

SUPPLY—MARINE AND FISHERIES—'ARCTIC'—MAINTENANCE—*Con.*

Northrup, W. B. (East Hastings)—*Con.*

tirely fallacious—3358. Subject of this expedition was never mentioned in House; quotes Major Moodie's report at page 7. Why was vessel supplied with provisions for three years when there was no possible risk of its running short of provisions?—3359. The government took a vote to purchase a vessel for one purpose and used it for another—3360. Quotes Mr. Préfontaine from 'Hansard' p. 6468—3365. Quotes p. 7 of Major Moodie's report; stores transferred to 'Neptune' on 23rd as 'Arctic' had to start for Quebec—3366. Minister not altogether responsible for estimates of his predecessor—3373. Gives some expenditures for supplies in detail. If the minister thinks it proper that crew of 'Arctic' should be regaled on champagne costing \$32 per pint case, he has a higher opinion of crew than the ordinary taxpayer of this country has—3374. Enumerates some expenditure—3375. Did minister imagine that any bill of goods could be made out by government in which Woods & Co. did not appear? Extravagance in expenditure on 'Arctic' is quite mild in character compared with expenditure on the ice-breakers—3376. Details some expenditures on ice-breaker 'Montcalm'—3377-8. Details some expenditures on ice-breaker 'Champlain'. If any hon. gentleman wants the height of extravagance that even a Department of Marine and Fisheries may attain let him study the history and accounts of that precious little private yacht, the 'Maisonneuve'—3378. The Auditor General's Report shows a total payment by government of \$5,000 for fur bags, while none were asked for by Captain Bernier—3392. The department did not follow Captain Bernier's requisition; if they had done so the quantity of provisions bought would have been considerably smaller—3393.

Osler, E. B. (West Toronto)—3376.

Was hon. minister (Mr. Brodeur) buying the furs on speculation, thinking they would rise?—3376.

Reid, J. D. (Grenville)—3366.

Hardly fair to lay all blame on Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur); Prime Minister should give some explanation—3366. Did second-class clerk get authority from Prime Minister to purchase \$30,000 worth of supplies that he sent out on this steamer? Does not believe that 'Arctic' could carry quantity of goods said to have been placed on that vessel—3367. Cost of running several steamers down St. Lawrence from 1896 to 1901 has remained practically the same. All parties doing business with Department of Marine and Fisheries have advanced their prices either for purpose of making big profits or allowing a rake-off—3368. Although there was \$250,000 worth purchased in 1905 the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been and is now purchasing from and doing business with the same firm or firms—3368. Geo. T.

SUPPLY—MARINE AND FISHERIES—'ARCTIC'—MAINTENANCE—*Con.*

Reid, J. D. (Grenville)—*Con.*

Merwin and F. L. Brooks and Company; department purchased cement from F. L. Brooks & Co., and paid \$2.75 and government paid freight—3369. Asks minister (Mr. Brodeur) if Mr. Merwin or Mr. Brooks have ever had their accounts financed by minister or his department, by any other banks outside the legitimate way of the department—3370. Would like matter of Brooks & Co. left entirely in hands of Public Accounts Committee—3371. Department of Marine and Fisheries is a disgrace to minister and a disgrace to country—3372. Is this statement of requirements the detailed list supplied by Captain Bernier?—3386. No one had any authority to add anything or deduct anything from that requisition. If any business man was handling that bill he would at once have had a number of copies of the detailed statement handed to him and would then have distributed them to wholesale men and asked for a tender, or price on total account—3387. Details some expenditures made to various wholesale houses in Montreal and Quebec—3388. There were double government payments paid to Halliday Bros. of Quebec, owner of steamer 'King Edward'—3389. Constant change of ministers is destroying unity and system of government; it is impossible to carry on works of departments under present conditions—3390.

Sproule, T. S. (East Grey)—3352.

Would you prescribe exactly the same quantity of food for men on that boat as you would to the Northwest Mounted Police on horseback?—3352. Since First Minister has made known his intention to grant a committee to inquire into expenditure it would be only proper to leave item until matter is examined more fully—3393. The items given by hon. friend the leader of opposition were the items submitted to government as necessary for this expedition—3396. Originally this expedition was believed to be a hunt for the North Pole. Was it intended that this boat should be kept sailing around northern waters for three years without any opportunity of replenishing her supplies—3397. Minister left impression on House that expedition was for North Pole—3398.

Stockton, A. A. (St. John city and co.)—3355.

Does the \$118,000 embrace supplies for the entire outfit?—3355. Thought that expedition was to discover the North Pole, not to explore Hudson bay—3356.

Taylor, Geo. (Leeds)—3379.

Since Auditor General's Report was laid on table has been working diligently to find where the \$90,000,000 this government spends annually goes to; Conservative government ran country on \$40,000,000—3379. Did not expect when question was first up that \$220,000 was going to be spent on expedition; quotes expenditures made to F. L. Brooks & Co. from Auditor General's Report; quotes letter to Gouldie