

they come from. That will not cost five cents, whereas this commission of Judge Winchester, judging from other commissions, will cost the country probably several thousands of dollars, and will be a white-washing, delaying institution when it is through.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does my hon. friend object to this commission ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I certainly do object to any such person being sent around this country, and I am satisfied that the taxpayers of this country will object to it. We don't want these judges taken from their jobs. We want them to attend to the business we pay them for doing, and it would suit the country better if they did that.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—MR. WILLIAM ROCHE.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). I rise for the purpose of making a personal explanation. Yesterday, in the course of the debate, I stated that the hon. member for Lennox had controverted some remarks which I had made. He said that he could not have done so, because he had spoken before me. I then said that that gentleman like some others in the House, after he had made his main speech, added a number of little speeches or speechlets. I afterwards said that I was merely speaking from memory, and if my statement was not correct, I would make any explanation necessary to the hon. gentleman. I was not certain at the time, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) was followed by my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), who made the following remarks :—

I would remind the junior member for Halifax (Mr. William Roche) that he is mistaken when he thinks that the hon. member for Lennox followed him last year with his speech or even with a speechlet. There is no record of either such speech or speechlet. But I can tell him that the hon. gentleman who did follow him and who criticised his language very severely was the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver).

That was a direct contradiction of what I had said, and I take the liberty now of referring the hon. gentleman to page 610 of the Debates on which he will see that the hon. member for Lennox made three little speechlets in the course of the debate, and that on page 615 he made five additional little speechlets. Now, my reputation being assailed and I have been directly contradicted without warrant, an explanation is due from the hon. member (Mr. Ingram), and if that is the method in which he pursues investigation, then if he contradicts me on some future occasion, he had better have his facts more under control of his volition.

Mr. INGRAM. I still adhere to the statement I made yesterday, and the record will prove my statement to be correct. The hon. gentleman from Lennox was afterwards

speaking on an item in the estimates, and which affected the question of immigration.

Mr. WM. ROCHE. It was the same debate on his motion, and he afterwards re-affirmed his previous statement.

Mr. INGRAM. The record will prove that the statement I made yesterday was correct, and if the record does not prove that I am willing to apologize. I defy the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Roche) to read from the record exactly the statements made by the hon. gentleman from Lennox.

Mr. WM. ROCHE. My hon. friend said that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) made neither speech nor speechlet, but the record shows that he made eight speechlets.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Read.

Mr. WM. ROCHE. I have not the book here; the gentlemen on the other side of the House have it.

MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST—TOWN OF WESTMOUNT.

Mr. L. A. A. RIVET (Hochelaga) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence exchanged between the Department of Finance and the town of Westmount, concerning the purchase of debentures of the Montreal Turnpike Trust.

He said in making this motion, I want to draw the attention of the government to the position which the town of Westmount occupies with regard to the Montreal Turnpike Trust. Some time ago the question of the Montreal Turnpike Trust was raised in this House by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I do not intend to reopen that question; I want simply to state the fact that a few years ago the town of Westmount made a commutation with the Montreal Turnpike Trust, whereby the tolls which existed in that municipality were commuted in an annual sum that was calculated according to the amount of interest on the capital of the debentures covering the portion of the road situated within the limits of the municipality of Westmount. The capital of such debentures was about \$6,800 on which the interest at six per cent was \$408 per year, which sum has since been annually paid by Westmount to the Montreal Turnpike Trust, under that commutation, &c., &c. Under that commutation the town of Westmount secured the control, to a certain extent of that portion of the road within its limits, and the toll-gates were removed. By that commutation the town of Westmount undoubtedly bettered its position, because the toll-gates were an encumbrance, not only to the citizens of Westmount, but to the public at large. It is admitted on all sides that in the neighbourhood of Montreal and on the island of Montreal generally, the toll-gate system is antiquated, and the public at large are looking for its removal.