

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Might I ask the hon. gentleman, is not the hon. member for North Essex the gentleman who plagiarized the resolution of another member of this House last session?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member has no right to say that an hon. member has plagiarized.

Mr. LANCASTER. If he got any comfort out of what he wanted to do in that respect, he can have it. The gentleman who promoted the matter to which the hon. member for North Victoria refers succeeded in doing for the people of Canada what he wanted to do after three sessions fighting, and got the support of the hon. member for North Essex afterwards. Whether it was right or wrong for that hon. member to endeavour to take credit for what he was not entitled to and had opposed until then is a different matter. That is all over now, the people got their rights, and they know whom to thank for them. But the people will not thank any hon. member of this House for turning away from the issue before the chair, which is the expenditure of a large sum of money for works for which the original vote of parliament was not intended. Speaking for myself, as a humble member of this House, but representing a somewhat important constituency, which pays a large share of taxes to the general funds of the country, I am not satisfied to pass this vote as it stands. As the issue is before the chair at this moment, I feel that this item ought to be struck out, and I shall be obliged, if it is pressed, to vote for the motion for the hon. member for Leeds. I do not care whether the hon. member for Leeds reads a letter that is not signed, or a memorandum or a statement; I do not care what he says is the source of his information. He stands in his place in this House and says he has certain information. What does it matter whether that information is in a letter, the writer of which has not given the permission to use his name, or has come within his knowledge in any other way? I cannot understand why hon. gentlemen opposite are tumbling over each other to find excuses for voting this money through.

I cannot see how that fact can alter the question before the House, and that question is whether the allegations stated in this paper are true. What difference does it make who wrote that letter, or whether that letter was signed by one man or another? The member who produced the letter has told the House that he is satisfied the statements are true and should be investigated. That hon. gentleman is surely not anonymous. He stands on his feet and makes an assertion and is courteous enough to state the source of his information although not obliged to. He says it is from a reputable gentleman whose name he is not at liberty to divulge at this particular moment. But these gentlemen opposite are disappointed and want to go off on a tan-

gent, and quarrel about whether that gentleman who wrote that document should have his name disclosed on this particular occasion or be produced when the commission is granted. If the government have good reasons for wanting this item to go through, they can always give them. If they have information to show that the statements made by the hon. gentleman who wrote that letter are not true, they can give it. They can produce the reports asked for from the engineers, the plans made by the architects or engineers showing the necessity of the work, if they have such reports and plans, and they can explain, what they have not done at all yet—not that I have noticed, at all events—how it is that this grant was asked for last year on an entirely different condition of things from this year, and how it is that a much larger amount is asked for this year in addition to what was voted last session. The people of this country do not want the public money voted under false pretense. I do not mean to use that word in any insulting or improper way, but it amounts to a false pretense to ask parliament to vote the people's money in order that we may build a certain work, employ labourers doing work for the King, and build this work as a government work, start it from the beginning and make it a government work, and then after that money is obtained on that representation use it to buy from somebody else some work that the government say will do as a substitute and pay an extravagant price for what is apparently supposed to have been done in that connection. The government should have known last year what they were going to do. I presume they thought they were going to do what they asked for. I presume they thought they were going to build the wharf when they got that grant; and if they have changed their policy, they should be able to give more information than they have given as to their reasons for the change and show what necessity there was for acquiring from these people—who are practically Americans and not Canadians, who are practically people belonging to the adjoining republic and not to Canada at all—a transfer of their property without any benefit whatever coming to the people of Canada. We are too fond of voting away the public money just for the mere sake of voting it away. We should only vote away money when it is going to do the Dominion good. If any money is asked to be voted which is not going to give full value to the people for every dollar voted, we should not vote it. There is no use in our voting money for the mere sake of voting it. If it is not going to benefit the people, there is no reason for voting it. Hon. gentlemen, particularly on the government side, appear to forget that they should first prove the benefit Canada is going to get from an expenditure before voting it, and it has not been shown that Canada will get one particle of benefit from this expen-