

Mr. KENDALL. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Ingram) says that the Intercolonial is interfered with from end to end on political grounds. Now I represent rather an important end of that railway. For forty miles that road runs through my constituency. I think we have at least 150 men employed on the Intercolonial living within the bounds of my constituency—my colleague says 250. Now I want the House to accept this statement: Since 1896 my colleague and myself together have had the right of recommendation to employment, the right of patronage on that road, and up to this moment I am unaware that a single man has been foisted upon that road, that a single recommendation made by my colleague or myself to the management for employment, has been accepted unless the man was required, and I challenge contradiction of that statement. Now I wish to make another statement. In 1896 the manager of that road called up a number of men and said: You, you, you, are in the black books of the Conservative party; go to Mr. So-and-so, or to Mr. So-and-so, and place yourselves right with the Conservative party.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the name of the manager of the road who did that?

Mr. KENDALL. His head was taken off. It was Mr. McLennan, station agent, who had charge of the employment of labour at that point. The former Conservative member for Richmond was returned by a small majority made up mostly by Intercolonial Railway employees who had a right to vote only in Sydney but who, after voting there, went on and voted in Inverness, and after voting there, went on and voted in Richmond county. We might have dealt severely with these men, but my colleague and I—

Mr. INGRAM. 'We'? I understood the hon. gentleman to say that they did not interfere with the management of this road.

Mr. KENDALL. I will answer that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why had they not a right to vote in Richmond county?

Mr. KENDALL. Their names were on the list, but they were not paid in Richmond county. Their names were wrongfully on the list, they were also wrongfully on the list in Inverness county and they voted not only in two counties but in three counties on the same day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That was perfectly legal.

Mr. KENDALL. It may have been legal, but it was evidence of partisanship. I may say that these very persons admitted that it was not their desire to so act but they said they were compelled to do so by the management of the road. We might have dealt with these men severely but we did not do

Mr. INGRAM.

so. We recognized that they were almost compelled to act as they did and those who remained still enjoy their positions on the road and many of them have been promoted under the present administration. When the 1900 election came on no such undue political pressure was brought to bear. I took it upon myself, and I think my colleague did the same, to have it published to the men on the Intercolonial Railway that they were at liberty to vote as they wished and some voted for us and some against us. Some of those who have voted against us have been preferred in their lines. I wish further to accentuate what I said to the hon. member for East Elgin when he challenged contradiction of the statement that the Cape Breton end of the Intercolonial Railway was overmanned by political interference.

Mr. INGRAM. If I were making such a statement as that which the hon. gentleman has made, I could not prove my case more conclusively. I live alongside of several railways. Imagine my going to the management and saying: You must put this man on, or this man must be dismissed. It should be no part of the patronage of a government member living alongside of a government railway to recommend and force the employment of any men on the line.

Mr. EMMERSON. How long have you held that view?

Mr. INGRAM. Always.

Mr. EMMERSON. And your friends alongside of you?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, Sir; and I also held that view when I was on that side of the House. I am one of those who entertained that view on that side of the House as well as on this side of the House, and I had the courage of my convictions.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think you were very much in the minority then.

Mr. INGRAM. I am in a happy minority now, but I am glad to know I am right, and I have proved out of the mouth of hon. gentlemen opposite, by means of the statements they have been making this afternoon, that it should be no part of the patronage of government members to say who shall be on the railway and who shall not be on the railway. That should not constitute a part of the patronage of the government, but the management of the government railway should have a free hand. If hon. gentlemen opposite do not like that, let them create a commission and hand in their recommendations to that commission, and if the commission think they require the services of any of these applicants let them employ them. Then you will have a better system than you have to-day. But so long as you have the system that you have to-day, you will have the same interference