, a former editor of a Strath-

cona paper, and now secretary of the Licensed Victuallers' Association. He told me that he expected the insurgents, as he called them, to have a couple more supporters. I asked him how that was, and he told me the hotelmen were dissatisfied, as they were being held up for cash money by the liquor license department. Weir said he had made complaints to the attorney-general, but he took no action. Finally, he (Weir) took such money, endorsed by Deyl, chief license inspector, and put it before the attorney-general, but he still took no notice. The announcement of the honorable member for Stettler (Mr. Shaw) and he would support the insurgents on the next vote. I did not believe that (laughter) and I do not believe it now. I did not ask Weir to approach the members for Stettler or any other member with regard to hotels. I simply listened to his story.

The member for St. Albert asked me to discuss certain questions with him at the Cecil, and why could I not speak to him about hotels or hotels?

**Cross Emphatically Denies.**  
Hon. Mr. Cross rose to refute the insinuation repeated by the member for Sturgeon with reference to the chief license inspector, W. A. Deyl. He is likely another method of bringing an insinuation against me or my department before the House," said the attorney-general. "Neither Mr. Weir nor any other man ever said to me that Mr. Deyl was taking cash money, nor did Mr. Weir or any other man present a cheque of his to me. I would like to know now if the member for Sturgeon would like an investigation into the charges against him?"

Mr. Boyle: "I might say yes." If anyone will say the charges are true I will move that they be referred to the committee on elections and privileges."

**Bennett Complains of Press.**  
R. B. Bennett addressed a few observations to the House on the same question. The newspapers were taking too much latitude in their reports of the doings of the Legislature. He was looking into the statutes and he wished later to take up extracts from the newspapers. He stated that the newspapers were not to be brought before the House. He had been the target and the victim even more than the member for Sturgeon. A statement was given out that said that he was a verbatim one of his and it was not more than half true. He said he had heard the statement, part only of which was published in his paper, the Calgary Herald. He said he was the highest court and it should inquire into these things. It was the duty of the premier to look into these things. He said he was not going to take any action in summoning a newspaper man before the bar of the House for unjustified criticisms.

An article, signed by Jess Dorman in the Optimist, contained a statement that the C.P.R. had distributed a million dollars among themselves. The member for Sturgeon took up the House. He had read of the effective work a million dollars had done in other parts of the country. He believed that much money could have been spent here. (Laughter.)

**Premier Wants Better Decorum.**  
Premier Rutherford remarked that he paid attention to the rumors in the newspapers he would be rising to a question of privilege every day.

In the House and it got down to business in the session.

In moving the second reading of the bill to amend the Municipalities Act, the attorney-general explained that it was similar to the Saskatchewan act of 1908 which had been modelled largely on the provisions in the Edmonton charter.

In moving the second reading of the bill to amend the Municipalities Act, the attorney-general explained that it was similar to the Saskatchewan act of 1908 which had been modelled largely on the provisions in the Edmonton charter.

In moving the second reading of the bill to amend the Municipalities Act, the attorney-general explained that it was similar to the Saskatchewan act of 1908 which had been modelled largely on the provisions in the Edmonton charter.

**Bennett Supports Bill.**  
R. B. Bennett supported the bill. There was no question about its importance to the province, he said, than education. Many parents had no adequate appreciation of the necessity for education for their children, nor of the great loss to the state from failure to have them educated. He thought that he might be able to get young men to leave the limit, but welcomed the measure as a step in the right direction. Believing the minister had given his best consideration of the conditions, he was willing to support the bill.

**Committee of the Whole.**  
The House then went into committee of the whole considering bills to incorporate the Staveland, Athabasca and Glenora railways, and to amend certain by-laws of the town of Camrose, respecting Alberta and Saskatchewan Central Railway Lines company.

In the committee of the whole on the committee on the Diamond Coal com-

pany and the Yellowhead Coal company bills, which were passed in committee with amendments after several hours' consideration.

Speaking of the provision in connection with the selling of liquor in the House, but the very foundation of representative government. On this question the House was the court of last resort. It was for them to say whether they would tolerate the stripping of files brought down by command of this House. One could understand that one letter might be missing, but when many were missing, as he proposed to show, there was no excuse.

It was a rule of business offices the world over that copies of letters sent were always kept, and when telegrams were forwarded, the originals were always forwarded.

**Tuesday's Session.**  
After a fastidious criticism that occupied the entire afternoon session in the Legislature Tuesday, the government were again sustained on a division just before the debate on a vote of 20 to 17. The debate arose over the resolution of censure of J. R. Boyle, Sturgeon and Great Waterways, from which it is charged documents are missing. The resolution was warmly debated by Messrs. Boyle, Charles Stewart (Sedgewick), E. H. Riley (Gleichen), Dr. Campbell (Ponoka), and R. B. Bennett, who spoke in support, and Hon. Mr. Cross and W. F. Puffer (Lacombe), in opposition.

C. M. O'Brien, Socialist, Rocky Mountain, also spoke, explaining that, as a representative of the labor classes, the question did not contain any interest to him, and he would like to know now if the member for Sturgeon would like an investigation into the charges against him?"

The division showed a line-up identical with that of last week, when the government were defeated. The greater part of the evening session was occupied with the debate on the resolution of censure of J. R. Boyle, Sturgeon and Great Waterways, from which it is charged documents are missing.

The resolution was warmly debated by Messrs. Boyle, Charles Stewart (Sedgewick), E. H. Riley (Gleichen), Dr. Campbell (Ponoka), and R. B. Bennett, who spoke in support, and Hon. Mr. Cross and W. F. Puffer (Lacombe), in opposition.

C. M. O'Brien, Socialist, Rocky Mountain, also spoke, explaining that, as a representative of the labor classes, the question did not contain any interest to him, and he would like to know now if the member for Sturgeon would like an investigation into the charges against him?"

The division showed a line-up identical with that of last week, when the government were defeated. The greater part of the evening session was occupied with the debate on the resolution of censure of J. R. Boyle, Sturgeon and Great Waterways, from which it is charged documents are missing.

The resolution was warmly debated by Messrs. Boyle, Charles Stewart (Sedgewick), E. H. Riley (Gleichen), Dr. Campbell (Ponoka), and R. B. Bennett, who spoke in support, and Hon. Mr. Cross and W. F. Puffer (Lacombe), in opposition.

C. M. O'Brien, Socialist, Rocky Mountain, also spoke, explaining that, as a representative of the labor classes, the question did not contain any interest to him, and he would like to know now if the member for Sturgeon would like an investigation into the charges against him?"

The division showed a line-up identical with that of last week, when the government were defeated. The greater part of the evening session was occupied with the debate on the resolution of censure of J. R. Boyle, Sturgeon and Great Waterways, from which it is charged documents are missing.

The resolution was warmly debated by Messrs. Boyle, Charles Stewart (Sedgewick), E. H. Riley (Gleichen), Dr. Campbell (Ponoka), and R. B. Bennett, who spoke in support, and Hon. Mr. Cross and W. F. Puffer (Lacombe), in opposition.

C. M. O'Brien, Socialist, Rocky Mountain, also spoke, explaining that, as a representative of the labor classes, the question did not contain any interest to him, and he would like to know now if the member for Sturgeon would like an investigation into the charges against him?"

The division showed a line-up identical with that of last week, when the government were defeated. The greater part of the evening session was occupied with the debate on the resolution of censure of J. R. Boyle, Sturgeon and Great Waterways, from which it is charged documents are missing.

The resolution was warmly debated by Messrs. Boyle, Charles Stewart (Sedgewick), E. H. Riley (Gleichen), Dr. Campbell (Ponoka), and R. B. Bennett, who spoke in support, and Hon. Mr. Cross and W. F. Puffer (Lacombe), in opposition.

C. M. O'Brien, Socialist, Rocky Mountain, also spoke, explaining that, as a representative of the labor classes, the question did not contain any interest to him, and he would like to know now if the member for Sturgeon would like an investigation into the charges against him?"

The division showed a line-up identical with that of last week, when the government were defeated. The greater part of the evening session was occupied with the debate on the resolution of censure of J. R. Boyle, Sturgeon and Great Waterways, from which it is charged documents are missing.

The resolution was warmly debated by Messrs. Boyle, Charles Stewart (Sedgewick), E. H. Riley (Gleichen), Dr. Campbell (Ponoka), and R. B. Bennett, who spoke in support, and Hon. Mr. Cross and W. F. Puffer (Lacombe), in opposition.

C. M. O'Brien, Socialist, Rocky Mountain, also spoke, explaining that, as a representative of the labor classes, the question did not contain any interest to him, and he would like to know now if the member for Sturgeon would like an investigation into the charges against him?"

The division showed a line-up identical with that of last week, when the government were defeated. The greater part of the evening session was occupied with the debate on the resolution of censure of J. R. Boyle, Sturgeon and Great Waterways, from which it is charged documents are missing.

The resolution was warmly debated by Messrs. Boyle, Charles Stewart (Sedgewick), E. H. Riley (Gleichen), Dr. Campbell (Ponoka), and R. B. Bennett, who spoke in support, and Hon. Mr. Cross and W. F. Puffer (Lacombe), in opposition.

down by the government, that said charge is true and correct. "I would be sorry to see that this House doth resent the action of the government in so tampering with and stripping the files and both demand that all documents and papers so removed be immediately restored to said files now upon the table of this House."

This was a question, said Mr. Boyle, in speaking to the resolution, concerned not only the privileges of the House, but the very foundation of representative government. On this question the House was the court of last resort. It was for them to say whether they would tolerate the stripping of files brought down by command of this House. One could understand that one letter might be missing, but when many were missing, as he proposed to show, there was no excuse.

It was a rule of business offices the world over that copies of letters sent were always kept, and when telegrams were forwarded, the originals were always forwarded.

**Tuesday's Session.**  
After a fastidious criticism that occupied the entire afternoon session in the Legislature Tuesday, the government were again sustained on a division just before the debate on a vote of 20 to 17. The debate arose over the resolution of censure of J. R. Boyle, Sturgeon and Great Waterways, from which it is charged documents are missing.

The resolution was warmly debated by Messrs. Boyle, Charles Stewart (Sedgewick), E. H. Riley (Gleichen), Dr. Campbell (Ponoka), and R. B. Bennett, who spoke in support, and Hon. Mr. Cross and W. F. Puffer (Lacombe), in opposition.

C. M. O'Brien, Socialist, Rocky Mountain, also spoke, explaining that, as a representative of the labor classes, the question did not contain any interest to him, and he would like to know now if the member for Sturgeon would like an investigation into the charges against him?"

The division showed a line-up identical with that of last week, when the government were defeated. The greater part of the evening session was occupied with the debate on the resolution of censure of J. R. Boyle, Sturgeon and Great Waterways, from which it is charged documents are missing.

The resolution was warmly debated by Messrs. Boyle, Charles Stewart (Sedgewick), E. H. Riley (Gleichen), Dr. Campbell (Ponoka), and R. B. Bennett, who spoke in support, and Hon. Mr. Cross and W. F. Puffer (Lacombe), in opposition.

C. M. O'Brien, Socialist, Rocky Mountain, also spoke, explaining that, as a representative of the labor classes, the question did not contain any interest to him, and he would like to know now if the member for Sturgeon would like an investigation into the charges against him?"

The division showed a line-up identical with that of last week, when the government were defeated. The greater part of the evening session was occupied with the debate on the resolution of censure of J. R. Boyle, Sturgeon and Great Waterways, from which it is charged documents are missing.

The resolution was warmly debated by Messrs. Boyle, Charles Stewart (Sedgewick), E. H. Riley (Gleichen), Dr. Campbell (Ponoka), and R. B. Bennett, who spoke in support, and Hon. Mr. Cross and W. F. Puffer (Lacombe), in opposition.

C. M. O'Brien, Socialist, Rocky Mountain, also spoke, explaining that, as a representative of the labor classes, the question did not contain any interest to him, and he would like to know now if the member for Sturgeon would like an investigation into the charges against him?"

The division showed a line-up identical with that of last week, when the government were defeated. The greater part of the evening session was occupied with the debate on the resolution of censure of J. R. Boyle, Sturgeon and Great Waterways, from which it is charged documents are missing.

The resolution was warmly debated by Messrs. Boyle, Charles Stewart (Sedgewick), E. H. Riley (Gleichen), Dr. Campbell (Ponoka), and R. B. Bennett, who spoke in support, and Hon. Mr. Cross and W. F. Puffer (Lacombe), in opposition.

C. M. O'Brien, Socialist, Rocky Mountain, also spoke, explaining that, as a representative of the labor classes, the question did not contain any interest to him, and he would like to know now if the member for Sturgeon would like an investigation into the charges against him?"

The division showed a line-up identical with that of last week, when the government were defeated. The greater part of the evening session was occupied with the debate on the resolution of censure of J. R. Boyle, Sturgeon and Great Waterways, from which it is charged documents are missing.

The resolution was warmly debated by Messrs. Boyle, Charles Stewart (Sedgewick), E. H. Riley (Gleichen), Dr. Campbell (Ponoka), and R. B. Bennett, who spoke in support, and Hon. Mr. Cross and W. F. Puffer (Lacombe), in opposition.

C. M. O'Brien, Socialist, Rocky Mountain, also spoke, explaining that, as a representative of the labor classes, the question did not contain any interest to him, and he would like to know now if the member for Sturgeon would like an investigation into the charges against him?"

The division showed a line-up identical with that of last week, when the government were defeated. The greater part of the evening session was occupied with the debate on the resolution of censure of J. R. Boyle, Sturgeon and Great Waterways, from which it is charged documents are missing.

The resolution was warmly debated by Messrs. Boyle, Charles Stewart (Sedgewick), E. H. Riley (Gleichen), Dr. Campbell (Ponoka), and R. B. Bennett, who spoke in support, and Hon. Mr. Cross and W. F. Puffer (Lacombe), in opposition.

C. M. O'Brien, Socialist, Rocky Mountain, also spoke, explaining that, as a representative of the labor classes, the question did not contain any interest to him, and he would like to know now if the member for Sturgeon would like an investigation into the charges against him?"

The division showed a line-up identical with that of last week, when the government were defeated. The greater part of the evening session was occupied with the debate on the resolution of censure of J. R. Boyle, Sturgeon and Great Waterways, from which it is charged documents are missing.

agreement between Clarke and the Morgan firm was enough to condemn the government. He wondered what the fathers of Liberalism would do in such cases as had occurred during the last few weeks of coming opera through which the Legislature had passed. In eloquent language he pictured the absurdity of Hon. W. E. Gladstone acting in a manner such as the present day exponents of Liberalism in the Alberta government.

The most vital documents in the whole transaction with the A. & G. W. railway were missing. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of the people of the province, but of the press all over Canada. The only answer that the government gave was that they represented the Liberal party and for that reason they should be supported. The government he contended, did not represent the Liberal party. It was a private corporation, and he would record a vote which he could not defend before his constituents. Mr. Smith drew a parallel case between private trusts and the actions of the government in the deal with the A. & G. W. railway. The actions of the government were receiving censure not only of