

diture. We can assume, from the evidence before the House, meagre as it is, that these people from New York city are going to get some benefit. And by a strained construction we may assume that as they are doing the work in Canada somebody in Canada will do the work and get part of the benefit in the wages from them for doing it. But that is not what we are voting money for. We are voting money because the work will be of some benefit to Canada, and until the government can show it is of some advantage to the people, I am not prepared to vote for this expenditure.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Essex (Mr. R. F. Sutherland) took occasion to rise and criticise my conduct as an hon. member of this House, because I read a statement which has been placed in my hands by a responsible party, and he said that the Minister of Justice categorically denied every statement in that paper. Well, I am going to take every statement in it, and put the question to the hon. minister with respect to each one whether he will deny or admit it. What is the first statement? It is this:

I refer to the operations of the company known as the North Shore Power, Railway and Navigation Company, a body corporate and politic, with head office in New York.

Did the minister deny that statement? The writer of this paper did not say whether they were Canadians or Americans. This statement does not say so.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, it does.

An hon. MEMBER. It says a lot of New York adventurers.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. American adventurers.

Mr. TAYLOR. That does not say they are living in New York. My hon. friend says they are living there but never fore-swore their allegiance. The writer of this paper does not say they are American or British subjects.

I think they have an office in Quebec, for which the firm of Mr. Fitzpatrick is counsel.

Does the hon. gentleman deny that statement? Then the writer says:

Anyway, it was that hon. gentleman who got this company its charter and has ever since watched over it with fatherly care.

Was he the hon. gentleman who got that company its charter? Did he deny that?

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND. What would that have to do with the question?

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Essex (Mr. R. F. Sutherland) said that the Minister of Justice denied categorically every statement.

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND. And I repeat that he did, in so far as it affected the case.

Mr. LANCASTER

Mr. TAYLOR. The statement you made—and 'Hansard' will prove it—was that the Minister of Justice denied categorically every statement made. I have given two already which he did not deny.

Some two years ago, this aggregation of New York adventurers—

He does not say living in New York, but that their head office is in New York. The only contention of the Minister of Justice was that these gentlemen had not fore-sworn their allegiance. But if they are living in New York, they may be New York adventurers all the same. Then the writer says:

Through the efforts of Fitzpatrick's firm, of which Mr. Parent, premier of Quebec, is a member, secured a tract of timber and pulp wood lands.

The statement of the Minister of Justice in answer to this was that the only way land can be secured in the province of Quebec is at public auction. That may be the case, and they may have secured them at public auction. The lands may have been put up at public sale, and they may have had an agent buy them in for the firm. This firm did not attend the sale and buy themselves, so I am informed, but they were bought by an agent. The Minister of Justice explained, and I accept his explanation, that the lands were sold at public auction.

Mr. BUREAU. That is the law.

Mr. TAYLOR. Some one bought them for this firm.

Secured a tract of timber and pulpwood lands, situated on the river Ste. Marguerite, about 300 miles below Quebec. After this, they purchased for a nominal sum, the water power of the River Ste. Marguerite.

The Minister of Justice did not say whether they did or not. The statement is that they purchased the water power there at a nominal sum, and that statement the Minister of Justice did not contradict.

For this purpose, it was necessary to have an outlet on Seven Islands Bay, so a railroad about nine or ten miles long, running from the first falls of the Ste. Marguerite to Seven Islands Bay was projected—but I understand it is not yet finished—all the rolling stock of which has been allowed in free of duty.

Did the Minister of Justice reply to that? Did he say whether it was or was not true? That this company got its rolling stock in free of duty?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Absurd.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister did not contradict the statement that they got the charter, that they built this short road and that they got their rolling stock in free of duty. And yet, the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. R. F. Sutherland) said that he contradicted every statement and charge made.